

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW,

ARGUMENT OF

ALONZO T. JONES

BEFORE THE

United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor;

AT

WASHINGTON, D. C., DEC. 13, 1888.

AMERICAN SENTINEL:

1059 CASTRO ST., OAKLAND, CAL.; 26 AND 28 COLLEGE PLACE,

CHICAGO, ILL.; 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

1889.

COPYRIGHTED 1889, BY ALONZO T JONES.

144000.com/SundayLaw

INTRODUCTION

THIS pamphlet is a report of an argument made upon the national Sunday bill introduced by Senator Blair in the fiftieth Congress. It is not, however, exactly the argument that was made before the Senate Committee, as there were so many interruptions in the course of my speech that it was impossible to make a connected argument upon a single point. By these questions, etc., my argument was not only forced to take a wider range than was intended when I began to speak, but I was prevented from making the definite argument that I designed to present. I do not speak of these interruptions and counter-arguments by way of complaint, but only to explain why this pamphlet is issued. Nevertheless it is a fact that while there were eighteen speeches before mine, occupying three hours, in all of which together there were only one hundred and eighty-nine questions and counter-arguments by all the members of the Committee who were present, I was interrupted by the Chairman alone, one hundred and sixty-nine times in ninety minutes, as may be seen by the official report of the hearing. -- Fiftieth Congress, Second Session, Messages and Documents No. 43, pp. 73-102.

A national Sunday law is a question of national interest. While it is true that the Sunday-rest bill did not become a law, the legislation having died with the expiration of the fiftieth Congress, it is also true that those who worked for the introduction and passage of that bill are now laying plans to have another national

iv

Sunday bill introduced as soon as possible in the fiftyfirst Congress, and will do all in their power to secure its enactment into law. The scope that was given to the subject by the questions asked of me by the Senate Committee, has opened the way for a somewhat exhaustive treatment of the subject. These questions being raised by United States senators, -- men of national affairs, -- show that a wider circulation of this matter is not out of place. The subject is worthy of the careful attention of the whole American people. The principles of the American Constitution, the proper relationship between religion and the State, the distinction between moral and civil law, the inalienable civil and religious rights of men, -- these are questions that never should become secondary in the mind of any American citizen.

An eminent American jurist has justly observed that in a government of the people "there is no safety except in an enlightened public opinion, based on individual intelligence." Constitutional provisions against the encroachments of the religious upon the civil power are safeguards only so long as the intelligence of the people shall recognize the truth that no man can allow any legislation in behalf of the religion, or the religious observances, in which he himself believes, without forfeiting his own religious freedom.

In enlarging as I have upon the matter presented in the original hearing, the meaning or intention of any statement has not been changed in the slightest degree. The

argument is submitted to the American people with the earnest hope that they will give thoughtful consideration to the principles involved. The positions taken will bear the severest test of every form of just criticism.

v

The bill proposed by Senator Blair, and upon which the argument was made, is as follows: --

"50th CONGRESS, } S. 2983. 1st SESSION. }

"IN the Senate of the United States, May 21, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor: --

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

"SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: Provided, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter.

"SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not

vi

being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of

the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person or corporation, or the agent or employee of any person or corporation, who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

"SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

"SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory,

vii

into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day."

Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D., representative of the Seventh-day Baptists, had spoken, and asked that a section be added to the bill granting exemption to observers of the Seventh day; but in answering the questions that were asked by the Chairman, Mr. Lewis compromised his position, and was followed soon after by Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, who remarked that Dr. Lewis had "given his whole case away." This is what is referred to in my introductory remarks to the effect that we did not intend to "give our case away."

A. T. J.

viii

CONTENTS.

SYNOPSIS. -- Introduction, 3-7; Beginning of Mr. Jones's Argument before the Senate Committee, 9, 10; The Words of Christ, 11, 12; Civil Government a Social Compact, 13-16; What to God? -- What to Caesar? 17-20; The Sabbath Not Due to Caesar, 21, 22; Civil Sabbath Laws Antichristian, 23, 24; The Civil Power Enforces Civility, 25, 26; Sunday-Law Inconsistency, 27, 28; Laws against Blasphemy, 29-40; Christianity and Roman Law, 41, 42; The United States Constitution, 43, 44; Sunday Laws Religious Legislation, 45, 46; Sunday Laws Unconstitutional, 47, 48; Sunday-Law Petitions, 49, 50; Sunday Laws Not Good, 51, 52; Religion Necessary to a Rest Day, 53, 54; A Rest Day Belongs Only to God, 55, 56; The History of It, 57, 58; A New Theocracy, 59, 60; The Government of Israel, 61, 62; The New Theocracy, 63-66; The Fourth-Century Theocracy 67, 68; Fourth-Century Sunday Laws, 69, 70; The Union of Church and State, 71, 72; The Foundation of the Inquisition, 73, 74; No Scripture Authority for Sunday, 75, 76; Sabbath Laws Belong Only with a Theocracy, 77, 78; More! More! More! More! 79, 80; Enforced Church-going on Sunday, 81, 82; The Object of Sunday Laws, 83, 84; Shall the Church Compel the Civil Power? 85, 86; The Cardinal Knows What He is Doing, 87, 88; The Argument Is Logical, 89, 90; Sunday Laws Mean Church and State, 91, 92; Only God Can Enforce the Decalogue, 93, 94; No Earthly Theocracy -- No Sunday Laws, 95, 96; A National Religion Proposed, 97, 98; Worse than Russia, 99, 100; The State Not a Religious Partisan, 101, 102; Shall this Majority Rule? 103, 104; Sunday Laws and the Working-Men, 105-108; Wages for Doing Nothing, 109-112; Church Members Compel Work on Sunday, 113, 114; The Preachers Desecrate the Day, 115, 116; Will They Compel Themselves? 117, 118; An Exemption Clause, 119, 120; Exemption Is Toleration in Disguise, 121, 122; The Workings of a Sunday Law, 123-128; Subversion of Liberty, 129, 130; The Workings of a Sunday Law, 131-134; Legislative Power not Omnipotent, 135, 136; An Unconstitutional Decision, 137, 138; The Pharisees Justified Themselves, 139, 140; Sunday Laws Invade Inalienable Rights, 141-146; Earthly Governments Civil, Not Moral, 147-152; Is the Objection Imaginary? 153, 154; No Ticket of Leave for Us, 155, 156; W. C. T. U. Legislation, 157, 158; Exemption for the Territories, 159, 160; The New Doctrine of Protection, 161, 162; Two Sundays Instead of One, 163, 164; The Answer to Unanswerable Arguments, 165, 166; The Authority for Sunday Laws, 167-172; No Authority for Sunday Laws, 173-183; Appendix A, 184-191; Appendix B, 192.

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

ARGUMENT OF ALONZO T. JONES BEFORE THE SENATE

COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator Blair. -- There are gentlemen present who wish to be heard in opposition to the bill. Prof. Alonzo T. Jones, of Battle Creek College, Mich., is one of those who have spoken to me in regard to it. Will you not state, Prof. Jones, what your desire is? I have no doubt that we can obtain leave of the Senate to sit during its session to-day. It is exceedingly desirable to go on with this hearing, and complete it now. How would such an arrangement comport with your convenience? First, state, please, whom you represent, and your reasons for desiring to be heard.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman, I represent the people known as Seventh-day Adventists. It is true, we have been entirely ignored by the other side. The very small "sect," as they stated it, of Seventh-day Baptists has been recognized, but we are more than three times their number, and many times their power in the real force of our work. We have organizations in every State and Territory in the Union. We have the largest printing-house in Michigan; the largest printing-house on the Pacific Coast; the largest Sanitarium in the world; a college in California and one in Michigan; an academy in Massachusetts; a printing establishment in Basel, Switzerland; one in Christiana,

10

Norway; and one in Melbourne, Australia. Our mission work has enlarged until, besides embracing the greater part of Europe, it has also extended nearly around the world; and we desire a hearing, with the consent of the Committee.

Senator Blair. -- Where do you reside?

Mr. Jones. -- At present in Michigan. My home for the past four years has been in California. I am now teaching history in Battle Creek College, Mich.

I must say in justice to myself, and also in behalf of the body which I represent, that we dissent almost wholly, I might say, wholly, from the position taken by the representative of the Seventh-day Baptists. I knew, the instant that Dr. Lewis stated what he did here, that he had "given his case away." We have not given our case away, Senators, nor do we expect to give it away. We expect to go deeper than any have gone at this hearing, both upon the principles and upon the facts, as well as upon the logic of the facts.

Senator Blair. -- This matter is all familiar to you. You are a professor of history. Can you not go on this afternoon?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, if I can have a little space between now and this afternoon to get my papers together. I have some references to read that I did not bring with me this morning.

Senator Blair. -- Very well.

ARGUMENT.

Senator Blair. -- You have a full hour, Professor. It is now half past one.

Mr. Jones. -- There are three particular lines in which I wish to conduct the argument: First, the

11

principles upon which we stand; second, the historical view; and, third, the practical aspect of the question.

The principle upon which we stand is that civil government is civil, and has nothing to do in the matter of legislation, with religious observances in any way. The basis of this is found in the words of Jesus Christ in Matt. 22:21. When the Pharisees asked whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not, he replied: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

In this the Saviour certainly separated that which pertains to Caesar from that which pertains to God. We are not to render to Caesar that which pertains to God; we are not to render to God by Caesar that which is God's.

Senator Blair. -- May not the thing due to Caesar be due to God also?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir. If that be so, then the Saviour did entangle himself in his talk, the very thing which they wanted him to do. The record says that they sought "how they might entangle him in his talk." Having drawn the distinction which he has, between that which belongs to Caesar and that which belongs to God, if it be true that the same things belong to both, then he did entangle himself in his talk; and where is the force in his words which command us to render to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar, and to God the things that are God's?

Senator Blair. -- Is it not a requirement of God's that we render to Caesar that which is due to Caesar?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes.

Senator Blair. -- If Caesar is society, and the Sabbath is required for the good of society, does not God require

us to establish the Sabbath for the good of society? and if society makes a law accordingly, is it not binding?

Mr. Jones. -- It is for the good of society that men shall be Christians; but it is not in the province of the State to make Christians. For the State to undertake to do so would not be for the benefit of society; it never has been, and it never can be.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not confuse this matter? A thing may be required for the good of society, and for that very reason be in accordance with the will and the command of God. God issues his commands for the good of society, does he not? God does not give us commands that have no relation to the good of society.

Mr. Jones. -- His commands are for the good of man.

Senator Blair. -- Man is society. It is made up of individual men.

Mr. Jones. -- But in that which God has issued to man for the good of men he has given those things which pertain solely to man's relationship to his God; and he has also given things which pertain to man's relationship to his fellow-men. With those things in which our duty pertains to our fellow-men, civil government can have something to do.

Senator Blair. -- Man would obey God in obeying civil society.

Mr. Jones. -- I will come to that point. In the things which pertain to our duty to God, with the individual's right of serving God as one's conscience dictates, society has nothing to do; but in the formation of civil society, there are certain rights surrendered to the society by the individual, without which society could not be organized.

Senator Blair. -- That is not conceded. When was this doctrine of a compact in society made? It is the philosophy of an infidel.

Mr. Jones. It is made wherever you find men together.

Senator Blair. -- Did you and I ever agree to it? Did it bind us before we were compos mentis?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. Civil government is an ordinance of God.

Senator Blair. -- Then it is not necessarily an agreement of man?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, it springs from the people.

Senator Blair. -- As to the compact in society that is talked about, it is not conceded that it is a matter of personal and individual agreement. Society exists altogether independent of the volition of those who enter into it. However, I shall not interrupt you further. I only did this because of our private conversation, in which I thought you labored under a fallacy in your fundamental proposition, that would lead all the way through your argument. I suggested that ground, and that is all.

Mr. Jones. -- I think the statement of the Declaration of Independence is true, that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Senator Blair. -- I do not controvert that.

Mr. Jones. -- Of all men in the world, Americans ought to be the last to deny the social compact theory of civil government. On board the "Mayflower," before the Pilgrim Fathers ever set foot on these shores, the following was written: --

"In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign,

14

Lord King James, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, king, defender of the faith, etc., having undertaken for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia; do by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid: and by virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape Cod, the eleventh of November, in the reign of our sovereign, Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland, the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini, 1620."

The next American record is that of the fundamental orders of Connecticut, 1638-39, and reads as follows: --

"Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his diuine prudence so to order and dispose of things that we, the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, and Harteford, and Wethersfield, are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vppon the river of Conectecotte and the lands thereunto adioyneing; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent gourment

established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons, as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one public State or commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be joined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together," etc.

15

And, sir, the first Constitution of your own State -- 1784 -- in its bill of rights, declares: --

"I. All men are born equally free and independent; therefore, all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good."

"III. When men enter into a state of society, they surrender some of their natural rights to that society, in order to insure the protection of others; and without such an equivalent, the surrender is void.

"IV. Among the natural rights, some are in their very nature unalienable, because no equivalent can be received for them. Of this kind are the rights of conscience."

And in Part 2, of that same Constitution, under the division of the "form of government," are these words: --

"The people inhabiting the territory formerly called the province of New Hampshire, do hereby solemnly and mutually agree with each other to form themselves into a free, sovereign, and independent body politic, or State, by the name of the State of New Hampshire."

In the Constitution of New Hampshire of 1792, these articles are repeated word for word. They remain there without alteration in a single letter under the ratification of 1852, and also under the ratification of 1877. Consequently, sir, the very State which sends you to this capitol is founded upon the very theory which you here deny. This is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence; it is the doctrine of the Scripture; and therefore we hold it to be eternally true.

These sound and genuine American principles -- civil governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, and the inalienability of the

16

rights of conscience, -- these are the principles asserted and maintained by Seventh-day Adventists.

Senator Blair. -- But society is behind the government which society creates.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. All civil government springs from the people, I care not in what form it is.

Senator Blair. -- That is all agreed to.

Mr. Jones. -- But the people, I care not how many there are, have no right to invade your relationship to God, nor mine. That rests between the individual and God, through faith in Jesus Christ; and as the Saviour has made this distinction between that which pertains to Caesar and that which is God's, when Caesar exacts of men that which pertains to God, then Caesar is out of his place, and in so far as Caesar is obeyed there, God is denied. When Caesar -- civil government -- exacts of men that which is God's, he demands what does not belong to him; in so doing Caesar usurps the place and the prerogative of God, and every man who regards God or his own rights before God, will disregard all such interference on the part of Caesar.

This argument is confirmed by the apostle's commentary upon Christ's words. In Rom. 13:1-9, is written: --

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye

17

must needs be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is easy to see that this scripture is but an exposition of Christ's words, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." In the Saviour's command to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, there is plainly a recognition of the rightfulness of civil government, and that civil government has claims upon us which we are in duty bound to recognize, and that there are things which duty requires us to render to the civil government. This scripture in Romans 13 simply states the same thing in other words:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."

Again: the Saviour's words were in answer to a question concerning tribute. They said to him, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" Rom. 13: 6 refers to the same thing, saying, "For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." In answer to the question of the Pharisees about the tribute, Christ said, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." Rom. 13:7, taking up the same thought, says, "Render therefore to all their dues:

18

tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." These references make positive that which we have stated, -- that this portion of Scripture (Rom. 13: 1-9) is a divine commentary upon the words of Christ in Matt. 22: 17-21.

The passage refers first to civil government, the higher powers, -- the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers, as bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then it commands to render tribute to whom tribute is due, and says, "Owe no man any thing; but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Then he refers to the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments, and says, "It there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

There are other commandments of this same law to which Paul refers. There are the four commandments of the first table of the law, -- the commandments which say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing;" "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Then there is the other commandment in which are briefly comprehended all these, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

Paul knew full well these commandments. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? -- Because he was writing concerning the principles set forth by the Saviour, which relate to our duties to civil government.

19

Our duties under civil government pertain solely to the government and to our fellow-men, because the powers of civil government pertain solely to men in their relations one to another, and to the government. But the Saviour's words in the same connection

entirely separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to civil government. The things which pertain to God are not to be rendered to civil government - - to the powers that be; therefore Paul, although knowing full well that there were other commandments, said, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" that is, if there be any other commandment which comes into the relation between man and civil government, it is comprehended in this saying, that he shall love his neighbor as himself; thus showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained simply in things pertaining to the relation of man with his fellow-men, and in those things alone.

Further: as in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the relations which men bear toward God.

As the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in the enumeration here given of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties enjoined in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be; that is to say, again, that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty

20

enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with those the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God -- not to Caesar, nor by Caesar -- that which is God's. Therefore, as in his comment upon the principle which Christ established, Paul has left out of the account the first four commandments, so we deny, forever, the right of any civil government to legislate in anything that pertains to men's duty to God under the first four commandments. This Sunday bill does propose to legislate in regard to the Lord's day. If it is the Lord's day, we are to render it to the Lord, not to Caesar. When Caesar exacts it of us, he is exacting what does not belong to him, and is demanding of us that with which he should have nothing to do.

Senator Blair. -- Would it answer your objection in that regard, if, instead of saying "the Lord's day", we should say, "Sunday"?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir, Because the underlying principle, the sole basis, of Sunday, is ecclesiastical, and legislation in regard to it is ecclesiastical legislation. I shall come more fully to the question you ask, presently.

Now do not misunderstand us on this point. We are Seventh-day Adventists; but if this bill were in favor of enforcing the observance of the seventh day as the Lord's day, we would oppose it just as much as we oppose it as it is now, for the reason that civil

government has nothing to do with what we owe to God, or whether we owe anything or not, or whether we pay it or not.

Allow me again to refer to the words of Christ to emphasize this point. At that time the question was

21

upon the subject of tribute, whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not. In answering the question, Christ established this principle: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." That tribute money was Caesar's; it bore his image and superscription; it was to be rendered to him. Now, it is a question of rendering Sabbath observance, and it is a perfectly legitimate and indeed a necessary question to ask right here: Is it lawful to render Lord's day observance to Caesar? The reply may be in His own words: Show me the Lord's day; whose image and superscription does it bear? -- The Lord's, to be sure. This very bill which is under discussion here to-day declares it to be the Lord's day. Then the words of Christ apply to this. Bearing the image and superscription of the Lord, Render therefore to the Lord the things that are the Lord's, and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. It does not bear the image and superscription of Caesar; it does not belong to him; it is not to be rendered to him.

Again: take the institution under the word Sabbath: Is it lawful to render Sabbath observance to Caesar or not? Show us the Sabbath; whose image and superscription does it bear? The commandment of God says, it "is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It bears his image and superscription, and his only; it belongs wholly to him; Caesar can have nothing to do with it. It does not belong to Caesar; its observance cannot be rendered to Caesar, but only to God; for the commandment is, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all. Therefore, belonging to God, bearing his superscription, and not that of Caesar, according to Christ's commandment,

22

it is to be rendered only to God; because we are to render to God that which is God's, and the Sabbath is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Sabbath observance, therefore, or Lord's day observance, whichever you may choose to call it, never can be rendered to Caesar. And Caesar never can demand it without demanding that which belongs to God, or without putting himself in the place of God, and usurping the prerogative of God.

Therefore, we say that if this bill were framed in behalf of the real Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, the day which we observe; if this bill proposed to promote its observance, or to compel men to do no work upon that day we would oppose it just as strongly as we oppose it now, and I would stand here at this table and argue precisely as I am arguing against this, and upon the same principle, -- the principle established by Jesus Christ, -- that with that which is God's the civil government never can of right have anything to do. That duty rests solely between man and God; and if any man does not

render it to God, he is responsible only to God, and not to any man, nor to any assembly or organization of men, for his failure or refusal to render it to God; and any power that undertakes to punish that man for his failure or refusal to render to God what is God's, puts itself in the place of God. Any government which attempts it, sets itself against the word of Christ, and is therefore antichristian. This Sunday bill proposes to have this Government do just that thing, and therefore I say, without any reflection upon the author of the bill, this national Sunday bill which is under discussion here to-day is antichristian. But in saying this I am not singling out this contemplated law as worse than all other Sunday

23

laws in the world. There never was a Sunday law that was not antichristian. and there never can be one that will not be antichristian.

Senator Blair. -- You oppose all the Sunday laws of the country, then?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir.

Senator Blair. -- You are against all Sunday laws?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed; and we would be equally against a Sabbath law if it were proposed, for that would be antichristian, too.

Senator Blair. -- State and national, alike?

Mr. Jones. -- State and national, sir. I shall give you historical reasons presently, and the facts upon which these things stand, and I hope they will receive consideration.

George Washington, I believe, is yet held in some respectful consideration -- he is by the Seventh-day Adventists at least -- and he said, "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and is to be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience." And so should we be protected, so long as we are law-abiding citizens. There are no saloon keepers among us. We are as a body for prohibition; and as for the principles of Christian temperance, we conscientiously practice them. In short, you will find no people in this country or in the world, more peaceable and law-abiding than we endeavor to be. We teach the people according to the Scripture, to be subject to the powers that be; we teach them that the highest duty of the Christian citizen is strictly to obey the law, -- to obey it not from fear of punishment, but out of respect

24

for governmental authority, and out of respect for God, and conscience towards him.

Senator Blair. -- That is the common Mormon argument. The Mormons say their institution is a matter of religious belief. Everybody concedes their right to believe in Mormonism, but when they come to the point of practicing it, will it not be to the disturbance of others?

Mr. Jones. -- I should have come to that, even though you had not asked the question. But as you have introduced it, I will notice it now. My argument throughout is that the civil government can never have anything to do with men's duties under the first four of the ten commandments; and this is the argument embodied in Washington's words. These duties pertain solely to God. Now polygamy is adultery. But adultery is not a duty that men owe to God, in any way, much less does it come under any of the first four commandments. This comes within the inhibitions of the second table of the law of God -- the commandments embracing duty to our neighbor. How men should conduct themselves toward their fellow-men, civil government must decide; that is the very purpose of its existence. Consequently, the practice of polygamy lying wholly within this realm, is properly subject to the jurisdiction of civil government. My argument does not in the least degree countenance the principles of Mormonism, nor can it fairly be made to do so. I know that it is offered as a very ready objection; but those who offer it as an objection and as an argument against the principles upon which we stand, thereby make adultery a religious practice. But against all such objection and argument, I maintain that adultery is not in any sense a religious practice. It is not only highly irreligious,

25

but it is essentially uncivil; and because it is uncivil, the civil power has as much right to blot it out as it has to punish murder, or thieving, or perjury, or any other uncivil thing. Moreover, we deny that honest occupations on any day of the week, or at any time whatever, can ever properly be classed with adultery.

There are also people who believe in community of property in this world. Suppose they base their principles of having all things in common upon the apostolic example. Very good. They have the right to do that. Every one who sells his property and puts it into a common fund, has a right to do that if he chooses; but suppose these men in carrying out that principle, and in claiming that it is a religious ordinance, were to take without consent your property or mine into their community. Then what? -- The State forbids it. It does not forbid the exercise of their religion; but it protects your property and mine, and in exercising its prerogative of protection, it forbids theft. And in forbidding theft, the State never asks any questions as to whether thieving is a religious practice. So also as to polygamy, which is practiced among the Mormons. But let us consider this in another view.

It is every man's right in this country, or anywhere else, to worship an idol if he chooses. That idol embodies his conviction of what God is. He can worship only according to his convictions. It matters not what form his idol may have, he has the right to worship it anywhere in all the world, therefore in the United States. But suppose that in the worship of that god he attempts to take the life of one of his fellow-men, and offer it

as a human sacrifice. The civil government exists for the protection of life, liberty, property, etc., and it must punish that man for his attempt upon the life of

26

his fellow-man. The civil law protects man's life from such exercise of any one's religion, but in punishing the offender, the State does not consider the question of his religion at all. It would punish him just the same if he made no pretensions to worship or to religion. It punishes him for his incivility, for his attempt at murder, not for his irreligion. I repeat, the question of religion is not considered by the State; the sole question is, Did he threaten the life of his fellow-man? Civil government must protect its citizens. This is strictly within Caesar's jurisdiction; it comes within the line of duties which the Scripture shows to pertain to our neighbor, and with it Caesar has to do.

Therefore it is true that the State can never of right legislate in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments, a man invades the rights of his neighbor, as to life, family, property, or character, then the civil government says that it is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious or immoral? -- Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only. It never can be proper for the State to ask any question as to whether any man is religious or not, or whether his actions are religious or not. The sole question must ever be, Is the action civil or uncivil.

Senator Blair. -- Now apply that right to this case -- to the institution of the Sabbath among men for the good of men.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good, we will consider that. Here are persons who are keeping Sunday. It is their right to work on every other day of the week. It is their right to work on that day, if they desire; but they

27

are keeping that day, recognizing it as the Sabbath. Now while they are doing that which is their right, here are other people who are keeping Saturday, and others who are keeping Friday. The Mohammedans recognize Friday. But we will confine ourselves to those who keep Saturday, the seventh day, as the Sabbath. Those who keep Sunday, and who want legislation for that day, ask that other people shall be forbidden to work on Sunday, because they say it disturbs their rest, it disturbs their worship, etc.; and they claim that their rights are not properly protected. Do they really believe that in principle? Let us see. They will never admit (at any rate, I have never yet found one of them who would) that their work on Saturday disturbs the rest, or the worship, of the man who rests on Saturday. If their work on Saturday does not disturb the Sabbath rest, or the worship, of the man who keeps Saturday, then upon what principle is it that our work on Sunday disturbs the rest of those who keep Sunday? I have never found one on that side yet who would admit the principle. If their work does not disturb our rest and our worship, our work cannot disturb their rest or their worship. More than this: In a general Sunday

convention held in San Francisco, at which I was present, there was a person who spoke on this very question. Said he: "There are some people, and a good many of them in this State, who do not believe in Sunday laws, and who keep Saturday as the Sabbath; but," said he, "the majority must rule. The vast majority of the people do keep Sunday; their rights must be respected, and they have a right to enact it into law." I arose and said, "Suppose the Seventh-day people were in the majority, and they should go to the legislature and ask for a law to compel you to keep

28

Saturday out of respect to their rights. Would you consider it right?" There was a murmur all over the house, "No."

Senator Blair. -- Upon what ground did they say, No?

Mr. Jones. -- That is what I should like to know. They were not logical. Their answer shows that there is no ground in justice nor in right for their claim that the majority should rule in matters of conscience.

Senator Blair. -- That does not follow. At least it does not strike me that it follows. The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society, and if Caesar regulates society, then the majority has a right in this country to say what we shall render to Caesar.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good, but the majority has no right to say what we shall render to God; nor has it any right to say that we shall render to Caesar that which is God's. If nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every one thousand people in the United States kept the seventh day, that is, Saturday, and I deemed it my right, and made it my choice, to keep Sunday, they would have not right to compel me to rest on Saturday.

Senator Blair. -- In other words, you take the ground that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on Sabbath, if it disturbs others?

Mr. Jones. -- As to its disturbing others, I have proved that it does not. They body of your question states my position exactly.

Senator Blair. -- You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath. This question was passed me to ask: "Is the speaker also opposed to all laws against blasphemy?"

29

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir. But not because blasphemy is not wrong, but because civil government cannot define blasphemy, nor punish it. Blasphemy pertains to God, it is an offense against him, it is a sin against him.

Senator Blair. -- Suppose the practice of it in society at large is hurtful to society?

Mr. Jones. -- That will have to be explained. How is it hurtful to society?

Senator Blair. -- Suppose it be hurtful to society in this way: A belief in the existence of God, and reverence for the Creator, and a cultivation of that sentiment in society, is for the good of society; is, in fact, the basis of all law and restraint. If the Almighty, who knows everything, or is supposed to, and has all power, has no right to restrain us, it is difficult to see how we can restrain each other.

Mr. Jones. -- He has the right to restrain us. He does restrain us.

Senator Blair. -- To commonly blaspheme and deride and ridicule the Almighty, would, of course, have a tendency to bring up the children who are soon to be the State, in an absolute disregard of him and his authority. Blasphemy, as I understand it, is that practice which brings the Creator into contempt and ridicule among his creatures.

Mr. Jones. -- What is blasphemy here, would not be blasphemy in China, and many other countries.

Senator Blair. -- We are not dealing with pagan communities. A regulation that may be appropriate in a pagan community, would not answer men in a Christian community. Do you mean that there is no such thing as blasphemy?

Mr. Jones. -- No; I do not mean that.

0 Senator Blair. -- The Chinaman hardly believes in

any god whatever; at least in no such God as we do. Taking our God and these Christian institutions of ours, what do you understand blasphemy to be?

Mr. Jones. -- There are many things that the Scriptures show to be blasphemy.

Senator Blair. -- The power of the law has undertaken in various States to say that certain things are blasphemy.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; but if the law proposes to define blasphemy and punish it, why does it not go to the depth of it, and define all and punish all?

Senator Blair. -- Perhaps it may not go as far as it ought. You say you are opposed to all laws against blasphemy, cursing, and swearing?

Mr. Jones. -- In relation to any one of the first four commandments.

Senator Palmer. -- Suppose that what is defined as blasphemy in the statutes of the several States, should detract from the observance of the law and regard for it, would you regard laws against it as being improper?

Mr. Jones. -- Under the principle that the Scripture lays down, no legislation in any way can be proper in regard to the first four commandments. There may be many ways in which it would appear very appropriate for civil government to do this or to do that; but when you have entered upon such legislation, where will you stop?

Senator Palmer. -- Abstaining from blasphemy is a part of the education of the youth of the country.

Mr. Jones. -- That is true. If youth are properly educated, they will never blaspheme.

0 Senator Palmer. -- We pass laws for the education of the youth. The question is whether abstention from blasphemy could not be included in the scope of education. Take it on that ground.

Mr. Jones. -- Idolatry (and covetousness is idolatry) is no more than a violation of the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me;" and if the State can forbid the violation of the third commandment and the fourth, why may it not forbid the violation of the first and the second, and in that case supplant God at once, and establish an earthly theocracy? That is the only logical outcome.

Senator Blair. -- Covetousness is a state of mind; but when it becomes practice by stealing -- taking from another without consideration -- the law interferes.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Palmer. -- There is an infection in blasphemy or in covetousness. For instance, if one covetous man in a neighborhood should infuse the whole neighborhood with covetousness to such an extent that all would become thieves, then covetousness would be a proper subject of legislation.

Mr. Jones. -- Never! You forbid the theft, not the covetousness. You cannot invade the condition of mind in which lies the covetousness.

Senator Blair. -- We do not say that we must invade the condition of mind; but society has a right to make regulations, because those regulations are essential to the good of society. Society by a major vote establishes a regulations, and we have to obey what is settled by the majority.

Mr. Jones. -- How shall it be discovered what is blasphemy, as it is only an offense against God? In the Puritan Theocracy of New England, our historian, Bancroft, says that "the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes was blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy."

Senator Blair. -- But the law was behind the jury, and said that the practice should be punished. If a

32

jury of twelve men said that one had committed the overt act, then it could be punished. It was the majority who made the law, and the jury only found the question of fact after the law had been violated. The jury did not make the law. This is a question as to making the law.

Mr. Jones. -- It is not wholly a question only of making the law. The question is whether the law is right when it is made. There is a limit to the lawmaking power; and that limit is the line which Jesus Christ has drawn. The government has no right to make any law relating to the things that pertain to God, or offenses against God, or religion. It has nothing to do with religion.

Blasphemy, according to Judge Cooley, in his "Constitutional Limitations," "is purposely using words concerning the Supreme Being, calculated and designed to impair and destroy the reverence, respect, and confidence due to him, as the intelligent Creator, Governor, and Judge of the world; . . . a bad motive must exist; there must be a willful, malicious attempt to lessen men's reverence for the Deity, or for the accepted religion."

It is seen at a glance that this comes from the old English system of statutes regulating "offenses against God and religion." That is where this statute is placed in every system of civil law; it could not be placed anywhere else. But offenses against God are to be answered for only at his tribunal; and with religion, or offenses against it, the civil power has nothing to do. It is a perversion of the functions of civil government to have it made a party to religious controversies. It will have ample exercise for its power and jurisdiction to keep religious disputants as well as other people civil,

33

without allowing itself ever to become a partisan in religious disputes and the conservator of religious dogmas.

But according to Judge Cooley's definition, blasphemy is an attempt to lessen men's reverence, not only for the Deity, but for "the accepted religion" as well. But any man in this wide world has the right to lessen men's reverence for the accepted religion, if he thinks that religion to be wrong. Consequently, as I said a moment ago, that which would be counted blasphemy here would not be counted blasphemy in China; and that which is in the strictest accordance with the word of God and the faith of Jesus Christ here, is necessarily blasphemy in China, or in Turkey, or in Russia. A man who preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ in China commits blasphemy under this definition. He does make a willful attempt to lessen men's reverence for their accepted religion, and for the deities recognized in their religion. He had to do so, if he is ever to get them to believe in Christ and the religion of Christ. He has to bring them to the place where they will have no reverence for their deities or for their accepted religion, before they ever can accept the religion of Jesus Christ. It is the same way in Turkey, or any other Mohammedan country, or any heathen country. Wherever the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in any Mohammedan or heathen country, it is blasphemy under this definition, because its sole object is not only to lessen men's reverence for their deities and for their accepted religion, but to turn them wholly from it, and if possible to obliterate it from their minds.

It is so likewise in Russia. Anybody there who speaks against the accepted religion, or against the saints, or their images, is subject to the penalty of blasphemy, which is banishment for life to Siberia.

But if blasphemy be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, if it be right for a government to make itself the "defender of the faith," then it is perfectly proper for the laws of China to prohibit under whatever penalty it pleases, the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within the Chinese dominions; because its effect is to lessen men's reverence for the deities recognized by China, and for the accepted religion of the country. It is the same way in any of the other countries named. And in that case there is no such thing as persecution on account of religion. The only persecutions that have ever been, were because of men's speaking against the accepted religion. If this principle be correct, then the Roman empire did perfectly right in prohibiting under penalty of death the preaching of the religion of Jesus Christ. Whenever Paul, or any of his brethren, spoke in the Roman empire, they blasphemed according to the Roman law. They were held as blasphemers, and were put to death under the very principle of this definition, which is the principle of the American statutes on the subject of blasphemy. The Christians had to tell the Roman empire that the Roman gods were no gods. They had to tell the Roman empire that the genius of Rome itself, which the Roman system held to be the supreme deity, was not such; but that it was subordinate, and that there was a higher idea of God and of right than the Roman empire or the Roman law knew anything of. They did speak deliberately

against the chief deity of Rome, and all the gods of Rome. They did it with the express purpose of destroying reverence for them and for the accepted religion. Rome put them to death. And I repeat, if the principle of the American statutes against blasphemy is correct, then Rome did right.

35

To make this clearer, I quote a passage from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in defense of this principle, in a decision upon this very subject, which says: "To prohibit the open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of a country, is a necessary measure to preserve the tranquillity of a government." That is precisely what the Roman empire did. Christianity did openly, publicly, and explicitly deny the popular religion of the country. It did it with intent to destroy men's reverence for the deities and the religion of that country. Rome prohibited it; and upon the principle of the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which is the principle of American law on blasphemy, Rome did right, and Christianity was a blaspheming religion. The principle of this decision seems to be that those who represent the popular religion of a country have so little of the real virtue of the religion which they profess, that if anybody speaks against it, it is sure to rouse their combativeness to such a degree as to endanger the public tranquillity. Therefore, in order to keep civil those who represent the popular religion, the State must forbid anybody to deny that religion.

This decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is one of the grand precedents that have been followed in all the later decisions upon this subject in the younger States; but this decision itself followed one by Chief Justice Kent of the Supreme Court of New York in 1811, in which the embodies the same principles. He defends the right of the State to punish such offenses against what he calls a Christian people, and not equally to punish like offenses against the religion of other people in this country, by the following argument: --

36

"Nor are we bound by any expressions in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mohammed, or of the Grand Llama, and for this plain reason: that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors."

This is only to argue that if the morality of the country were engrafted upon the religion of Mohammed or the Grand Llama, and Christians were to speak against and deny that accepted religion, it would be proper that the State should punish those

Christians for so doing. If that principle be correct, then a Mohammedan country has the right to prohibit the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within its limits.

According to these decisions, Luther and the reformers of his day were blasphemers. The penalty was death, in many cases at the stake, yet under this principle the State did right to put them to death in whatever way the law prescribed; because they did certainly make an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of every country in which they lived, and of all Europe; and if the words of Luther were used to-day in any Catholic country, they would be counted as blasphemous, as a willful and malicious reviling of the accepted religion. The reformers did hold up to ridicule and contempt the popular religion of all Europe. They did right, too; and when the State punished them, it was but carrying out the principles upheld by Chancellor Kent and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and all the other States that have legislated on the subject of religion.

As I have already stated, it was upon this principle precisely that the Roman empire forbade the preaching

of the gospel the Christ. It only forbade an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of the country, yet in forbidding that, it forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. But Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did it in the face of the Roman law, and in opposition to the whole power of the Roman empire; and everybody in all the world has an undeniable right to make an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of this country, or any other, if he thinks that religion to be wrong.

The principle of these decisions and of the civil statutes against blasphemy, is essentially a pagan principle, and not a Christian principle. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that Chief Justice Kent not only cited the precedents of the church-and-state principles of the colonies and of the British government, but appealed to the pagan governments of antiquity and the papal institutions of modern Europe, as the basis of his decision. It is true that all these nations have set themselves up as the special guardians of their deities, and have prohibited the denial of the popular religion; and it is equally true that all these nations have resisted every step in enlightenment and progress that has ever been made in the march of time. Every step forward in religion and in enlightenment has of necessity been taken in the face of all the opposition which these States and empires could bring to bear. But the principles of American institutions are neither pagan nor papal. The principles of the American Constitution which forbids legislation on the subject of religion, are Christian principles. And it is strictly in order for Supreme Courts in making decisions in behalf of what they boast of as the Christian religion, to base their decision upon something else than the course of

the pagan governments of antiquity, and the papal institutions of modern Europe. Upon such a subject it would seem to be proper for them to refer to the teachings and the principles of the Author of Christianity, but singularly enough, it has never been done, and doubtless for the very good reason that it never can be done; for the teachings of Jesus Christ are directly against it. His word forbids civil government to have anything to do with what pertains to God. And instead of teaching his disciples to prosecute, to fine, and to punish by civil law those who speak against them or their religion, he says, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." How can men be brought to respect God or Jesus Christ by civil penalties upon their bodies and goods? How can they respect the religion of men who are ready to prosecute and imprison them? Every principle of the thing is contrary both to the spirit and the letter of Christianity. The religion of Jesus Christ properly exemplified in the daily lives of those who profess it, is the best argument and the strongest defense against blasphemy, both as defined by the Scriptures and by the civil statutes.

Laws, therefore, prohibiting "what a jury may call blasphemy," are pagan, and not Christian. The decisions of the Supreme Courts of New York and Pennsylvania upon this subject are pagan decisions, and not Christian; they are based upon pagan precedents, not Christian. The deadly persecutions of all history, pagan, papal, and so-called Protestant, are justified in these decisions. Michael Servetus was burnt for "blasphemy." The only use that ever has been, or ever is, made of any such laws in any country, is to give some

religious bigots who profess the popular religion, an opportunity to vent their wrath upon persons who disagree with them. Any man who really possesses the religion of Christ will have enough of the grace of God to keep him from endangering the public tranquillity when his religion is spoken against.

Therefore, I say that we are opposed to all laws of civil government against blasphemy, not because blasphemy is not wrong, but because it is a wrong of that kind with which civil government has nothing to do; and in this we stand wholly upon Christian principle. We stand exactly where the early Christians stood; for, I say again, when Paul spoke in the Roman empire, he was blaspheming, according to the law, was held as a blasphemer and an atheist, and was put to death as such, under the very principle upon which the American laws of blasphemy are sustained.

Senator Blair. -- The law was wrong, you say?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly the law was wrong. The Roman law was that no man should have particular gods of his own, -- gods not recognized by the Roman law.

Senator Blair. -- That law was not for the good of society?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Certainly it was not. Then you have to repeal the law or obey it.

Mr. Jones. -- It ought to be repealed.

Senator Blair. -- During these eighteen hundred years we have contrived to repeal that law; but here comes an intelligent people who have evolved among themselves, as the result of a thousand or fifteen hundred years of history, among other things, the institution of the Christian Sabbath, by writing it in the

40

laws of every State in this country, so that the whole American people made up of communities or States, have enacted the principle of this law.

Mr. Jones. -- The same principle is under the bill before the Committee. There is the same principle under it all. If you can legislate in regard to the Sabbath, you can legislate in regard to blasphemy; you can legislate in regard to idolatry, and every other offense against God, as did both the Puritan and the papal theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- You deny the right of the majority, in other words, to make a law in conformity with which the whole shall practice in society?

Mr. Jones. -- I deny the right of any civil government to make any law respecting anything that pertains to man's relationship to his God, under the first four of the ten commandments. I wish right here to show further that this is not only the principle of the word of Jesus Christ, but also of the American Constitution.

Before Christianity was preached in the world, the Roman empire had among its laws these statutes: --

"1. No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws.

"2. Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same. But hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular.

"3. Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death."

The Christians did have a particular God of their own, not recognized by the Roman law. They did introduce a new religion. The Roman empire enforced the law, and that is why the Christians were put to death. If things pertaining to God be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, then no Christian was ever persecuted, and there has never been persecution in this world. All the Roman empire did in killing Christians was to enforce the law. Then the question was with the Christians, at that time, and the question is with us, Is not the law wrong? and did not the Christians have the right to attack the law? That is what they did. When a Christian was brought before the magistrate, a dialogue followed something like this: --

Magistrate. -- "Have you a particular God of your own, -- a god not recognized by the Roman law?"

Christian. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Did you not know that the law is against it?"

C. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Have you not introduced a new religion?"

C. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Did you not know that the law is against it?"

C. -- "Yes."

0 M. -- "Did you not know that the penalty is death, for those of the lower ranks?"

1 C. -- "Yes."

2 M. -- "You are of the lower ranks?"

3 C. -- "Yes."

4 M. -- "You have introduced a new religion?"

5 C. -- "Yes."

6 M. -- "You have a God of your own?"

7 C. -- "Yes."

8 M. -- "What is the penalty?"

9 C. -- "Death."

0 That was all. The Romans enforced the law upon the Christians in the first days of Christianity; and there was no persecution in it, if the principle be recognized

42

that civil government has a right to legislate in religious things. The empire had this apparent advantage, too, that the law existed before Christianity was known in the world. Christianity appeared to Rome as nothing else than an uprising against the imperial power. Laws are made to be enforced; and to enforce the law is all that the Roman empire ever did, whether up to the time of Constantine, or at any other time. In fact, all the papacy did in the Middle Ages was to have the emperors enforce the law. We stand to-day just where the Christians did at that time; we come to the root of the whole matter, and deny the right of the civil government to legislate on anything that pertains to our duties to God under the first four commandments, and assert the Christian and American principle that every man has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

The principle that the Christians asserted was to render to Caesar that which is Caesar's, and to deny the right of Caesar to demand anything that pertains to God. They gave their lives in support of that principle, against the law of the Roman empire, and against the very existence of the Roman empire. This principle was asserted and maintained until it forced the Roman empire, with all its power, to recognize the right of every man to have a particular god of his own, and to worship that god as he chose. The Roman empire did come in the days of Constantine and Licinius to that point. At the death of Galerius, it was decreed in the Roman law, by the emperors Constantine and Licinius in the Edict of Milan, that every man should be at liberty to have any god he pleased, and worship him as he pleased. But it was the Christian principle that forced the Roman empire to that point in the face of all its laws and institutions of ages.

43

Our national Constitution embodies the very principle announced by Jesus Christ, that the civil government shall have nothing to do with religion, or with what pertains to God; but shall leave that to every man's conscience and his God. As long as he is a good citizen, the nation will protect him and leave him perfectly free to worship whom he pleases, when he pleases, as he pleases, or not to worship at all, if he pleases.

In Article VI. of the Constitution of the United States, this nation says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By an amendment making more certain the adoption of the principle, it declares in the first amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This first amendment was adopted in 1789, by the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution. In 1796 a treaty was made with Tripoli, in which it was declared (Article II.) that "the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." This treaty was framed by an ex-Congregationalist clergyman, and was signed by President Washington. It was not out of disrespect to religion or Christianity that these clauses were placed in the Constitution, and that this one was inserted in that treaty. On the contrary, it was entirely on account of their respect for religion, and the Christian religion in particular, as being beyond the province of civil government, pertaining solely to the conscience, and resting entirely between the individual and God. This fact is so well stated by Mr. Bancroft in his "History of the Constitution of the United States," that I will here insert it: --

44

"In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and often these protectors, one after another, might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian War grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation, -- the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest forms, -- when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power." -- Last chapter.

At this point I am brought to the assertion of the second of the principles upon which we stand in our

45

opposition to Sunday laws, or any other form of religious legislation: that is, the principle of the Constitution of the United States; and upon this principle I maintain that this proposed Sunday law is unconstitutional.

The object of this Sunday bill is wholly religious. The last section shows the object of the entire bill; and that is, "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day." No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the civil, observance of the day that is required; because it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word civil is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The title of the bill declares that its object is to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day as a day of rest, "and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship." The first section defines the Lord's day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; the third section refers to it as a day of religious worship; the fourth section refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and the sixth section plainly declares, what is apparent throughout, that the object of the bill is "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day," on the first day of the week.

It is the religious observance of the day that its promoters, from one end of the land to the other, have in view. In the convention, now in session in this city,

46

working in behalf of this bill, only yesterday Dr. Crafts said: --

"Taking religion out of the day, takes the rest out."

In the "Boston Monday Lectures," 1887, Joseph Cook, lecturing on the subject of Sunday laws, said: --

"The experience of centuries shows, however, that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship. Unless Sabbath observance be founded upon religious reasons, you will not long maintain it at a high standard on the basis of economic and physiological and political considerations only."

And in the Illinois State Sunday convention held in Elgin, Nov. 8. 1887, Dr. W. W. Everts declared Sunday to be "the test of all religion."

Sunday is a religious institution wholly; Sunday legislation, wherever found, is religious legislation solely; and this bill does not in its terms pretend to be anything else than religious. Being therefore as it is, religious legislation, it is clearly unconstitutional. In proof of this, I submit the following considerations: --

All the powers of Congress are delegated powers. It has no other power; it cannot exercise any other. Article X. of Amendments of the Constitution expressly declares that --

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In all the powers thus delegated to Congress, there is no hint of any power to legislate upon any religious question, or in regard to the observance of any religious institution or rite. Therefore, this Sunday bill, being a religious bill, is unconstitutional; and any legislation with regard to it will be unconstitutional. Sunday being

47

a religious institution, any legislation by Congress in regard to its observance, will be unconstitutional as long as the United States Constitution shall remain as it now is.

Nor is this all. The nation has not been left in doubt as to whether the failure to delegate this power was or was not intentional. The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," shows that the failure to delegate such power was intentional, and makes the intention emphatic by absolutely prohibiting Congress from exercising any power with regard to religion. It is impossible to frame a law on the subject of religion that will not prohibit the free exercise of religion. Therefore the first amendment to the Constitution absolutely prohibits Congress from ever making any law with regard to any religious subject, or the observance of any religious rite or institution.

More than this, the National Reform Association knows, and has been contending for twenty-five years, that for Congress to make any Sunday laws would be unconstitutional. Yet the National Reform Association is one of the most prominent agencies in urging forward this bill; and the Secretary of that Association stood at this table to-day to plead for its passage. And this only shows that they are willing knowingly to resort to unconstitutional means to secure their coveted power, and to accomplish their purposes. As for Dr. Crafts and his fellow-workers, whether or not they know it to be unconstitutional, we do not know. In the announcements of the national Sunday-law

convention now (Dec. 11-13, 1888) being held in this city, it was stated that the church in which the convention was to meet would

48

be festooned with the names of six millions of petitioners; but at the beginning of the first meeting it was stated that there were fourteen millions of them. A question was sent up asking how the number could have grown so much larger so suddenly. Mrs. Bateham was recalled to the platform to answer the question, and when she answered it, the cause of such a sudden and enormous growth was explained by the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter indorsing the bill, and solely upon the strength of his name, seven million two hundred thousand Catholics were counted as petitioners.

This was not a complete answer to the question, because the Cardinal's letter does not authorize any such use of it as they have made, at least so much of it as was made public does not. The whole of the letter was not made public there, because, Dr. Crafts said, it was for the Senate Committee. It was laid on the table here to-day. But so much of it as was read merely referred to the action of the Baltimore Council in commanding a stricter observance of Sunday, and said: --

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by judicious legislation."

This was all. He said, "I am happy to add my name," etc. He did not say that he added, or that he wished to add, seven million two hundred thousand others with his name, or in his name; yet this was done. But it was not so much to be wondered at, because the same principle had been acted upon before throughout the country, and when five hundred petitioners could be made out of one hundred, and two hundred

49

and forty thousand out of two hundred and forty, it was perfectly easy and entirely consistent to make seven million two hundred thousand and one out of one.

This thing was perfectly consistent also with the principle in another point. The petition reads: "We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby petition," etc. In counting these seven million two hundred thousand petitioners in behalf of the Sunday law, they thereby certified that all these were Catholics "twenty-one years of age or more." But there was not a man in that convention, and there is not a woman in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, who does not know that there are not that many Catholics in the United States "twenty-one years of age or more." They virtually certified that all the Catholics in the United States are "twenty-

one years of age or more," for they distinctly announced that "all the Roman Catholics" were petitioning for the Sunday law. But as they had virtually certified the same thing of the Protestant churches throughout the country, why should they not go on and swing in "all the Roman Catholics" in the same way? They could do the one just as honestly as they could do the other. When men and women professing themselves to be Protestant Christians will do such things as that to carry the Catholic Church with them, it is not to be wondered at if they should be willing to resort to unconstitutional means to make their religious zeal effective in national law.

Senator Blair. -- Then you assume that this bill and all Sunday laws concern only the relation of man to God, and not the relation of men to each other?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, that is the principle upon which we stand.

50

Senator Blair. -- Right there I find fault with your original proposition. You have got to establish, before you can defeat the ground of Sunday laws, that Sunday laws are not for the good of Caesar; that is, not for the good of society.

Mr. Jones. -- I have not had time to prove that yet. I will prove fully that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody.

Senator Blair. -- Come to the point as soon as you can. That is the point in this case, as between you and the law proposed to be enacted.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good. For the State to compel men to do no work is to enforce idleness. Idleness is the root of unlimited evil. It is a true proverb that we learned in our boyhood, "Satan always finds something for idle hands to do." In this world, to compel men to be idle is to force them into a line of influences and temptations which in the very nature of things can end only in evil. It is well known, and it is one of the principal grounds of the complaints of those who are working for Sunday laws, that Sunday is, of all the week, the day of the most wickedness; that the record of crime and violence on Sunday exceeds that of any other day of the week, especially in large cities.

Dr. Crafts refers constantly to London as an exemplary city in the matter of enforced Sunday laws, but the fact was brought out last spring by a member of this Committee -- Senator Payne -- that the statement had lately been "made on authority, that London on Sunday is the most immoral and dissipated city in the world." Now why is this? They argue that it is because the saloons are open on Sunday. But the saloons are open every other day of the week. Then the saloons being open no more on Sunday than on any

51

other day, why is it that there is so much more violence done on Sunday than on other days of the week? -- It is because more men are idle on Sunday than on any other day of the week. Upon this point I quote an extract from the Cincinnati Commercial Gazette of March 10, 1888.

"They declare Sunday the moral ruin of the people. They prove it by alleged statistics of criminal prosecutions to show that more crimes of violence are committed on Sunday than on all other days of the week. Why is this? Because the saloons are open? -- They are open on other days. This reduces them to the sole reason that it is because it is a day of idleness.

"Their argument is absolutely destructive to the beneficence of the custom of a rest day. They continually affirm that a Sabbath day is the very foundation of religion, morals, and society, and they incessantly declare that the custom of Sunday cessation from work in the cities had made it a day of moral ruin. What is their recourse from the destruction which they charge upon the day of idleness? -- To make statutes more stringent to enforce idleness. Arguing that idleness on that day leads mankind to moral ruin, they call for a more rigid enforcement of idleness, to lead mankind to the ways of salvation.

"Surely there is need to revise their basis in season before they can proceed rationally in legislation. Selling beer is no more a sin on Sunday than on other days. The reason why more crimes of violence are done on Sunday than on other days -- if that is a fact -- is not that the saloons are open, but that the men are idle. The good of a day of rest for the toilers has to be taken with the drawback of this unavoidable evil from idleness and indulgences of appetites. The cause is the cessation of vocations."

This argument is entirely sound. We submit to the consideration of any candid mind that it would be far better to allow men to follow their honest occupations

on Sunday as they do on other days of the week, than to compel them to be idle, and thus forcibly throw them into the way of all the temptations and evil that beset men in this world. No State, therefore, can ever afford for its own good to enact laws making idleness compulsory, as Sunday laws do.

More than this, to prohibit men from following their honest occupations at any time, under penalties of fine or imprisonment, or perhaps both, is for the State to relegate honest occupations to the realm of crime and put a premium upon idleness and recklessness. It is well known that in many localities if a man will only be idle on Sunday, he can run into all sorts of dissipation and wickedness to any extent, except that of down-right violence, without any fear of prosecution or penalty of any kind. But if any

quiet, industrious citizen chooses to engage in his honest occupation, -- going quietly about his own business on his own premises on Sunday, -- he is subjected to prosecution, to a penalty of a heavy fine, and perhaps imprisonment. This is nothing else than to put a premium upon wickedness. No State can afford to make crimes of honest occupations. No State can afford to put such a premium upon idleness and all its attendant wickedness.

All these complaints of evil and violence and wickedness on Sunday, so enlarged upon by the people who are working for Sunday laws, is an open confession that wickedness is the effect of enforced idleness, and this in itself is the strongest argument that can be offered against the very things for which they plead. The States of the Union have all these years been sowing the wind in this very thing, and now they are reaping the whirlwind. And, worse than all, they propose to

53

cure the evils of all this enforced idleness by more stringently enforcing more idleness throughout the whole nation, and by the national power.

It may be answered that this reflects upon the wisdom of God in appointing a day of rest; but it does not. God appointed the Sabbath for a purpose; and that purpose is that men should remember him in his works of creation, and worship him as Creator.

The intention of the commandment enjoining the observance of the Sabbath day, is the honor of God, and his worship as Creator. This worship and the religious sanctions which God has associated with the Sabbath, are considerations which will ever prevent the day from becoming a day of idleness of those who keep the Sabbath in obedience to him; and the worship of God and the religious sanctions which he has put upon the Sabbath, are the only things that ever can prevent the Sabbath from becoming a day of idleness. Those who advocate this Sunday bill well know this. This whole principle is embodied in that statement Dr. Crafts made to the Knights of Labor, that "if you take religion out of the day, you take the rest out." The same principle is also apparent in the words of Joseph Cook, before referred to, that you will in vain endeavor to secure the enforcement of a day of rest unless you enforce it as a day of worship; and unless it be founded on religious reasons, it cannot be long maintained.

Thus these men themselves confess the point which I here make: that it is only the religious sanctions and worship that can ever keep a day of rest from being a day of idleness, and of consequent wickedness. But it is only God who can furnish those sanctions; the State never can. Therefore, next step in the

54

proceeding on the part of those who are calling for this law is to have the State attempt to supply the religious sanctions which belong with the day of rest, and which only can keep it from being a day of idleness and a day of evil. But they know that the State has none of

those religious sanctions; and they know that these will have to be supplied to the State by the church, and then the church will call upon the State, by its power, to force them upon the citizen.

This is precisely what is proposed. Rev. Sam Small, in a sermon in Kansas City last winter, expressed the views of many more than himself, when he said: --

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously, and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it, and enact it into laws."

But any attempt to enforce religious observances only enforces hypocrisy and multiplies sin, because love for God is essential to every act of religious duty. For a man to tender obedience or homage to God when he has no love for God in his heart, only dishonors God, and does violence to his own nature. For anybody to obey God, or perform religious observances from interested motives, is sin; and for the State to exert its power in compelling men to act religiously, and pretend to honor God when they have in the heart no love for God, is only to force them into hypocrisy, and to compel them to commit sin, which, increased and multiplied by the exertion of national power, can end only in ruin, and that speedily.

For as Mr. Buckle has most forcibly expressed it: --

55

"In this way, men being constrained to mask their thoughts, there arises a habit of securing safety by falsehood, and of purchasing impunity with deceit. In this way, fraud becomes a necessity of life; insincerity is made a daily custom; the whole tone of public feeling is vitiated; and the gross amount of vice and of error fearfully increased."

Consequently, it is only at its own peril that the State can ever enforce the observance of a day of rest.

More than this, for the State to allow itself to be dictated to by the church as is here proposed by Mr. Small, is to render the church superior to the civil power, which can end in nothing but a religious despotism, which is the worst of all despotisms. Thus by every line of reasoning that can spring from the subject, it is demonstrated that for the State to fix a day of compulsory rest can only end in evil. Therefore, my proposition is proved, that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody.

Further: as it is only the religious sanctions which surround a day of rest, that can prevent it from being a day of idleness, and consequently of evil; and as God only can

supply these sanctions, it follows that to God only, can Sabbath observance be rendered. He only can command it; he only can secure it; and being a duty which can be rendered only to God, we are brought again directly to the command of Jesus Christ, to render unto God, not to Caesar, that which is God's, which clearly forbids the State to have anything to do with Sabbath observance.

This whole line of argument is fully sustained by the Sabbath commandment itself. That commandment says: "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

56

thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Here are the reasons: first, he rested on the seventh day; second, he blessed it and made it holy. That you may become tired is not given as a reason for doing no work on the seventh day. God does not say that on the seventh day you shall do no work, because if you should, you would overdo or break down your physical system. Nothing of the kind. Man's physical wants are not referred to in the commandment. It say, Work six days, because the Lord worked six days; rest on the seventh day, because the Lord rested on the seventh day; keep that day holy, because the Lord blessed it and made it holy. It is the Lord who is to be held in view. It is the Lord who is to be exalted. Therefore the fourth commandment and its obligations have solely to do with man's relationship to God. It is not man's physical, but his spiritual, needs that are held in view in the Sabbath commandment. It is intended to be a day in which to worship God, -- a day of holy remembrance of him, and of meditation upon his works. The day is to be kept holy. If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all. When the State undertakes to demand the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, it demands of men that which does not belong to it, but which belongs only to God. When the State undertakes to secure the observance of the Sabbath, it undertakes that which, to it, is an impossible task, because holiness is not an attribute of civil government, nor has it either the power or the credentials

57

to promote holiness; and as has been already demonstrated, all that it ever can do in any such effort is to enforce idleness and put a premium upon recklessness, which, for its own welfare, the State can never afford to do. If the State undertakes to supply, from whatever source, the religious sanctions which alone can keep the day from being one of idleness, generating evil, it only enforces hypocrisy, and increases sin.

Therefore I repeat, that by every logical consideration of the subject, I have sustained my proposition that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody or anything in this world.

Senator Blair. -- Do you understand that this bill undertakes to make anybody worship God?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, I affirm that it does; and I will prove it by statements made by those who stood here to-day. But I have some other points to make first; and here I propose to introduce my historical argument. I want you all to see that in this way the papacy was made in the fourth century. I shall read all that I do read, perhaps, on this point, from Neander's Church History, vol. 2, Prof. Torrey's edition, Boston, 1852. I can only refer to it by the page. As I have related, the Roman empire was forced by the principles of Christ, to recognize the right of every man to worship as he chose. This right was recognized in the Edict of Milan, A. D. 312. But liberty of conscience trembled in the balance but a moment, and then the bishopric, with that ambitious spirit that developed the papacy, took up the strain, and carried forward that line of work which ended in the imperious despotism of the Middle Ages. I want you to see just how that was done, and you will then have no difficulty in seeing the tendency of the present movement.

Neander says: --

"There had in fact arisen in the church a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way." -- p. 132.

A theocratical theory of government tending to subordinate the secular to itself, was the scheme. In other words, the church aimed to make the ecclesiastical power superior to the civil power. These theocratical bishops made themselves and their power a necessity to Constantine, who, in order to make sure of their support, became a political convert to the form of Christianity, and made it the recognized religion of the empire; for says Neander further: --

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." -- Idem.

Out if that theocratical theory of government came the papacy, which did subordinate the civil to the ecclesiastical power, and that same spirit is to be guarded against to-day in the United States as much as in any other country.

I want you to see that there is a theocratical theory underlying this whole scheme. Mr. Bateham has said that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union started this movement a short time ago, and that they had worked it up. What is their aim in civil

59

government? I quote from the monthly reading of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of September, 1886, -- a monthly reading for all the local Unions throughout the country -- the following: --

"A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers; hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."

A theocratical theory, you see, is behind this movement, and is again coming in to interfere in civil things, to establish a theocracy, and to subordinate the civil power at last, to the ecclesiastical.

Senator Blair. -- Do you think the question of giving the ballot to women is a religious question?

Mr. Jones. -- No. I only read this for the purpose of giving the proof that there is a theocratical theory underlying this, as there was that in the fourth century, so as to show the parallel.

Senator Blair. -- But the parallel seems to imply that the extension of the suffrage to woman is by divine appointment, and is the introduction of a theocratic form of government?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, they want the ballot so as to make a theocracy successful.

Senator Blair. -- Therefore you would be against woman's suffrage?

Mr. Jones. -- I would be against woman's suffrage, or any other kind of suffrage, to establish a theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- But that is not the question. It is possible these women have misstated their own idea there.

0 Mr. Jones. -- No, because I have other proofs. Let me read them.

Senator Palmer. -- Do you suppose they intended there a practical theocracy?

Mr. Jones. -- I do, sir; but let me read further, and you will get their own words.

Senator Blair. -- If these women are trying to overthrow the institutions of the country, and are about to establish a sacerdotal State, we ought to know it.

Mr. Jones. -- That is true, and that is why I am speaking here; we want the nation to know it.

Senator Blair. -- These women need looking after, I admit.

Mr. Jones. -- They do in that respect, and there are many men concerned in the same business.

Senator Blair. -- Otherwise it would not be dangerous.

Mr. Jones. -- It would be dangerous anyway. A theocratical theory of government is dangerous any where. It is antichristian, as well as contrary to right and the principles of justice.

Senator Blair. -- Do you suppose that the government of heaven is a theocracy?

0 Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; but a civil government -- a government of earth -- is not.

1 Senator Blair. -- Then why is it dangerous?

2 Mr. Jones. -- Governments of earth are not dangerous when properly controlled.

3 Senator Blair. -- They only say that a true theocracy is yet to come. A millennium is supposed to be coming; perhaps they have reference to a millennium that we have not yet got, so that they will wait some years before they get it.

4 Mr. Jones. -- But I am going to read what kind of laws they propose to make to bring in the millennium.

5 Senator Blair. -- So far as you have read, you have not touched the question; for they say a true theocracy

is yet to come, and it may be they are looking to the coming down of the New Jerusalem, for the time of the new theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- No, because no true theocracy can ever come through civil laws, or through politics, or through the ballot.

Senator Blair. -- That is not sure at all.

Mr. Jones. -- It is by the Scriptures.

Senator Blair. -- I do not know; I have read the Bible several times. But go on.

Mr. Jones. -- The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, and led them through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges "until Samuel the prophet," to whom, when he was a child, God spoke, and by whom he made known his will. In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. This was allowed, and God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king of Israel. Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king of Israel; and David's throne God established forevermore. When Solomon succeeded to the kingdom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father." 1 Chron. 29 : 23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God. The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, and who entered into a solemn covenant before God that he

would loyally render allegiance to the king of Babylon. But Zedekiah broke his covenant; and then God said to him: --

"Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Eze. 21:25-27; see chap. 17:1-21.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "It shall be no more, until he

come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Who is he whose right it is? -- "Thou . . . shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33. And while he was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the night in which he was betrayed he himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will "be no more, until he come whose right it is," and then it will be given him. And that time is the end of this world, and the beginning of "the world to come." Therefore while this world stands, a true theocracy can never be in it again. Consequently, from

63

the death of the Christ till the end of this world, every theory of an earthly theocracy is a false theory; every pretension to it is a false pretension; and wherever any such theory is proposed or advocated, whether in Rome in the fourth century, or here in the nineteenth century, it bears in it all that the papacy is or that it ever pretended to be, -- it puts a man in the place of God.

Now I will read another statement as to the purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It is from the annual address of the President of the National Union, at the Nashville convention, 1887. It is as follows; --

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; -- "

Senator Blair. -- "Shall be."

Mr. Jones. -- "Shall be this world's king."

Senator Blair. -- But you are a clergyman, and you read the Bible to us.

Mr. Jones. -- I am going to read a passage presently right on this point.

Senator Blair. -- Is it not in the same Bible that the time when Christ is to be the king, is the present?

Mr. Jones. -- I am going to read a passage from the Bible in connection with this subject. Allow me to finish this extract: --

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; -- yea, verily, **THIS WORLD'S KING** in its realm of cause and effect, -- king of its courts, its camps, its

commerce, -- king of its colleges and cloisters, -- king of its customs and constitutions. . .
. The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

That emphasizes "this world's king." Jesus Christ himself said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Then assuredly the Woman's Christian Temperance Union stands against the words of Jesus Christ, in saying that he shall be this world's king; and that that kingdom is to enter the realm of the law through the gate-way of politics. Jesus Christ has his entrance through the gate-way of the gospel, and not through politics.

Nor did this purpose end with the Nashville National Woman's Christian Temperance Union convention. The proposition was repeated by the New York national convention last summer, in the following resolution: --

"Resolved, That Christ and his gospel, as universal king and code, should be sovereign in our Government and political affairs."

Well, let us apply the resolution. Suppose the gospel were adopted as the code of this Government. It is the duty of every court to act in accordance with the code. There is a statute in that code which says, --

"If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if the trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."

Suppose, then, a man steals a horse. He is arrested, tried, and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code, and the Government must conform to the code. He is released, and repeats the act; is again arrested and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code.

And if he repeats the offense seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turns to the court, saying, : I repent," the Government must forgive him, for so says that which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has resolved should be the governmental code.

Any such system as that would destroy civil government in twenty-four hours. This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only illustrating the absurd perversion of its principles by these people who want to establish a system of religious legislation here. God's government is moral, and he has made provision for maintaining his government with the forgiveness of transgression. But he has made no such provision for civil government. No such provision can be made, and

civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God's method of saving those who sin against his moral government; civil government is man's method of preserving order, and has nothing to do with sin, nor the salvation of sinners. If civil government arrests a thief or a murderer and finds him guilty, the penalty must be executed, though the Lord does forgive him.

The theocratical theory referred to seems to pervade the whole body, for the eighth district of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Augusta, Wis., Oct. 2-4, 1888, representing fifteen counties, passed this resolution: --

"Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and, --

"Whereas, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law, and the only law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore, --

"Resolved, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation."

66

The law which Christ gave from Sinai is not a civil law; it is the moral law. But if that be a civil law, and this a civil government, what in the world does a civil government want with a moral Governor? These excellent women should be informed that civil government is based upon civil law, and has civil governors only. Moral government is founded in moral law, and has a moral Governor only. Any governmental theory that confounds these is a theocratical theory, which is precisely the governmental theory of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, as is demonstrated by these proofs. And any theocratical theory of government since Christ died, is the theory of the papacy.

These extracts prove that the purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the establishment of "a practical theocracy." Please do not misunderstand me here. There are none who have more respect or more good wishes for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in the line of its legitimate work, than have we. We are heartily in favor of union, of temperance union, of Christian temperance union, and of woman's Christian temperance union; but we are not in favor of any kind of political Christian temperance union, nor of theocratical temperance union. We sincerely wish that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union would stick to its text, and work for Christian temperance by Christian means; and not for Christian temperance by political means, nor for political temperance by theocratical means. I believe in Christian temperance. Not only do I believe in it, but I practice it. I practice Christian Temperance more strictly than the Woman's Christian Temperance Union even preaches it. But believing in it as thoroughly as I do, and endeavoring to practice it as strictly as I believe in it, I would never

lift my hand nor open my lips in any effort to compel men to practice the Christian temperance in which I believe and which I practice. Christianity persuades men, instead of trying to compel them. By the purity and love of Christ, Christianity draws men instead of trying to drive them. It is not by the power of civil government, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, that Christianity secures the obedience of men and the practice of Christian temperance.

The establishment of a theocracy is the aim of the prime movers in this Sunday-law movement, as it was also the aim of the church leaders of the fourth century. And what came of that movement at that time? I read again: --

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and. . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." -- Neander, p. 132.

This being their theory, which resulted in the determination "to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims," the question arises, What means did they employ to secure control of this power? The answer is, They did it by means of Sunday laws.

The first and greatest aim of the political church managers of that time was the exaltation of themselves; and second only to that was the exaltation of Sunday. These two things had been the principal aim of the bishops of Rome for more than a hundred years, when Constantine gave them a chance to make their schemes effectual by the power of the State. The arrogant pretensions of the bishop of Rome to secure power over the whole church, was first asserted in behalf

of Sunday by Victor, who was bishop of Rome from A. D. 193 to 202.

"He wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter [that is, commanding them to celebrate it on Sunday]. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition. . . with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome." -- Mosheim, chap. 4, par. 11.

The one means by which these church managers secured from Constantine the use of the power of the State, was the famous edict prohibiting certain kinds of work on "the venerable day of the sun." That edict runs thus: --

"Let all the judges and towns-people and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines, lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

This edict was issued March 7, A. D. 321. Only judges and towns-people and mechanics were to rest on Sunday; people in the country were at full liberty to work. But this did not satisfy the political managers of the churches for any great length of time. "The object of the first Sunday law," says Sozomen, "was that the day might be devoted with less interruption

69

to the purposes of devotion." And as the government was now a theocracy, it was only consistent that all should be required to be religious. Consequently, an additional Sunday law was secured, which commanded all people to do no work on Sunday.

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered in fact as guilty of sacrilege." -- Neander, p. 300.

Then as the people were not allowed to do any manner of work, they would play, and as the natural consequence, the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday. But the object of the law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and that the people might go to church. Consequently, that this object might be met, there was another step to take, and it was taken. At a church convention held at Carthage in 401, the bishops passed a resolution to send up a petition to the emperor, praying --

"That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast-days, to some other days of the week." -- Idem.

History does not say whether or not this petition represented the names of fourteen million petitioners, the greater part of whom never signed it at all. History is also silent as to whether the petition was indorsed by any one man who could be counted for seven million two hundred thousand men. But history is not silent as to the reason why it was necessary to send up the petition. The petitioners themselves gave the reason, and it was this; --

"The people congregate more to the circus than to the church." -- Idem, note 5.

In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But rather than to give up their jobs, they would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were compelled to work: they pronounced it persecution, and asked for a law to protect those persons from such "persecution." The church had become filled with a mass of people, unconverted, who cared vastly more for worldly interests and pleasures than they did for religion. And as the government was now a government of God, it was considered proper that the civil power should be used to cause all to show respect for God, whether or not they belonged to a church, or whether they had any respect for God.

The people, not being allowed to work, crowded the circus and the theater. They had no wish to be devoted; and as they were forced to be idle, a flood of dissipation was the inevitable consequence. Neander says of it: --

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hinderance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart." -- Idem.

And further: --

"Church teachers. . . were in truth often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church." -- Idem.

And the church could not then stand competition; she wanted a monopoly. She got it, at last.

This petition of the Carthage Convention could not be granted at once, but in the year 425, the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made; namely, --

In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance." -- Idem, p. 301.

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which "the devotion of the faithful" was "disturbed" by these things, was that when the circus or the theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the "faithful" would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and therefore their "devotion" was "disturbed." And of course the only way in which the "devotion" of such "faithful" ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time. Thus, and by this means, every reason for not being devoted was taken away from all the people. Then in the very next sentence Neander says: --

"In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases as final as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he did for them did he give them power over those who did not belong to the church, to compel them to act as though they did, except in that one thing of the Sunday law. Their decisions, which he decreed to be final, were binding only on those who voluntarily chose that tribunal, and affected none others. Before this time, if any who had repaired to the tribunal of the

bishops were dissatisfied with the decision, they could appeal to the civil magistrate. This edict cut off that source of appeal, yet affected none but those who voluntarily chose the arbitration of the bishops. But in the Sunday law, power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday law there was given to the church control of the civil power, that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as if they did. The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing -- the Sunday law. Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

The work, however, was not done yet. True, the bishops had secured the power of the State to take away from the people all excuse for not being religious; but from the beginning of the whole scheme, the people had no real wish to be religious. They had none of the spirit of devotion in their hearts; and although the State had forbidden them to work, and had shut the Sunday circuses and theaters, still the people would not be religious. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them; and the theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case; and the great Catholic Church Father and Catholic saint, Augustine, was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote: --

"It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or

73

by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development." -- Schaff's Church History, vol. 2, sec. 27.

Of this theory Neander remarks: --

"It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which. . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition." -- Church History, p. 217.

The history of the Inquisition is only the history of the carrying out of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded. The church induced the State to compel all to be idle for their own good. Then it was found that they all were more inclined to wickedness. Then to save them from all going to the Devil, they tried to compel all to go to heaven. The work of the Inquisition was always for love of men's souls, and to save them from hell!

Allow me to summarize these statements from Neander: He says of the carrying into effect of the theocratical theory of those bishops, that they made themselves dependent upon Constantine by their disputes, and "by their determination to use the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." Then he mentions the first and second Sunday laws of Constantine; the Sunday law of 386; the Carthage Convention, resolution, and petition of 401; and the law of 425 in response to this petition; and then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: "In this way the church received help from the State for

74

the furtherance of her ends." She started out with the determination to do it; she did it; and "in this way" she did it. And when she had secured the control of the power of the State, she used it for the furtherance of her own aims, and in her own despotic way, as announced in Augustine's Inquisitorial theory. The first step logically and inevitably led to the last; and the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step unto the last, as framed in the words of Augustine, and illustrated in the history of the Inquisition.

That is the system with which Sunday laws belong. That is the theory upon which they are based. They have no other foundation. Mr. Elliott, who has spoken here in behalf of this bill, knows that there is no law in the Bible for keeping the first day of the week. I could read a passage from his own book, "The Abiding Sabbath," page 184, in which he confesses "the complete silence of the New Testament, so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath, or definite rules for its observance, are concerned." And everybody knows that the Old Testament does not say anything about the observance of the first day of the week as Sabbath. Everybody likewise knows that the Old Testament does not say anything about keeping the first day of the week as the day of the resurrection of the Saviour, or for any other reason. Dr. Johnson and others here this morning have said that the first day of the week was chosen because it was a memorial of the resurrection of the Saviour. It is the New Testament that tells about the resurrection of the Saviour. That is granted. Dr. Elliott confesses, and the American Tract Society publishes it, that there is "complete silence of the New Testament" in regard to it. Then what right have they

75

to put it into law, and try to compel by civil law all people to keep as the Lord's day that for which there is no scriptural authority? Let me read another passage from another book, printed by the American Sunday-school Union. On page 186 of "The Lord's Day," written by Mr. A. E. Waffle, are these words: --

"Up to the time of Christ's death, no change had been made in the day. The authority must be sought in the words or in the example of the inspired apostles."

Then on the very next page he says: --

"So far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not, however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week."

Dr. Schaff, in the Schaff Herzog Cyclopedia, says: --

"No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined."-- Article Sunday.

If, then, they confess that Christ gave no law for its observance, why do they want to compel people to observe it? What right have they to compel anybody to observe it? I deny their right to compel me or anybody else to do what Christ never commanded any man to do.

Senator Blair. -- You admit there was a Sabbath before Christ came?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- And he said came not to destroy, but to fulfill?

0 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

1 Senator Blair. -- Is there anything in the New Testament which destroyed the Sabbath already existing?

2 Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

76

Senator Blair. -- Then why does it not continue to exist?

Mr. Jones. -- It does exist, and we keep the commandment which provides for the Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- Then you say there is a Sabbath recognized, and that is equivalent to its re-affirmation by Christ?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- I do not see from what you are stating, but that Christ recognized an existing law, and that it is continuing at the present time. You say that it is one day, and they say that it is another.

Mr. Jones. -- But they are after a law to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, when they confess that the Lord never gave any command in regard to it. The commandment which God gave says that the "seventh day is the Sabbath."

Senator Blair. -- Is it still the Sabbath?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, and we keep it; but we deny the right of any civil government to compel any man either to keep it or not to keep it.

Senator Blair. -- The civil government of the Jews compelled its observance?

0 Mr. Jones. -- That was a theocracy.

1 Senator Blair. -- Does it follow that when the only form of government is a theocracy and that embraces all that appertains to government, another form of government which is not a theocracy necessarily, cannot embrace the same subject-matter as the theocracy? If the subject-matter of a theocratical, a monarchial, or a republican

form of government is not the same, to control the establishment of good order in society, pray what is it? We say, and it our form of government, that the people shall legislate, shall construe the law,

77

and execute the law. Under the old theocratic form, God made the law, God construed it, and God executed it through his instrumentalities; but we do just the same thing by the will of the people, that under the theocratic form of government was done in the other way. Now if the Sabbath is necessarily for the general good of society, a republican form of government must make and enforce the observance of the Sabbath just as the theocracy did. You seem to be laboring, as it strikes me, under the impression that a civil government for the good of the people carried on by us under the republican form, cannot do anything that the theocratic form of government does when the theocratic is the only form. They necessarily cover the same subject-matter, -- the control, the development, the good, and the health of society, it makes no difference which one it may be.

Mr. Jones -- A theocratic government is a government of God.

Senator Blair. -- So are the powers that be ordained of God.

Mr. Jones. -- This Government is not a government of God.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not consider the Government of the United States as existing in accordance with the will of God?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, but it is not a government of God. The government of God is a moral government. This is a civil government.

Senator Blair. -- A theocracy is a civil government, and governs in civil affairs, as well as in the region of spirituality and morality and religion.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, and God governs it, and nothing but a theocracy can enforce those things which

78

pertain to man's relation to God under the first four commandments.

Senator Blair. -- But this proposed legislation is outside of the theocratic part of it.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all; for it purposes by penalties to "promote" the religious observance of the Lord's day, while nothing but the government of God can do that. That is the point I am making here, that if you allow this legislation, you lead to the

establishment of a new theocracy after the model of the papacy, and civil government has nothing to do with religious things. This bill is wholly religious; and if you begin this course of religious legislation, you will end only in a theocracy, -- a man-made theocracy, -- and that will be the papacy repeated.

Senator Blair. -- We have had the Sunday laws in this country for three hundred years. They have constantly become more and more liberalized. Have you ever known an instance, though the sentiment in favor of the Sabbath seems to be growing constantly stronger, where any State in this Union undertook to enact a law that anybody should go to church, which is the danger you seem to apprehend?

Mr. Jones. -- Not yet. They are now after the first law. This will lead to that. The law of Constantine was enacted in 321, and it commanded at first only that towns-people and mechanics should do no work, that they might be religious. They did not ask for too much at first. As was said in a ministers' meeting in San Diego, Cal., about two months ago, "In this thing you must not ask for too much at first. Ask just what public sentiment will bear, and when you get that, ask for more." And as was said upon this bill by Dr. Crafts in this Capitol, --

79

"We will take a quarter of a loaf, half a loaf, or a whole loaf. If the Government should do nothing more than forbid the opening of the post-offices at church hours, it would be a national tribute to the value of religion, and would lead to something more satisfactory."

Then in telling what would be more satisfactory, he said: --

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and so make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

At another point in the same speech, Mr. Crafts referred to the proposed law as one for "protecting the church services from post-office competition." And in explaining how this could be done, he said: --

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve, would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; but we want more."

And, --

"A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of the employees, would be better than nothing; but we want more than this."

He continues: --

"Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be opened at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing;. . . but we desire more than this."

0 How much more? Still he continues: --

1 "A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday, would be better than nothing; but we want more than that."

2 And when will they ever get enough? It is precisely as it was when the Emperor Constantine forbade the

80

judges, towns-people, and mechanics to work on Sunday. That was an imperial tribute to the "value of religion," and led to "something more satisfactory" -- to the church managers.

Senator Blair. -- Have you ever heard of a proposition's being made in any legislative body to compel any one to attend church on Sunday?

Mr. Jones. -- The propositions that are made are for that very purpose, to stop the Sunday trains, the Sunday newspapers, -- in short, to stop all work on Sunday, so that the people can go to church.

Senator Blair. -- But these people come here and say that they have no such purpose, and they have been doing these things in the States for a hundred years, and during the Colonial period anterior to that time. Have you ever heard on the American continent, within the territory of what is now the United States, a proposition or a suggestion in a legislative body to compel anybody to attend church?

Mr. Jones. -- Not in legislative body, but in ecclesiastical bodies.

Senator Blair. -- Ecclesiastical bodies do not make the laws. Congress is not an ecclesiastical body.

Mr. Jones. -- But it is an ecclesiastical body that is seeking to secure and enforce this law, just as the New England theocracy did when "absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine;" and then when people were compelled under such penalty to go to church and listen to the preaching, it was such preaching as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomacke of an ostrich."

Nor was this confined to Colonial times or to New England; for after the Colonies became States, North

Carolina had a Sunday law, -- has yet, for aught I know, -- reading as follows: --

"Be it enacted. . . that all and every person or persons shall on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety."

In 1803, Tennessee passed a law embodying the same words. But South Carolina and Georgia went farther than this; South Carolina enacted that --

"All and every person 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, publicly and privately; and having no reasonable or lawful excuse, on every Lord's day shall resort to their parish church, or some other parish church, or some meeting or assembly of religious worship."

In 1803, Georgia likewise enacted a Sunday law whose first section required all persons to attend public worship. In 1821, the State of Connecticut, in revising its laws, made its Sunday law read in the first section, that --

"It shall be the duty of the citizens of this State to attend the public worship of God on the Lord's day."

This is precisely the line of things proposed by these men and women now working for this Sunday law. This is the first step in that direction. The whole object which they have in view in stopping work on Sunday, is identical with that of the fourth century; namely, in order that the people may be devoted, in order that they may go to church. The very intention of these men in securing the law is religious.

I will refer you to some of the statements of the very men who stood in this room this forenoon, arguing

for this Sunday bill. Dr. W. W. Everts, of Chicago, in a Sunday-law convention in Illinois, Nov. 8, 1887, declared Sunday to be the "test of all religion." Taking his own words, what can the enforcement of it ever be but the enforcement of a religious test? Dr. Crafts, who is so prominent in this work, said to the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis, as I have before quoted, and he repeated it in this city last night, "If you take religion out of the day, you take the rest out of it." This statement was made in reply to a question as to whether a day of rest could not be secured to the working-men without reference to religion. Taking the statement of Dr. Crafts, therefore, its being a day of rest to anybody depends altogether upon whether religion is in it; for if you take religion out, you take the rest out. He, with these others, demands a law compelling the people to take the rest.

Religion being in the rest, and the rest wholly dependent upon the fact that religion is in it, it is inevitable that their effort to secure a law compelling everybody to rest on Sunday is an effort to establish by law a religious observance.

Again: in the Boston Monday lectureship of 1887, Joseph Cook said, --

"The experience of centuries shows that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship."

Further: Dr. Everts said in the Elgin convention: --

"The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, and allow the hour of worship to go by unheeded."

And in Chicago only three weeks ago, Dr. Herrick Johnson named the matter with which he said the Sunday papers are filled -- crime, scandal, gossip, news, and politics -- and exclaimed: --

83

"What a melange! what a dish to set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast, to prepare him for hearing the word of God! It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether."

Dr. Everts said further in the Elgin convention: --

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!"

I will give one more statement which sums up the whole matter. In a Sunday-law mass-meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, Cal., in January, 1887, Rev. Dr. Briggs, of Napa, Cal., said to the State: --

"You relegate moral instruction to the church, and then let all go as they please on Sunday, so that we cannot get at them."

Therefore they want the State to corral all the people on Sunday, so that the preachers can get at them.

These statements might be multiplied indefinitely; but these are enough. The speeches, and the sermons, and the work, of those who are in favor of the Sunday laws, are all in the same line. They all plainly show that the secret and real object of the whole Sunday-law movement is to get the people to go to church. The Sunday train must be stopped, because church members ride on it, and don't go to church enough. The Sunday paper must be abolished, because the people read it instead of going to church, and because those who read it and go to church too, are not so well prepared to receive the preaching.

It was precisely the same way in the fourth century concerning the Sunday circus and theater. The people, even the church members, would go to these instead of to church; and even if they went to both, it must be confessed that the Roman circus or theater was not a very excellent dish -- "What a melange!" -- to set down before a man to prepare him for hearing the word of God. The Sunday circus and theater could not afford to keep open unless they could get a great many spectators, and so break up a great many congregations; and as they hurried the spectators fast on to perdition, they had to be shut on Sunday, so as to keep "a great many congregations" out of perdition. It is exceedingly difficult to see how a Sunday circus in the fourth century could hurry to perdition any one who did not attend it; or how a Sunday train in the nineteenth century can hurry to perdition any one who does not ride on it. And if any are hurried to perdition by this means, who is to blame: the Sunday train, or the ones who ride on it? And Dr. Johnson's complaint of the Sunday papers, is of the same flimsy piece. If the Sunday paper gets into a man's house, where lies the blame; upon the paper, or upon the one who takes it and reads it? Right here lies the secret of the whole evil now, as it did in the fourth century: they blame everybody and everything else, even to inanimate things, for the irreligion, the infidelity, and the sin that lie in their own hearts.

When they shall have stopped all Sunday works; and all Sunday papers, and all Sunday trains, in order that the people may go to church and attend to things divine, suppose that then the people fail to go to church or attend to things divine: will the religio-political managers stop there? Having done all this that the

people may be devoted, will they suffer their good intentions to be frustrated, or their good offices to be despised? Will not these now take the next logical step, -- the step that was taken in the fourth century, -- and compel men to attend to things divine? Having taken all the steps but this, will they not take this? Having compelled men to rest, will they stop short of an effort to supply the religious sanctions which alone can prevent a day of enforced rest from being a day of enforced idleness, and consequently of wickedness? The probability that they will not is strengthened by the fact that the theory

upon which this is carried on is identical with that of the fourth century -- the theory of a theocracy.

I have cited the theocratical purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The National Reform Association, whose secretary stood at this table to-day to plead for the passage of this bill, aims directly at the establishment of a theocracy in this Government. In their own words, they propose to make this republic "as truly and really a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel."

The Sunday-law Association also holds much the same theory. In the Elgin Sunday-law convention, Dr. Mandeville, of Chicago, said: --

The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty, and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty."

Nehemiah was ruling there in a true theocracy, a government of God; the law of God was the law of the land, and God's will was made known by the written word, and by the prophets. Therefore, if Dr. Mandeville's argument is of any force at all, it is so only upon

86

the claim of the establishment of a theocracy. With this idea the view of Dr. Crafts agrees precisely, and Dr. Crafts is general field secretary for the National Sunday-law Union. He claims, as expressed in his own words, that --

"The preachers are the successors of the prophets." -- Christian Statesman, July 5, 1888.

Now put these things together. The government of Israel was a theocracy; the will of God was made known to the ruler by prophets; the ruler compelled the officers of the law to prevent the ungodly from selling goods on the Sabbath. This government is to be made a theocracy; the preachers are the successors of the prophets; and they are to compel the officers of the law to prevent all selling of goods and all manner of work on Sunday. This shows conclusively that these preachers intend to take the supremacy into their hands, officially declare the will of God, and compel all men to conform to it. And this deduction is made certain by the words of Prof. Blanchard, in the Elgin convention: -

-

"In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are the representatives of God."

And the chief of these representatives of God, will be but a pope again; because when preachers control the civil power as the representatives of God, a pope is inevitable.

These quotations prove, to a demonstration, that the whole theory upon which this religio-political movement is based, is identical with that of the fourth century, which established the papacy. They show also that the means employed -- Sunday laws -- by which to gain control of the civil power to make the wicked

87

theory effective, are identical with the means which were employed in the fourth century for the same purpose. The next question is, Will they carry the theory into effect as they did in the fourth century and onward? In other words, when they get the power to oppress, will they use the power? A sufficient answer to this would seem to be the simple inquiry, If they do not intend to use the power, then why are they making such strenuous efforts to get it? If Congress lets them have the power, they will surely use it. Human nature is the same now as it was in the fourth century. Politics is the same now it was then. And as for religious bigotry, it knows no centuries; it knows no such thing as progress or enlightenment; it is ever the same. And in its control of civil power, the cruel results are also ever the same.

How appropriate, therefore, is it that Cardinal Gibbons should indorse the national Sunday bill! How natural, indeed, that he should gladly add his name to the number of petitioners in support of the movement to secure legislation in the interests of the church! He knows just how his brethren in the fourth century worked the same kind of scheme; he knows what the outcome of the movement was then; and he knows full well what the outcome of this movement will be now. He knows that the theory underlying this movement is identical with the theory which was the basis of that; he knows the methods of working are the same now as they were then; he knows that the means employed to secure control of the civil power now, are identical with the means employed then; and he knows that the result must be the same. He knows that when religion shall have been established as an essential element in legislation in this Government, the experience of fifteen

88

hundred eventful years, and "the ingenuity and patient care" of fifty generations of statesmen, will not be lost in the effort to make the papal power supreme over all here and now, as was done there and then. And in carrying out the instructions of Pope Leo XIII., that "all Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled upon the principles of the true church," the Cardinal assuredly is glad to have the opportunity to add his name to the more than six millions of Protestants who are set for the accomplishment of the same task.

To those Protestants who are so anxious to make religion a subject of legislation, it now appears very desirable; and it also appears a very pleasant thing to secure the alliance of the papacy. But when they shall have accomplished the feat, and find themselves in the midst of the continuous whirl of political strife and contention with the papacy, not alone for supremacy, but for existence, -- then they will find it not nearly so desirable as it now appears to their vision, blinded by the lust for illegitimate power.

And when they find themselves compelled to pay more than they bargained to, they will have but themselves to blame; for when they make religion a subject of legislation, they therein confess that it is justly subject to the rule of majorities. And then, if the Romish Church secures the majority, and compels the Protestants to conform to Catholic forms and ordinances, the Protestants cannot justly complain. Knowing, as we do, the outcome of the same kind of movement before, we do not propose to allow this scheme to be worked out here without a decided protest.

Senator Blair. -- You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or nation either.

89

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, of course I am logical, all the way through. I want to show you the wicked principle upon which this whole system is founded, and the reason I do this is because the last step is involved in the first one. If you allow this principle and this movement to take the first step, those who get the power will see in the end that they take the last step. That is the danger. See how in the fourth century the logic of it ended only with the Inquisition.

Senator Blair. -- Was the Inquisition abolished by the abolition of the Sunday laws?

Mr. Jones. -- No; but the principle of it was established by Sunday laws.

Senator Blair. -- Then if the inquisition was established by the Sunday laws, how was it abolished, but by the abolition of the Sabbath? How can you remove an effect except by removing its cause?

Mr. Jones. -- The Sunday laws never have been abolished.

Senator Blair. -- Then the Sunday law could not have been the cause of the Inquisition.

Mr. Jones. -- The power which embodies the Inquisition still continues, and its emissaries have been in this country defending the Inquisition. That same power is now

grasping for the control of the civil law, and the same causes generally produce the same effects.

Senator Blair. -- And the removal of the causes removes the effects with them.

Mr. Jones. -- Sometimes.

0 Senator Blair. -- Therefore the Sunday laws were not the cause of the Inquisition, unless the Inquisition still exists.

1 Mr. Jones. -- No, the Sunday laws did not cause the Inquisition.

2 Senator Blair. -- I understood you to say that it did.

90

Mr. Jones. -- I say, through that the church received the power to make the principle and the work of the Inquisition effective. A certain exercise of power may be forbidden, and yet the means by which the power was obtained may not be forbidden. In other words, the power which was obtained through the deception of Sunday laws, may be prohibited in certain things, and yet allowed in many other things.

Senator Blair. -- The Lord made the Sabbath, and governed the Jewish nation for nearly three thousand years with a Sabbath. Do you think the Sabbath was for the good of the Jewish people, or for their injury?

Mr. Jones. -- It was established for the good of the human race.

Senator Blair. -- Including the Jewish people?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir.

Senator Blair. -- It was established as a part of the civil administration.

Mr. Jones. -- But the church and the State were one.

Senator Blair. -- Therefore what we call the civil administration was included in that theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- The church and the State were one. They were united, and it was a theocracy.

0 Senator Blair. -- If the administration of the Sabbath during these three thousand years, at least, was for the good of the Jews and the human race, why will not the Sabbath be good for the Jews and the human race since the time of Christ, as well as before?

1 Mr. Jones. -- It is for the good of the human race.

2 Senator Blair. -- The civil law must administrate it if it is done. Then we will get no Sabbath now under our division of powers of government, unless we have the Sabbath recognized and enforced by the State authority?

91

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly we have a Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- Your proposition is to strike out the Sabbath from the Constitution and condition of society in these modern times?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Certainly so far as its existence and enactment and enforcement by law are concerned.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, by civil law.

Senator Blair. -- It was enforced in what we call the civil conduct of men under that theocratic form of government for at least three thousand years.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- Now the observance of the Sabbath depends upon a compulsory observance of the law.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all.

0 Senator Blair. -- It required the law of God which he enforced by death, by stoning men to death when they violated it, and we have the Sabbath day only by virtue of what we call the civil law, which is equally a part of God's law.

1 Mr. Jones. -- That government was not organized specially to enforce the Sabbath.

2 Senator Blair. -- They stoned men to death who violated the law.

3 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; and likewise for the transgression of the other commandments.

4 Senator Blair. -- God enforced it, in other words, by human means.

5 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; my answer to all that is that that was a theocracy, -- a union of church and state. The church was the State, and the State was the church.

6 Senator Blair. -- You say now that there is no State to enforce it?

92

Mr. Jones. -- I say that no government can enforce the Sabbath, or those things which pertain to God, except a theocratic government -- a union of church and state. Therefore I say that if you establish such a law as is here proposed, you lead directly to a union of church and state. The logic of the question demands it, and that is where it will end, because the law cannot be enforced otherwise. These gentlemen say they do not want a union of church and state. What they mean by church and state is, for the State to select one particular denomination, and make it the favorite above all other denominations. That is a union of church and state according to their idea. But a union of church and state was formed by Constantine when he recognized Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire. Everybody knows that that was a union of church and state, and that it ended in the papacy. A union of church and state is where the ecclesiastical power controls the civil power, and uses the civil power in its own interests. That is where this movement will end, and that is one of the reasons why we oppose it.

Senator Blair. -- You say the church and state separated shall not do those proper things which the church and state always did when united in the theocracy?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Then why do you say that the state --

Mr. Jones. -- I did not mean to deny your proposition; I think the way you intended, I mean "Yes," because I certainly do say that the church and state separated shall do those proper things which were done when they were united in the theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- If in this division of the powers of

93

government into church and state, you exclude from the powers of the church the establishment and enforcement and regulation of the Sabbath, why do you not necessarily, if the Sabbath is a good thing, pass it over to the control of the State?

Mr. Jones. -- Because if the church will not recognize it and preserve it, the State cannot compel people to do it. The State that attempts it is bound to fail.

Senator Blair. -- Then you necessarily take the ground that God did wrong in the enforcement of the Sabbath during those three thousand years when his government was both church and state.

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir. If God would come himself to govern, and make himself governor, as he did of Israel, he could enforce the law as he did there. But until God does that, we deny the right of all the churches or anybody else, to do it.

Mr. Senator Blair. -- Even if it is for the good of society?

Mr. Jones. -- What they say is for the good of society is for the ruin of society.

Senator Blair. -- Do you understand that it is the church or the State that is making this law?

Mr. Jones. -- It is the State that is doing it, just as Constantine did it, to satisfy the churches.

Senator Blair. -- It may or may not satisfy the churches. The churches give their reasons here, which may be right or wrong, for the establishment of the Sabbath -- for this Sunday legislation in all the States. The State, the whole people, make the law. You say that the whole people shall not make a good law because the churches ask for it.

Mr. Jones. -- I say the whole people shall not make a bad law, even though the churches do demand it; for any civil law relating to God is a bad law.

Senator Blair. -- Then what God did for three thousand years for the good of the Jews and the human race, was wrong?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir; it was right.

Senator Blair. -- Then why not continue it?

Mr. Jones. -- Because he has discontinued that kind of government.

Senator Blair. -- We have done nothing in the world to divide the powers of government into those of church and state. We say those departments shall not interfere with each other.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- Here and in the States we are trying to run the civil parts. We have taken jurisdiction of a portion of what God has entire jurisdiction, as to the church and state in the civil relations of men. The entire society does that. We put the sovereignty into the hands of everybody except women, and some of us are trying to do that. We have the same subject-matter, the good of society under our control, which under the theocracy was united into both church and state. If you do not let the State continue to do what was essential to society then, and is now, you are striking at one of the great ends for which government exists.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all; because God has discontinued that kind of government.

Senator Blair. -- He has not discontinued the necessity of laws for the regulation of society.

0 Mr. Jones. -- He has in that way.

1 Senator Blair. -- No; it is just as necessary that there should be a Sabbath now for the good of man, as when God made and enforced the law by his direct supervision under a theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- But no government but a theocracy can enforce such laws.

Senator Blair. -- Then unless we have a theocracy, we shall have no Sabbath.

Mr. Jones. -- We shall have no laws regulating the Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- The Sabbath did not descend to the Jews and to all mankind, because there was a theocratic form of government among the Jews. How did the Sabbath come to mankind at large, when there was no theocratic form of government?

Mr. Jones. -- Those nations never kept it. Nobody but the Jews ever kept it.

Senator Blair. -- They could have kept it, because you say the Sabbath existed for all; not for the Jews alone, but for the human race.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, but if they did not keep it, it would do no good.

Senator Blair. -- It did not exist for good, then?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; a thing may exist for my good, and I may refuse to use it, as thousands do the salvation of Christ.

0 Senator Blair. -- I was taking your statement as true that it did exist for good outside of the Jews.

1 Mr. Jones. -- I said it was for the good of man. The Saviour said it was for the good of man. The Saviour died for the good of man.

2 Senator Blair. -- You would abolish the Sabbath, anyway?

3 Mr. Jones. -- Yes, in the civil law.

4 Senator Blair. -- You would abolish any Sabbath from human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?

96

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.

Senator Blair. -- Your time has expired. Please take five minutes to close, as I have asked you some questions; still, they were questions that touched the trouble in my own mind.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; but I supposed that I was to have an hour to devote, uninterruptedly, to the points in questions.

Senator Blair. -- We have always been accustomed to conducting these hearings with reference to getting at the difficulties we had in our own minds, and I do not feel as though you could complain with an hour and ten minutes, if we give you ten minutes more.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good. Mr. Chairman, I have shown that in the fourth century this same movement developed a theocracy and in that the papacy, religious despotism, and oppression for conscience' sake. Now I want to show the secret of at least a portion of the present movement. The representative of the National Reform Association spoke here in behalf of this proposed legislation. That Association is asking for such a law and for such an amendment to the Constitution as you have proposed, in relation to the Christian religion in the public schools. That measure pleases them well, and this proposed Sunday law pleases them well.

Senator Blair. -- Just incorporate that proposed amendment to the Constitution in your remarks.

Mr. Jones. -- Very well; it is as follows: --

"50th CONGRESS, } S. R. 86.

1st SESSION. }

"Joint Resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.

97

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution: --

"ARTICLE.

"SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

"SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the People of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

"SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary."

98

What, then, do these men propose to do with the civil power when they can use it? The Christian Statesman is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, said: --

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."

To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality, is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christians, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites. It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association declares, civil power has the right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D. D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared in the Christian Statesman of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men."

Rev. M. A. Gault, a district secretary and a leading worker of the Association, says: --

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences, is to have the Government simply set up the moral law and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

When they have the Government lay its hand on dissenters, what will they have it do? Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Neb., and reported in the Christian Statesman of May 21, 1885, said: --

99

"We might add in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the Devil, and for the sake of the Devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

That is what they propose to do. And that is worse than Russia. In the Century for April, 1888, Mr. Kennan gave a view of the statutes of Russia on the subject of crimes against the faith, quoting statute after statute providing that whoever shall censure the Christian faith or the orthodox church, or the Scriptures, or the holy sacraments, or the saints, or their images, or the Virgin Mary, or the angels, or Christ, or God, shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote parts of Siberia. This is the system in Russia, and it is in the direct line of the wishes of the National Reform Association.

Nor is that all. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., another vice-president of that Association, makes all dissenters atheists. He names atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists, then classes them all together as atheists. I will read his own words: --

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry -- the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."

100

They class us as atheists, and are going to condemn all alike; and you are asked to give them the power. Remember these are the views of the members of the National Reform Association, whose secretary stood at this table this morning in defense of this Sunday law. These extracts show what his ideas are, and how he would use them. Dr. Everts, of Chicago, who also was here, declared last month in Chicago, in my hearing, on the subject of this Sunday law, that "it is atheism or the Sabbath."

Mr. Edwards continues: --

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic; for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist; but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith. . . . I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon ! The atheist may live, as I have said; but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land ! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent!"

Senator Blair. -- Many atheists are for Sunday laws.

Mr. Jones. -- Let them be so if they choose; but what I am striking at, is that these men have no right

to say that I am an atheist simply because I do not believe in keeping Sunday.

Senator Blair. -- You come here and seriously argue against these people, because they and the atheists blackguard each other. What have we to do with that? They abuse each other. It is worse in the Christian than in the atheist, because the Christian has some rules to guide his conduct, which the atheist has not. Here seems to be some strong intemperate language which one human being makes use of towards another. An atheist or a Christian alike may find fault with that. I do not know any way that we can interfere with it; but if you claim to argue against this bill because these people abuse atheists, I reply to that by saying that many atheists are for this bill just as these people are. They unite in support of this bill, therefore mutual recriminations amount to nothing.

Mr. Jones. -- But the mutual recrimination amounts to this, that although this is confined simply to words between them now, --

Senator Blair. -- I do not think you ought to argue to us by taking this precious time of yours and ours to show that these people use intemperate language towards each other.

Mr. Jones. -- But I am doing it to show that they use the intemperate language now, but if they get the law, they will use more than the language against them. These men only want to make the State a party to their religious disputes. They want to get the nation by law to commit itself to the defense of religious observances, so they can add its power to their side of the controversy, and send to "hell" or some other place where the Devil is, those who even accidentally disagree with them. But the State has no business to allow itself to

be made a party to any religious controversy. That has been the bane of every nation except this, and God forbid that this one should be dragged from its high estate, and made the tool of the irregular passions of religious parties. The State will find its legitimate employment in seeing that these parties keep their hands off each other, and that the ebullitions of their religious zeal are kept within the bounds of civility. It is not safe to put civil power into the hands of such men as these. But that is just what this Sunday bill will do if it shall pass.

Senator Blair. -- The atheist is for this proposed law. He is not intelligently going to support a law which enables these people to burn him at the stake.

Mr. Jones. -- I know he is not intelligently going to do it.

Senator Blair. -- He is liable to be as intelligent as they are. Mr. Hume was a very intelligent man; so was Voltaire; so was Franklin, if Franklin was an atheist; Franklin was a deist, at all events.

Mr. Jones. -- It is safe to say that not one in ten of the people whose names are signed in behalf of this Sunday law now what is the intention of it, and what those will do with it when they get it.

Senator Blair. -- Then it is a lack of intelligence on their part.

Mr. Jones. -- I know people who signed that petition who would now be just as far from signing it as I would.

Senator Blair. -- That is because you told them of those terrible consequences which they had not believed would follow. The masses of the people do not believe that the Christian people of this country have united in every State in this Union for such a purpose.

Mr. Jones. -- Here is the principle: Here are six million Protestants and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics --

103

Senator Blair. -- Cardinal Gibbons has written a letter which is in evidence. He is for it, and a great many Catholics are also for it; but it does not follow that those Catholics are for it simply because Cardinal Gibbons wrote that letter. They were for it before Cardinal Gibbons wrote the letter. You must remember that the Catholics in this country are intelligent, as well as we. Some of them are ignorant, some of us are ignorant.

Mr. Jones. -- But here is the point. These people are complaining of the continental Sunday --

Senator Blair. -- They do not complain of it because it is Catholic; they complain of it because it is not as good for the people as our form of Sunday --

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. And in this movement, the American Sunday, they say, comes from the Puritans, and these people know --

Senator Blair. -- Do you argue against it because it comes from the Puritans, or because it comes from the Catholics? It comes from both, you say; we say it is for the good of society, and that God is for it, because it is for the good of man.

Mr. Jones. -- But let me state the point that I am making: I think everybody knows that it is perfectly consistent with the Catholic keeping of Sunday for the Catholic to go the church in the morning and to the pleasure resort if he chooses in the afternoon. These men stand here in convention, and cry out against the continental Sunday and against its introduction here. Everybody knows that the continental Sunday is the Roman Catholic Sunday. Yet these men, while denouncing the continental Sunday, join hands with the Roman Catholics to secure this Sunday law. They have counted here six million Protestants and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics. Suppose this law were secured in answer to these petitions, would

104

they then have a Puritan Sabbath, or a continental Sunday? In other words, would the six million Protestants compel the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to keep Sunday in the Puritan, or even the Protestant way, or will the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics do as they please on Sunday, and let the six million Protestants whistle for "the breath of the Puritan " which Dr. Herrick Johnson invokes ? More than this, if it should come to compulsion between these, would not the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics be able to make it unpleasant for the six million Protestants?

Senator Blair. -- I have been all through this that the working people go through. I have been hungry when a boy. The first thing I can remember about is being hungry. I know how the working people feel. I have tugged along through the week, and been tired out Saturday night, and I have been where I would have been compelled to work to the next Monday morning if there had been no law against it. I would not have had any chance to get that twenty-four hours of rest if the Sunday law had not given it to me. It was a civil law under which I got it. The masses of the working people in this country would never get that twenty-four hours' rest if there had not been a law of the land that gave it to us. There is that practical fact, and we are fighting with that state of things. The tired and hungry men, women, and children, all over this country, want a chance to lie down, and rest for twenty-four hours out of the whole seven days.

Mr. Jones. -- So have I been through this that the working people go through. I have carried the hod by the day. I have swung the hammer and shoved the plane by the day. I am a working-man now just as much as I ever was, though not in precisely the same way; and I say to you that I never was robbed of that

105

twenty-four hours' rest. Nor are there so many compelled to lose it as these Sunday-law advocates try to make out. Dr. Crafts said last night over in that convention that he had had communication with people in every nation but two, and --

"In the world around he could not find a man who had financially lost by refusing to work on Sunday. But many have gained by the conscientious sacrifice."

Much testimony was borne in the Chicago convention last month to the same effect in this country; and in the convention now in session in this city, the Hon. Mr. Dingley, member of Congress from Maine, said last night that the American working-men are indifferent to the efforts which are put forth in this direction.

Senator Blair. -- He is wrong about it. Mr. Dingley didn't know what he was talking about when he said that.

Mr. Jones. -- He said he had investigated the matter.

Senator Blair. -- I have investigated it, and I say that Mr. Dingley was simply laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. Jones. -- Dr. Crafts said this morning that he talked two hours with a convention of laboring men at Indianapolis, answering their questions, until at the end of two hours they indorsed this movement. If they are crying for it, if they are fairly tearing their hair for it, how can it be possible that he had to talk two hours to persuade them that it was all right?

Senator Blair. -- Take his statement in full, if you take it at all. He says they are crying for it.

Mr. Jones. -- Then why was it necessary to talk to them for two hours?

Senator Blair. -- Then you simply say he did not tell the truth? You discredit the witness?

0 Mr. Jones. -- I do.

Senator Blair. -- You say perhaps he did not tell the truth, that is all. I think he was right.

Mr. Jones. -- But the two things do not hitch together properly. If they are calling for it so loudly, certainly it ought not to require two hours to convert them. The fact is that the laboring men are not calling for it. Great effort is being made to have it appear so. But the Knights of Labor never took any such step except at the solicitation of Dr. Crafts. This bill had scarcely been introduced last spring before Dr. Crafts made a trip to Chicago and other cities, soliciting the indorsement of the Knights of Labor. Instead of their petitioning for this Sunday law, they have first been petitioned to petition for it; the object of it had to be explained, and objections answered, before they could even be

brought to support it. The object of the petition for this bill was explained by Dr. Crafts to the Central Labor Union of New York, and its indorsement secured. the Central Labor Union embraces a number of labor organizations, and the Christian Union declares the Central Labor Union to be a "radically Socialistic" organization. This, in itself, would not be particularly significant were it not for the fact that the arguments which Dr. Crafts presents to these organizations to gain their support are entirely Socialistic. Nor are these confined to Dr. Crafts. Other leaders of the movement also advocate the same principles.

Dr. Crafts went to the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis last month to get the delegates there to indorse the petition for the passage of this Sunday bill. He has referred to this in his speech here this forenoon, and has made a portion of his speech to them and to the Locomotive Engineers a part of his speech here. A report of his speech at Indianapolis was printed in the Journal of United Labor, the official journal of the Knights of Labor of America, Thursday, Nov. 29, 1888. He said to them there: --

107

"Having carefully read and re-read your 'declaration of principles' and your 'constitution,' and having watched with interest the brave yet conservative shots of your Powderly at intemperance and other great evils, I have found myself so closely in accord with you that I have almost decided to become a Knight of Labor myself. If I do not, it will be only because I believe I can advance your 'principles' better as an outside ally."

The following question was asked by one of the Knights: --

"Would it not be the best way to stop Sunday trains to have the Government own and control the railroads altogether, as the Knights advocate?"

Dr. Crafts answered: --

"I believe in that. Perhaps the best way to begin the discussion of Government control for seven days per week is to discuss this bill for Government control on one day. If the railroads refuse the little we now ask, the people will be the more ready to take control altogether."

The Knights of Labor advocate the doctrine that the Government shall take control of all the railroads in the country, and hire the idle men in the country at regular railroad wages, and run the roads, as it now runs the Post-office Department, without reference to the question whether anything is made or lost by the Government. This is what gave rise to the above question. Dr. Crafts proposes to play into their hands by making the bid for their support, that if they will help the Sunday-law workers get Government control of the railroads one day in the week, then the Sunday-law workers will help the Knights to get Government control every day in the week.

Another question that was discussed both there and at the convention of Locomotive Engineers at Richmond, Va., was the following: --

"Will not one day's less work per week mean one-seventh less wages?"

The response to this was as follows: --

"As much railroad work as is done in seven days can be done in six days, and done better, because of the better condition of the men. And on this ground the engineers would be sustained in demanding, and, if necessary, compelling, the railroad company to so readjust the pay schedule that the men will be paid as much as at present."

That is to say, Dr. Crafts and the Sunday-law workers propose to stand in with the laboring men to compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is made certain by the following petition to the State legislatures, which is being circulated everywhere with the petition for this bill. I got this at the Chicago convention. Dr. Crafts distributed the petitions by the quantity there, and he is doing the same at the convention now in this city: --

"To the State Senate [or House]: The undersigned earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding any one to hire another, or to be hired for more than six days in any week, except in domestic service, and the care of the sick; in order that those whom law or custom permits to work on Sunday may be protected in their right to some other weekly restday, and in their right to a week's wages for six days' work."

Now a week consists of seven days. A week's wages for six days' work is seven days' wages for six days' work. This petition asks the legislatures of all the States to pass a law protecting employees in their right to seven days' wages for six days' work. No man in this world has any right to seven days' wages for six days' work. If he has a right to seven days' wages for six days' work, then he has an equal right to six days'

wages for five days' work; and to five days' wages for four days' work; and to four days' wages for three days' work; to three days' wages for two days' work; to two days' wages for one day's work; and to one day's wages for no work at all. This is precisely what the proposition amounts to. For in proposing to pay seven days' wages for six days' work, it does propose to pay one day's wages for no work. But if a man is entitled to one day's wages for doing nothing, why stop with one day? Why not go on and pay him full wages every day for doing nothing? It may be thought that I misinterpret the meaning of the petition; that, as it asks that nobody be allowed to hire another for more than six days of any week, it may mean only that six days are to compose a week; and that it is a week's wages of six days only that is to be paid for six days' work. That is not the meaning of the

petition. It is not the intention of those who are gaining the support of the Knights of Labor by inventing and circulating the petition.

Dr. George Elliott, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church in this city, -- the church in which this National Sunday Convention is being held, -- the church that is now festooned with fourteen million petitions that they have n't got, -- festooned, at least partly, with one seven-million-two-hundred-thousand-times-multiplied Cardinal, -- Dr. Elliott, while speaking in favor of this bill this forenoon, was asked by Senator Call these questions: --

"Do you propose that Congress shall make provision to pay the people in the employ of the Government who are exempted on Sunday, for Sunday work?"

"Mr. Elliott. -- I expect you to give them adequate compensation.

"Senator Call. -- Do you propose that the same amount shall be paid for six days' work as for seven?

110

"Mr. Elliott. -- I do; for the reason that we believe these employees can do all the work that is to be done in six days. And if they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay."

There it is in plain, unmistakable words, that they deliberately propose to have laws, State and national, Which shall compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is sheer Socialism; it is the very essence of Socialism. No wonder they gained the unanimous indorsement of the convention of the Knights of Labor, and of the Locomotive Engineers, and the Socialistic Labor Union of New York City, by proposing to pay them good wages for doing nothing. I confess that I, too, would support the bill upon such a proposition as that if I looked no further than the money that is in it.

But this is not all. The Knights of Labor not only accept the proposition, but they carry it farther, and logically, too. This principle has been advocated for some time by the Knights of Labor in demanding ten hours' pay for eight hours' work -- virtually two hours' pay for doing nothing. The Christian Union and the Catholic Review propose to help the working-men secure their demanded eight-hour law, and then have the working-men help to get the six-day law by forbidding all work on Sunday. Dr. Crafts and Dr. Elliott go a step farther, and propose to secure the support of the working-men by having laws enacted compelling employers to pay them full wages on Sunday for doing nothing. But the Knights of Labor do not propose to stop with this. The same copy of the Journal of United Labor which contained the speech of Dr. Crafts, contained the following in an editorial upon this point: --

"Why should not such a law be enacted? All the work now performed each week could easily be accomplished in five days of eight hours each if employment

111

were given to the host of willing idle men who are now walking the streets. It is a crime to force one portion of a community to kill themselves by overwork, while another portion of the same people are suffering from privation and hunger, with no opportunity to labor. The speech of the Rev. Mr. Crafts, published elsewhere, furnishes an abundance of argument as to why such a law should be put in force."

So when the Sunday-law advocates propose to pay a week's wages for six days' work of eight hours each, because all the work can be done in six days that is now done in seven, then the Knights of Labor propose to have a week's wages for five days' work, because, by employing all the idle men, all the work that is now done in seven days can be done in five. And as Dr. Elliott has said, "If they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay." But if a week's wages are to be paid for five days' work of eight hours each, that is to say, if two days' wages can rightly be paid for no work at all, why should the thing be stopped there? If the Government is to take control of the railroads all the time in order to pay two days' wages for doing nothing, and if the States are to enact laws compelling employers to pay employees two days' wages for doing nothing, then why shall not the Government, both State and national, take possession of everything, and pay the laboring men full wages all the time for doing nothing? For if men have the right to one day's wages for no work, where is the limit to the exercise of that right? The fact of the matter is that there is no limit. If a man is entitled to wages for doing nothing part of the time, he is entitled to wages for doing nothing all the time. And the principle upon which Dr. Crafts and his other Sunday-law confreres gain the support of the working-men to this Sunday bill is nothing at all but the principle of down-right Socialism.

112

There is a point right here that is worthy of the serious consideration of the working-men. These Sunday-law workers profess great sympathy for the laboring men in their struggle with the grinding monopolies, and by Sunday laws they propose to deliver the working-men from the power of these monopolies. But in the place of all these other monopolies, they propose to establish a monopoly of religion, and to have the Government secure them in the perpetual enjoyment of it. They may talk as much as they please about the grasping, grinding greed of the many kinds of monopolies, and there is truth in it; but of all monopolies, the most greedy, the most grinding, the most oppressive, the most conscienceless the world ever saw or ever can see, is a religious monopoly. When these managers of religious legislation have delivered the working-men from the other monopolies -- granting that they can do it -- then the important question is, Who will deliver the working-men from the religious monopoly?

Senator Blair. -- Abolish the law of rest, take it away from the working people, and leave corporations and saloon keepers and everybody at perfect liberty to destroy that twenty-four hours of rest, and lawgivers and law-makers will find out whether or not the people want it, and whether they want those law-makers.

Mr. Jones. -- There are plenty of ways to help the working-men without establishing a religious monopoly, and enforcing religious observance upon all. There is another point that comes in right here. Those who are asking for the law and those who work for it, are those who compel the people to work on Sunday. In the Illinois State Sunday convention in Chicago last month, it was stated in the first speech made in the convention, "We remember how that the working-men are compelled to desecrate the Sabbath by the great corporations."

113

The very next sentence was, "We remember also that the stockholders, the owners of these railroads, are members of the churches, that they sit in the pews and bow their heads in the house of God on the Sabbath day."

Senator Blair. -- That is only saying that there are hypocrites in this world. What has that to do with this proposed law?

Mr. Jones. -- I am coming to that. It has a good deal to do with it. The stockholders who own the railroads act in this way, those men said; and it was stated by a minister in that convention that a railroad president told him that there were more petitions for Sunday trains from preachers than from any other class.

Senator Blair. -- There are a lot of hypocrites among the preachers, then.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; although you yourself have said it. I confess I have not the heart to dispute it.

Senator Blair. -- I do not find any fault with that statement. If it is true, it does not touch this question.

Mr. Jones. -- If these preachers and church members will not keep the Sabbath in obedience to what they say is the commandment of God, will they keep it in obedience to the command of the State?

Senator Blair. -- Certainly the hard working man needs rest; the preachers, church members, and millionaires may do as they please: the bill comes in here and says that the national government, taking part of the jurisdiction of the civil government of the United States by a concession made by the States, by virtue of its control of interstate commerce, and the post-office business, and the army and navy, will take advantage of what the

States have given to the general Government in the way of jurisdiction, and will not introduce practices which destroy the Sabbath in the States. That is the object of this legislation. That is all that is undertaken

114

here. It is simply an act proposing to make efficient the Sunday-rest laws of the State, and nothing else.

Mr. Jones. -- But those laws are to be enforced, if at all, by those who are so strongly in favor of them.

Senator Blair. -- No, by the State. If these people were in favor of them, or not in favor of them, or violated them, that is another thing. A man may be for a law which he violates. A great many of the strongest temperance people in the world use intoxicating liquors. They say that they realize the evil, and that they are in favor of the enactment of law which will extirpate those evils. The strongest advocates I have ever seen of temperance legislation are men who have come to realize that the grave is just ahead of them. They cannot get rid of the appetite, but they pray the government: for legislation that will save the boys.

Mr. Jones. -- That is all right. I am in favor of prohibition straight; but not Sunday prohibition.

Senator Blair. -- You cannot adduce a man's practice as a reply to the argument on a question that touches the public good. It does not vitiate a man's principle because he fails to live up to it himself.

Mr. Jones. -- But the secret of the whole matter is this: As an argument for the Sunday law, these men assert that the great railroad corporations desecrate the Sabbath, and by persistently running Sunday trains, also compel the railroad men to work and to desecrate the day. They at the same time assert that the men who own the railroads belong to the churches. If, then, the railroads compel their men to desecrate the day, and the owners of the railroads are church members, then who is it but the church members that are compelling people to desecrate the day?

Further than this, they quoted at Chicago the statement of a railroad president, that the roads "get more

115

requests for Sunday trains signed by preachers" than they do from other people. But as the church members own the railroads, and the preachers request them to run Sunday trains, then who is to blame for the "desecration" of the day but the preachers and their own church members? Can't the preachers stop asking for Sunday trains without being

compelled to do so by the civil law? In the Chicago convention last month -- November 20, 21 -- Dr. Knowles, who is secretary of this National Sunday-law Union, said that by the influence of William E. Dodge, even after his death, the Delaware & Lackawanna Railroad Company had resisted the temptation to run trains on Sunday until the present year. But five hundred ministers met in conference in New York and used competing lines on Sunday, and by this the hands of the Sunday observance committee have been tied ever since. After that, when the Delaware & Lackawanna directors were asked not to run Sunday trains, they replied, --

"How can you come to us pleading for us to run no trains on Sunday, when your preachers by the hundreds on Sunday use our rival lines, which do run on Sunday. If your preachers ride on Sunday trains on other roads, we cannot see why they and other people cannot ride on our trains on Sunday. And if it is all right for these other roads to run trains on Sunday, -- and certainly ministers of the gospel would not ride on them if it were wrong, -- then we cannot see how it can be such a great wrong for us to run Sunday trains."

That is a very proper answer. No wonder the Sunday committee's hands are tied by it. And yet that very conference of five hundred preachers, assembled in New York last summer, took the first decided step toward the organization of the National Sunday Association, of which Dr. Knowles himself is secretary.

By these facts there is presented the following condition

116

of things: (1.) Church members own the railroads; (2.) Preachers sign requests for Sunday trains; (3.) The church members grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains, and the preachers ride on the Sunday trains, and other church members go on Sunday excursions; (4.) Then the whole company -- preachers and church members -- together petition Congress and the State legislatures to make a law stopping all Sunday trains! That is to say, they want the legislatures, State and national, to compel their own railroad-owning church members not to grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains. In other words, they want the civil power to compel them all -- preachers and church members -- to act as they all say that Christians ought to act. And they insist upon quoting all the time the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." But if they will not obey the commandment of God, which they themselves acknowledge and quote, what assurance have we that they will obey the law of Congress or State legislature when they get it, especially as it will rest entirely with themselves to see that the law is enforced? Will they compel themselves by civil law to do what they themselves will not otherwise do? The sum of this whole matter is that they want the civil power to enforce church discipline; and that not only upon themselves, but upon everybody else. The whole system, and all the pretensions upon which this Sunday law is demanded, are crooked.

As to the enforcement of the law, it will fall to those who are working to get it; because certainly those who do not want it will not enforce it, and the officers of the law are not given to the enforcement of laws which are not supported by public opinion. This is proved by the fact that the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago now have Sunday laws that ought to satisfy any reasonable

117

person, and yet not one of them is enforced. And the preachers of that city and State, instead of seeing that these are enforced, call convention after convention to work up more Sunday laws, both State and national.

What, then, is the next intention? -- It is to make it a political question in both State and nation, and make the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws the price of votes and political support. This is proved by the following resolutions adopted by the Elgin Sunday-law convention: --

"Resolved, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath newspapers, engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God's day brings them.

"Resolved, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath."

Such a resolution as this last may work in Illinois, though it is doubtful, but with their own statement made in that convention, it is certain that this resolution can never work under the Constitution of the United States. They stated in the convention that the Sabbath is "the test of all religion." To demand that candidates or political officers shall pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcement of statutes in favor of the Sabbath is, therefore, to require a religious test as a qualification for office. The national Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government; "consequently, no Sabbath or Sunday-law test can ever be applied to any candidate for any national office or public trust.

118

It is true they use the word civil in the resolution, but that corresponds with much of their other work. There is not, and there cannot be, any such thing as a civil Sabbath. The Sabbath is religious wholly, and they know it; and in all their discussion of this resolution and the subject generally in the convention, it was as a religious institution, and that only.

Senator Blair. -- Is there any other point you would wish to present?

Mr. Jones. -- There is another point, and that is, that we will be sufferers under such a law when it is passed. They propose to put in an exemption clause. Some of them favor an exemption clause, but it would not in the least degree check our opposition to the law if forty exemption clauses were put in, unless, indeed, they should insert a clause exempting everybody who does not want to keep it. In that case, we might not object so much.

Senator Blair. -- You care not whether it is put in or not?

Mr. Jones. -- There is no right whatever in the legislation; and we will never accept an exemption clause as an equivalent to our opposition to the law. It is not to obtain relief for ourselves that we oppose the law. It is the principle of the whole subject of the legislation to which we object; and an exemption clause would not modify our objection in the least.

Senator Blair. -- You differ from Dr. Lewis?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, we will never accept an exemption clause, as tending in the least to modify our opposition to the law. We as firmly and as fully deny the right of the State to legislate upon the subject with an exemption clause as without.

Senator Blair. -- There are three times as many of you as of his denomination?

119

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; there are nearly thirty thousand of us, and we ask for no exemption clause. We stand wholly upon the principle of the question. There should be no exemption from a just law. If the law is right, it is wrong to exempt.

In 1887 Mrs. Bateham herself wrote and printed a "Letter to Seventh-day Believers," proposing in substance that if we would help them to secure a Sunday law, they would exempt us from its penalties. We replied then as we reply now and always. We will not help you to put upon others what we would not have put upon ourselves.

Senator Blair. -- You object to it?

Mr. Jones. -- We object to the whole principle of the proposed legislation. We go to the root of the matter, and deny the right of Congress to enact it.

Senator Blair. -- You say that the proposed exemption does not make it any better?

Mr. Jones. -- Not a bit; because if the rightfulness of the legislation be admitted, then we admit that it is the right of a majority to say that such and such a day shall be the Sabbath or the Lord's day, and that it shall be kept. The majorities change in civil government; the majority may change within a few years, -- may change, in fact, at any election, -- and then the people may say that the day which we believe should be kept must be observed, or they may say that this day shall not be kept. If we admit the propriety of the legislation, we must also admit the propriety of the legislation to the effect that a certain day shall not be kept, and it makes every man's observance of Sunday, or otherwise, simply the football of majorities. That has been the course of religious legislation from the formation of the papacy onward, and that is the end of religious legislation of all kinds everywhere.

120

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think there is a distinction between a majority in a monarchical government, and a majority in a republican government? In a monarchical government the majority is simply one man who has power.

Mr. Jones. -- But in a republic when you throw this subject into civil affairs, it makes a great deal of difference. Why, sir, we would object to the passage of a law enforcing the observance of the day which we keep, and to accept an exemption clause would only be to contradict ourselves. Allow me to illustrate this: There was a time when we did not keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. While we did not keep it, we had the right not to keep it. We became convinced that we ought to keep it; and we are now doing so. We have the right to keep it. More than this, we have the right again not to keep it if we choose not to keep it. But if, while keeping it, we should consent to the State's assumption of power to compel us to do that which we have the right to omit if we please, we would therein resign our freedom of religious faith and worship. If these people would only think on this question, they would see that they themselves cannot afford to consent to this legislation, much less demand it. No man can ever safely consent to legislation in favor of the form of faith or worship which he himself professes. In so doing he resigns his right to profess some other form of faith if he should become convinced that other form is nearer the truth than his own. He virtually resigns his right to think any further on the subject of religious observances, and must thenceforth accept them ready made from the legislative power; that is, as the majority may dictate. The Sunday observers may thus give away their religious liberty if they choose; but as for us, we do not propose to do it. We are going to assert and maintain our rights. And when these give theirs

121

away, we are going to assert their right to re-assert their rights.

Another thing: An exemption clause is only a toleration clause in disguise. For us to accept it would be but to confess that all religious rights are summed up in the majority, and that we are willing to accept from them whatever religious liberty they think we ought to have. But no such confession, sir, will we ever make. To no such thing will we ever consent or submit. We are Americans, sir, and citizens of the United States, too, and we assert all the rights of American citizens. The vocabulary of American ideas knows no such word as "toleration." It asserts rights. As was said by the Senate Committee on this very subject sixty years ago, so say we, --

"What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised by virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotism may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them."

Nor is this all that there is to be said on this point. There is another principle involved. If we should accept the exemption clause, it would not help the thing. It would be exceedingly short. Suppose an exemption clause were given. There are people who would profess to be Seventh-day Adventists for the express purpose of getting a chance to open saloons or houses of business on Sunday. Therefore in outright self-defense, the majority would have to repeal the exemption clause.

Senator Blair. -- Call Mrs. Bateham's attention to that.

Mr. Jones. -- Let me repeat it. If you give an exemption clause -- it has been tried -- there are reprehensible men, saloon keepers, who know they will get more traffic on Sunday than they can on Saturday, and

122

they will profess to be Seventh-day Adventists, they will profess to be Sabbath keepers. You cannot "go behind the returns," you cannot look into the heart, you cannot investigate the intention, to see whether they are genuine in their profession or not. They will profess to be Sabbath keepers, and then they will open their saloons on Sunday. Then in outright self-defense, to make your position effective, you will have to repeal that exemption clause. It will last but a little while.

Senator Blair. -- I agree with you there.

Mr. Jones. -- For that reason these people cannot afford to offer an exemption clause; and for the reason that it puts the majority in the power of our conscience, we deny the right to do anything of the kind. I ask the organizations represented here to think of this after this hearing is over. It will bear all the investigation they choose to give it.

Senator Blair. -- I should like to call everybody's attention to the point. If you need any legislation of this kind, you would better ask for legislation to carry out your purposes, and be careful that in the effort to get the assistance of the parties against you, you do not throw away the pith and substance of all for which you ask.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, that is the point. To show the workings of this principle, I will state that Arkansas in 1885 had an exemption clause in its Sunday law. That exemption clause, it was claimed, was taken advantage of by saloon keepers to keep open on Sunday. A delegation went to the legislature of Arkansas, and asked them to repeal the exemption clause, so that they could shut the saloons on Sunday. The legislature did it. If they had shut the saloons on Sunday, that would have been all well enough. But they did not even try it. There was not a saloon keeper arrested under that repealed law; there were only two men not keeping the

123

seventh day, who were arrested under it; there was not a man who did not keep the seventh day fined under it; but there were Seventh-day Baptists and some Seventh-day Adventists, poor almost as Job's turkey, who were prosecuted and fined. One man had his only horse taken from him, and his cow, and at last his brethren contributed money to save him from jail. Such men were prosecuted time and again; and the lawyers of the State, under the leadership of Senator Crockett, succeeded in carrying through the legislature, against the persistent opposition of the church managers, a bill restoring the exemption clause, to save these poor, innocent people from the persecution that was being carried on.*

Senator Blair. -- I am glad you put in that fact, because it is something that happened.

Mr. Jones. -- I ask leave to read the statement made in the Arkansas Legislature by Senator Crockett, upon that very subject: --

"Let me, sir, illustrate the operation of the present law by one or two examples. A Mr. Swearigen came from a Northern State and settled on a farm in -- County. His farm was four miles from town, and far away from any house of religious worship. He was a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and, after having sacredly observed the Sabbath of his people (Saturday) by abstaining from all secular work, he and his son, a lad of seventeen, on the first day of the week went quietly about their usual avocations. They disturbed no one -- interfered with the rights of no one. But they were observed, and reported to the Grand Jury, indicted, arrested, tried, convicted, fined, and having no

124

money to pay the fine, these moral, Christian citizens of Arkansas were dragged to the county jail and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days -- and for what? -- For daring, in this so-called land of liberty, in the year of our Lord 1887, to worship God.

"Was this the end of the story? -- Alas, no, sir! They were turned out; and the old man's only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his children, was levied on to pay the fine and costs, amounting to thirty-eight dollars. The horse sold at auction for twenty-seven dollars. A few days afterward the sheriff came again, and demanded thirty-six dollars, eleven dollars balance due on fine and costs, and twenty-five dollars for board for himself and son while in jail. And when the poor old man -- a Christian, mind you -- told him with tears that he had no money, he promptly levied on his only cow, but was persuaded to accept bond, and the amount was paid by contributions from his friends of the same faith. Sir, my heart swells to bursting with indignation as I repeat to you the infamous story.

"Another, and I am done. Sir, I beg you and these senators to believe that these are neither fancy nor exaggerated sketches. Five years ago a young man, newly married, came to -- County from Ohio. He and his wife were Seventh-day Baptists. The young girl had left father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all the dear friends of her childhood, to follow her young husband to Arkansas -- to them the land of promise. The light of love sparkled in her bright young eyes. The roses of health were upon her cheeks, and her silvery laugh was sweet music, of which her young husband never wearied. They purchased a little farm, and soon by tireless industry and frugal thrift, their home blossomed like a rose in the wilderness. After awhile a fair young babe came to them to brighten the sunshine, and sweeten the bird songs. They were happy in each other's affection and their love for the little one. For them 'all things worked together for good;' for in their humble, trusting way, they worshiped God and loved their fellow-men.

"Two years ago the law under which their prosperity and happiness had had its growth was repealed!

125

Accursed be the day which brought such a foul blot upon our State's fair fame! A change, sudden, cold, and blasting as an Arctic storm, came over their lives, and pitilessly withered all their bright flowers of hope. Under this repeal, persecution lifted its ugly, venomous head. The hero of my sad story was observed by an envious, jealous neighbor, quietly working, as he believed God had commanded him, on Sunday. He was reported to that Inquisitorial relic of barbarism, the Grand Jury, indicted, tried, convicted, and thrown into jail because his conscience would not let him pay the fine.

"Week after week dragged its slow length along. Day after day the young wife, with baby in her arms, watched at the gate for his coming, and, like Tennyson's Marianna --

"She only said: "My life is dreary --
He cometh not," she said.
She said: "I am aweary -- aweary --
I would that I were dead."

"Then baby sickened and died; the light in the young wife's eyes faded out in tears; her silvery laugh changed to low, wailing sobs. Pale-faced Misery snatched the roses from her cheeks, and planted in their stead her own pallid hue. Sir, how can I go on? At length the cruel law was appeased, and this inoffensive citizen (except that he had loved God and sought to obey him) was released from prison, and dragged his weary feet to the happy home he had left a few short weeks before. He met his neighbors at the gate bearing a coffin. He asked no questions, his heart told him all. No, not all! He knew not -- he could never know -- of her lonely hours, of her bitter tears, of the weary watching and waiting, of the appeals to God, -- that God for whom she had suffered so much, -- for help in the hour of her extremity, of baby's sickness and death. He could not know of these. But he went with them to the quiet country burial-place, and saw beside the open grave a little mound with dirt freshly heaped upon it, and then he knew that God had taken both his heart's idols, and he was left alone. His grief was too deep for tears. With staring eyes, he saw them lower the body of his young

126

wife into the grave. He heard the clods rattle upon the coffin, and it seemed as if they were falling upon his heart. The work was done, and they left him with his dead; and then he threw himself down between the graves, with an arm across each little mound, and the tears came in torrents, and kept his heart from breaking. And then he sobbed his broken farewell to his darlings, and left Arkansas forever, -- left it, sir, as hundreds of others are preparing to leave, if this General Assembly fails to restore to them the protection of their rights under the Constitution, national and State.

"On next Monday, at Malvern, six as honest, good, and virtuous citizens as live in Arkansas, are to be tried as criminals for daring to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences; for exercising a right which this Government, under the Constitution, has no power to abridge. Sir, I plead, in the name of justice, in the name of our republican institutions, in the name of these inoffensive, God-fearing, God-serving people, our fellow-citizens, and last, sir, in the name of Arkansas, I plead that this bill may pass, and this one foul blot be wiped from the escutcheon of our glorious commonwealth."

Arkansas was not alone in this, however, though it was worse there than anywhere else. I myself, with other brethren in California, had to send hundreds of dollars into Tennessee, to support the families of the brethren of our own faith there, while the husbands and fathers who made the money for their support were in jail because they chose to work for their families on Sunday, and make bread for them after having kept

the Sabbath according to their conscience. That has been done, Mr. Chairman, in these United States. That is the care these people have for the laboring man.

Senator Blair. -- You reason from that that there should be no Sunday law whatever?

Mr. Jones. -- If you allow a Sunday law, you must allow it to any extent. It must be enforced. All they

127

did in Arkansas was to enforce the law, simply as in the Roman empire they enforced the law, and put Christians to death. They simply enforced the law, but the law was wrong. Any condition of the law that will allow such things as that is a wrong condition of the law.

Senator Blair. -- This bill proposes that work must not be done to the disturbance of others. This work was done to the disturbance of others.

Mr. Jones. -- I know that this bill for a national Sunday law proposes that work must not be done "to the disturbance of others," and in that very phrase lies one of its worst features. The bill declares that no person shall do any work, or "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." This leaves it entirely with the other man to say whether that which I do disturbs him; and that is only to make every man's action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. And everybody knows that it requires a very slight thing to disturb one who has a spite or prejudice against you. At the Illinois State Sunday-law convention last month (Nov. 20, 21), Dr. R. O. Post, of Springfield, made a speech on the subject of "Sunday Recreation," in which he declared as the sum of his whole speech that, --

"There is no kind of recreation that is proper or profitable on Sunday, outside of the home or the sanctuary."

Only let such a law as is embodied in this bill become of force where R. O. Post, D. D., is, and any kind of recreation outside of the home or the sanctuary would be sure to disturb him, and the one engaged in the recreation could be arrested and prosecuted. But it may be argued that no judge or jury would uphold any such prosecution. That is not at all certain, as we shall

128

yet see; but whether or not it is so, it is certain that if your neighbor should say that what you did disturbed him, under such a law as that he could have you arrested, and put to the inconvenience and expense of defending yourself before the court. In 1887, the city of

San Francisco, Cal., had an ordinance on another subject that embodied the very principle of this clause of this Sunday bill. It reads thus: --

"No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway, or upon adjacent premises."

It is easy to see that the principle of this ordinance is identical with that of the clause in the first section of this bill, which forbids anything "to the disturbance of others."

While that San Francisco ordinance was in force, a man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which not only had a tendency to annoy, but actually "annoyed" a business man across the street. Pape was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of habeas corpus, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says: --

"The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge: -
-

"If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in itself, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other

129

persons. . . . Instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

"But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty, as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar.

Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the Constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment, the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable,"

This decision applies with full force to this proposed national Sunday law. Under this law, all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, game, amusement, or recreation on Sunday; because the National Reformers are as much in favor of this Sunday law as is anybody else, and there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much "disturbed" by any amusement or recreation indulged in on

Sunday, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or caprice of the "disturbed" one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action really has or has not disturbed him.

The California decision is, that such a statute "sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny," as that which is embodied in these words of this Sunday bill.

Nor is this confined to this particular section; the same principle is found in Section 5. This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. When wages are paid for Sunday work, "whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same." Whoever is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except for work of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money.

So much for this bill as it reads. Now, as to the work for which the Seventh-day observers of Arkansas were prosecuted. It was not to the disturbance of others. Let me state some of the facts, the authentic record of which I have, but it is too voluminous to present in detail.

With two exceptions, all the arrests and prosecutions were of people who observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. And in these two exceptions, those who were held for trial were held without bail, -- simply on their own recognizance, -- and although the testimony was direct and positive, the jury "agreed to disagree," and the cases were both dismissed; while in every case of a Seventh-day Adventist, the least bail that was accepted was \$110; the most of them were held under bonds for \$250, and some for as high as \$500. There was not a single case dismissed, and in all the cases the complaint was never made that what was done had disturbed the worship or the rest of any one. But the indictments were all for the crime of "Sabbath-breaking" by the performance of labor on Sunday.

The statute of Arkansas at that time ran thus: --

"SECTION 1883. Every person who shall on the Sabbath, or Sunday, be found laboring, or shall compel his apprentice or servant to labor or perform service other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity, on conviction thereof shall be fined one dollar for each separate offense.

"SEC. 1884. Every apprentice or servant compelled to labor on Sunday shall be deemed a separate offense of the master.

"SEC. 1885. The provision of this act shall not apply to steamboats and other vessels navigating the waters of the State, nor such manufacturing establishments as require to be kept in continual operation."

In the case of Mr. Swearingen, mentioned by Senator Crockett, the conviction was upon the testimony of a witness who swore that the work for which he was convicted was done on a day which proved to be seventeen days before the law was enacted, thus by its enforcement making the law *ex post facto*. The Constitution of the United States forbids the making of *ex post facto* laws. But when a law not being *ex post facto* in itself,

made so by its enforcement, it is time that something was being done to enlighten courts and juries upon that subject, even though it should be by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that no law not being *ex post facto* in itself shall be made so by its enforcement. Then, on the other hand, several cases were tried, and the men convicted and fined after the law was repealed, though for work done before.

In almost every case the informer, the prosecuting witness, or perhaps both, were men who were doing work or business on the same day, and sometimes with the very persons accused; yet the man who kept the seventh day was convicted in every instance,

while the man who did not keep the seventh day, but did work or business with the man who did, was left entirely unmolested, and his evidence was accepted in Court to convict the other man. I give some instances: --

First, a man by the name of Millard Courtney, who was the prosecuting witness against two men, Armstrong and Elmore, had taken a man with him to where these men were working, and there they made a contract for roofing a school-house; and yet Courtney's evidence convicted these two men of Sabbath-breaking at the very time he was doing business with them.

Second, J. L. Shockey was convicted upon the testimony of a man by the name of Hammond, who went to him on Sunday where he was at work, and bargained with him for a Plymouth Rock rooster.

Third, J. L. James, who worked in the rain for nothing on Sunday that a poor widow, a member of another church, might be sheltered, was convicted of Sabbath breaking upon the evidence of a man who carried wood and chopped it up that same day within seven rods of the man who was convicted by his testimony.

Fourth, one La Fever and his wife went to Allen Meeks's house on Sunday to visit. They found Meeks

133

planting potatoes. Meeks stopped planting potatoes, and spent the rest of the day visiting with them; and yet Meeks was convicted of Sabbath-breaking and fined upon the evidence of La Fever.

Fifth, the second case of Mr. Meeks. Riley Warren went to his house on Sunday, to see him about hiring a teacher for the public school. In the social, neighborly conversation that passed between them, Meeks incidentally mentioned that he had mended his wagon-brake that morning; and yet he was convicted of Sabbath-breaking upon the evidence of that same Riley Warren. Meeks was thus virtually compelled to be a witness against himself, -- clearly another violation of both the State and United States Constitution.

Sixth, Mr. Reeves's boys were hauling wood on Sunday. In the timber where they got the wood, they met another boy, a Seventh-day Adventist, John A. Meeks, hunting squirrels. They joined him in the hunt, scaring the squirrels around the trees so he could shoot them. Then the squirrels were divided between the Meeks boy and the Reeves boys. Then the Meeks boy was indicted, prosecuted, and convicted of Sabbath-breaking upon the evidence of the father of those boys who were hauling wood, and who helped to kill the squirrels.

Seventh, James M. Pool, for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, was convicted of Sabbath-breaking, on the evidence of a "sanctified" church member who had gone to Pool's house on Sunday to buy tobacco.

Allow me to mention the methods of prosecution. In the case of Scoles, J. A. Armstrong was called before the Grand Jury. After repeated answers to questions in regard to work done on Sunday by different parties in several different lines of business and traffic, he was asked the direct question whether he knew of any Seventh-day Adventists who worked on

134

Sunday, and when in the nature of the case he answered in the affirmative, every one of the Seventh-day Adventists whom he named was indicted, and not one of any other class or trade.

In the second case of James A. Armstrong; he was arrested at the instance of the mayor. When asked for the affidavit upon which Armstrong was arrested, the mayor said that A. J. Vaughn had called his attention to Armstrong's working, and had said, "Now see that you do your duty," yet Vaughn testified under oath that he did not see Armstrong at all on the day referred to. Armstrong was not only arrested at the instance of the mayor, but he was also tried before the mayor, who acted as Justice of the Peace. And when Vaughn testified that he had not seen Armstrong at all on the day referred to, this made the mayor, virtually, both prosecuting witness and judge; and the questions which he asked show that that was precisely his position, and his own view of the case. The question which he asked to each of the first two witnesses was, "What do you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on Sunday, June 27?" This question assumes all that was expected to be proved on the trial.

This is enough to show the workings of such a Sunday law as is embodied in this Senate bill. There were many other cases, every one in the same line. But throughout the whole list of cases, it is only the record of how people who were performing honest labor on their own premises in a way in which it was impossible to do harm to any soul on earth, were indicted, prosecuted, and convicted upon the evidence of men who, if there were any wrong involved in the case at all, were more guilty than they. If religious persecution could possibly be more clearly demonstrated than it is in this thing, we hope never to see an illustration of it.

It may be asked, Why was not an appeal taken? An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the

135

State, in the first case that was tried. The judgment of the lower Court was confirmed in an opinion closing with these words: --

"The appellant's argument, then, is reduced to this: That because he conscientiously believes he is permitted by the law of God to labor on Sunday, he may violate with impunity the statute declaring it illegal to do so; but a man's religious belief cannot be accepted as a justification for his committing an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. If the law operates harshly, as laws sometimes do, the remedy is in the hands of the legislature. It is not the province of the judiciary to pass upon the wisdom or policy of legislation. That is for the members of the legislative department; and the only appeal from their determination is to the constituency."

This decision of the Supreme Court is of the same piece with the prosecutions and judicial processes throughout. It gives to the legislature all the omnipotence of the British Parliament, and in that does away with all necessity for a Constitution. The decision on this principle alone, is un-American. No legislative body in this country is framed upon the model of the British Parliament in respect to power. In this country, the powers of every legislature are defined and limited by Constitutions. It is the prerogative of Supreme Courts to define the meaning of the Constitution, and to decide whether an act of the legislature is Constitutional or not. If the act is Constitutional, then it must stand, whatever the results may be. And the Supreme Court is the body by which the Constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of any statute is to be discovered. But if, as this decision declares, the legislature is omnipotent, and that which it does must stand as law, then there is no use for a Constitution. "One of the objects for which the judiciary department is established, is the protection of the Constitutional rights of the citizens."

So long as there is a Constitution above the legislature, which defines and limits its powers, and protects and guards the rights of the citizens, so long it is the province of the Supreme Court to pronounce upon the acts of the legislature. The Supreme Court of Arkansas, therefore, in this case, clearly abdicated one of the very functions for which it was created, or else subverted the Constitution of Arkansas; and in either case, bestowed upon the legislature the omnipotence of the British Parliament, which is contrary to every principle of American institutions. Nor is the State of Arkansas an exception in this case; for this is the usual procedure of Supreme Courts in sustaining Sunday laws. They cannot be sustained upon any American principle; resort has to be made in every instance, and has been with scarcely an exception, either to the church-and-state principles of the British Government, or to the British principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. But American principles are far above and far in advance of the principles of the British Government, in that they recognize Constitutional limitations upon the legislative power, and countenance no union of church and state; consequently Sunday laws never have been, and never can be, sustained upon American principles.

That this stricture upon Supreme Court of Arkansas is not unjust, we have the clearest proof. The three judges who then composed the Supreme Court, were all members of the Bar Association of the State of Arkansas. In less than three months after this decision was rendered, the Bar Association unanimously made a report to the State on "law and law reform," an official copy of which I have in my possession. In that report, under the heading "Sunday Laws," is the following: --

"Our statute as it stands in Mansfield's Digest, provides that 'persons who are members of any religious

137

society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act [the Sunday law], so that they observe one day in seven, agreeably to the faith and practice of their church or society.' -- Mans. Dig., sec. 1886.

"This statute had been in force from the time of the organization of the State government; but it was unfortunately repealed by act of March 3, 1885. -- Acts 1885, p. 37.

"While the Jews adhere, of course, to the letter of the original command to remember the seventh day of the week, there is also in the State a small but respectable body of Christians who consistently believe that the seventh day is the proper day to be kept sacred; and in the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience, supported, as he supposed, by good theological arguments. It is very evident that the system now in force, savoring, as it does, very much of religious persecution, is a relic of the Middle Ages, when it was thought that men could be made orthodox by an act of parliament. Even in Massachusetts, where Sabbatarian laws have always been enforced with unusual vigor, exceptions are made in favor of persons who religiously observe any other day in the place of Sunday. We think that the law as it stood in Mansfield's Digest, should be restored, with such an amendment as would prevent the sale of spirits on Sunday, as that was probably the object of repealing the above section."

Now the Arkansas Constitution says: --

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no

138

preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship, above any other."

This report of the Bar Association says, "In the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

The members of the Supreme Court being members of the Bar Association, in that report it is confessed that they confirmed a judgment against a man for doing that which the Constitution explicitly declares all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do.

Senator Blair. -- Then if they had a law like this, they were wrongly convicted under the law, just as innocent men are sometimes hung; but you cannot reason that there should be no law against murder because innocent men are sometimes executed. It is fault in the administration of the law. You cannot reason from that that there should be no law.

Mr. Jones. -- If there had been arrests of other people for working on Sunday, in anything like the numbers that there were of seventh-day observers, and the law had been enforced upon all alike, then the iniquity would not have been so apparent; or if those who were not seventh-day observers, and who were arrested, had been convicted, even then the case would not have been so clearly one of persecution. But when in all the record of the whole two years' existence of the law in this form, there was not a solitary saloon keeper arrested, there was not a person who did not observe the seventh day arrested, with the two exceptions named, then there could be no clearer demonstration that the law was used only as a means to vent religious spite against a class of citizens guiltless of any crime, but only of professing a religion different from that of the majority.

The fact of the matter is, -- and the whole history of these proceedings proves it, -- that from beginning to end these prosecutions were only the manifestation of that persecuting, intolerant spirit that will always make itself felt when any class of religionists can control the civil power. The information upon which the indictments were found, was treacherously given, and in the very spirit of the Inquisition. The indictment itself is a travesty of legal form, and a libel upon justice. The principle was more worthy of the Dark Ages than of any civilized nation or modern time; and the Supreme Court decision that confirmed the convictions, is one which is contrary to the first principles of Constitutional law or Constitutional compacts.

And if Congress should lend its sanction to religious legislation to the extent of passing this national Sunday bill, now under consideration, and its principles should be

made of force in all the States, the history of Arkansas from 1885-86 would be repeated through the whole extent of the nation. This I can prove, at least so far as the intention goes of those who are actively in favor of it. Rev. D. Mc Allister is one of the principal men of the National Reform Association. That Association and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held a joint convention at Lakeside, Ohio, in July, 1887; and speaking on the subject of a national Sunday law, Dr. Mc Allister said: --

"Let a man be what he may, -- Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath, -- let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation. They may hold any other day of rest of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer

140

in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor."

Then some one stated from the audience that --

"There is a law in the State of Arkansas enforcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many good persons have not only been imprisoned, but have lost their property, and even their lives."

To which Mr. Mc Allister coolly replied: --

"It is better that a few should suffer, than that the whole nation should lose its Sabbath."

This argument is identical with that by which the Pharisees in Christ's day justified themselves in killing him. It was said: --

"It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." John 11:50.

And then says the record: --

"Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death." Verse 53.

It is because of these principles, unblushingly avowed by the very men who stand in the lead in the effort to secure the enactment of this national Sunday law; and because of the practical effect of such a law in Arkansas and Tennessee, and to some extent in Pennsylvania, -- it is because of these things that we say to you, gentlemen of the United States Senate, you cannot afford to give to these men the power which they seek in the

enactment of this proposed Sunday law. The speech of Senator Crockett's, which I have read, was made in the legislature of Arkansas, when he was pleading for the restoration of that exemption clause, -- when he was pleading for toleration, in fact.

141

Senator Blair. -- Do you know whether this young man had money or friends?

Mr. Jones. -- Dr. Lewis, can you certify whether he had money?

Dr. Lewis. -- The case was never reported to other churches for relief. I do not know as to his personal estate.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think it was a peculiar man who would allow his child to be killed and his wife to starve?

Dr. Lewis. -- The case was not reported to our churches in the North.

Mr. Jones. -- About that peculiarity I will say that John Bunyan stayed twelve years in Bedford jail when he could have got out by simply saying the word "yes," and agreeing that he would not preach.

Senator Blair. -- It was a very different thing to be called on to say that he would abstain from the performance of a great duty in his church. He preached the gospel, and he would not agree not to preach the gospel. But here is a man who lets his wife and child die rather than pay twenty-five or fifty dollars and get out, and have an opportunity to go to work for them.

Mr. Jones. -- What kind of law is that which puts a man upon his conscience to choose between his wife and child and paying a fine of twenty-five or fifty dollars? But suppose he had paid the fine, and got out and gone to work again, how long could he have worked? When the next Sunday came round, it was his duty to his wife and child to work for their support. Is he to go to work on Sunday, and go through the course of prosecution again, and again pay a fine of twenty-five or fifty dollars? How long could this be kept up? There are not many poor farmers who can clear from twenty-five to fifty dollars every week above all expenses, to be devoted to paying regular fines for the privilege of following

142

their honest occupation on their own premises. But it will be said, "Let him not work on Sunday, then he would not have to pay a fine." Well, if he consents to do no work on Sunday, he consents to be robbed of one-sixth of his time, which he honestly owes to the support of his wife and child. For to rob him of one-sixth of his time is precisely what the

State does in such a case; and it is either confiscation outright, or confiscation under the guise of a fine imposed as punishment for his refusing to allow himself to be robbed of one-sixth of his time. Either this, or else he must give up his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and the word of God, and so surrender his rights of conscience altogether. It comes to this, therefore, that Sunday laws are a direct invasion of the rights of conscience.

More than this, Sunday laws are a direct invasion not only of the Constitutional right, but the inalienable right, of acquiring possessing, and protecting property. I here adopt the language of the Supreme Court of California, -- language which can never be successfully controverted: --

"The right to protect and possess property is not more clearly protected by the Constitution than the right to acquire. The right to acquire must include the right to use the proper means to attain the end. The right itself would be impotent without the power to use the necessary incidents. If the legislature have the authority to appoint a time of compulsory rest, . . . it is without limit, and may extend to the prohibition of all occupations at all times... For the Constitution to declare a right inalienable and at the same time leave the legislature unlimited power over it, would be a contradiction in terms, an idle provision, proving that a Constitution was a mere parchment barrier, insufficient to protect the citizen, delusive and visionary, and the practical result of which would be to destroy,

143

not conserve, the rights which they may assume to protect. The legislature, therefore, cannot prohibit the proper use of the means of acquiring property, except the peace and safety of the State require it." -- *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal., pp. 517,510.

But does the peace and safety of the State require it in any such case as is here involved? Can it ever be against the peace and safety of the State for any man to follow his honest, legitimate, and even laudable occupations? It is against the peace and safety of the State to prohibit it. For, as I have before conclusively proved, for the State to do so is for it to put honest occupations in the catalogue of crimes; to put peaceable and industrious citizens upon a level with criminals; and to put a premium upon idleness and recklessness. It is certainly against the peace and safety of any State to do any such thing. Therefore it is demonstrated that Sunday laws are an invasion of the inalienable right of acquiring and possessing property, and for that man in Arkansas to have obeyed that law, would have been to surrender his inalienable right.

Once more: As the right to acquire property includes the right to use the proper means to attain that end, and as such a law deprives a man of the use of such means during one-sixth of his time, it follows that it is a violation of that provision of the

Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, which declares that "no State shall deprive any citizen of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

All this, sir, is involved in the question as to whether that man shall recognize the law to such an extent as even to pay the fine. If he does, then it follows inevitably that all his property shall go to pay fines, or else he must choose between yielding his rights of conscience, and allowing one-sixth of his time to be confiscated, and in that a certain proportion of property;

144

because to the industrious citizen, time is property. But if the State by a Sunday law or by any other means, may confiscate a part, it may confiscate all. Where, then, shall resistance to oppression begin? -- I say, At the very first appearance of it. Under cover of the word "Loan" Charles I. undertook to confiscate a small sum of money from each of the property owners of England. John Hampden's share was about seven dollars and seventy-five cents. He was a rich man, but he refused to pay it; and his refusal to pay that paltry sum led to all England's being plunged into confusion and civil war: the king lost his head, Hampden himself lost his life, and all this rather than to pay the insignificant sum of seven dollars and seventy-five cents! -- less than one-third of the fine imposed upon this man for refusing to assent to the confiscation of one-sixth of his property. But John Hampden's refusal to pay that money established the Constitutional principle that every man has the inalienable right to acquire, possess, and protect property -- a right which was invaded in this case. Upon this principle alone that man was entirely justified in refusing to pay the fine imposed by that Sunday law. But as there was also involved the inalienable right of conscience, he was doubly justified in refusing to obey the law or to recognize the principle.

Senator Blair. -- Suppose he was a guilty man. Suppose he did not believe it was an offense to steal, and that he conscientiously thought that he could take goods from another in a certain way. He had been convicted under the law, and was under the penalty of paying twenty-five dollars' fine. Is he to put his right of conscience against the demands of wife and child, and against the judgment of the community, and the State in which he lives, and to which he owes all the rights to the enjoyment of property, and everything

145

else he has? In this case a man saw all this evil done rather than pay twenty-five or fifty dollars, and he says he did that by reason of his conscience.

Mr. Jones. -- The cases are not parallel at all, unless indeed you count it as much of a crime for a man to follow his honest occupation as it is for him to steal. This,

however, we have demonstrated is the very thing that Sunday laws do. But we forever protest against honesty industry's being put upon a level with thieving.

The man who steals takes the property of others without compensation and without regard to the question of right. If, then, the State takes from him property or time without compensation, he cannot complain of injustice. But in the case of the man who works on Sunday, he invades no man's right in any degree; he takes no man's property or his time in any way, much less does he take it without compensation. For the State to punish the thief, is just. For the State to punish the industrious citizen, is pre-eminently unjust.

But aside from all this, did you ever hear of a man whose conscience taught him that it was right to steal, that it was a conscientious conviction to steal?

Senator Blair. -- I have heard of great many instances where an individual confessed that he had conscientiously violated the law, yet he was punished.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; and the Christians were put to death under the Roman empire for violating the law.

Senator Blair. -- But that does not answer my question, and it is not necessary that it should be answered.

Mr. Jones. -- It is right for any man to violate any law that invades his Constitutional rights; and it is his right conscientiously to violate any law that invades the rights of conscience. God declares the man innocent who violates the law that interferes with man's relationship to God -- the law that invades the rights of conscience. See cases "The King vs. Shadrach, Meshach

146

and Abed-nego;" and "The State vs. Daniel," reported in Daniel, chapters 3 and 6.

The end of the Arkansas case, as reported by Senator Crockett, was that the poor man lost both his wife and his child.

Senator Blair. -- What became of him?

Mr. Jones. -- He left the State.

Senator Blair. -- I should think he ought to leave it.

Mr. Jones. -- So do I, sir. But what can be said of freedom any more in this country, when such things can be? That is also true of six other men who followed the

dictates of their own consciences, -- as good, honest, virtuous citizens, as lived in Arkansas.

Senator Blair. -- There is a good deal of humbug about the dictates of one's own conscience. If a man is to set up his conscience against the obligations to do what is right and to perform his duty toward society, an unintelligent and uninformed conscience of that kind might be allowed to destroy all society. It is not conscience always.

Mr. Jones. -- I beg your pardon, sir. The rights of conscience are eternally sacred. There is no conscience in regard to the State, however; conscience has to do with God, and with what he has commanded; and a man reads in the Bible what God commands. I here adopt the words of the present Associate-justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hon. Stanley Matthews, in his speech in the case of the Cincinnati School Board vs. Minor et al. He says: --

"We may call the eccentricities of conscience, vagaries, if we please; but in matters of religious concern we have no right to disregard or despise them, no matter how trivial and absurd we may conceive them to be. In the days of the early Christian martyrs, the Roman lictors and soldiers despised and ridiculed the fanaticism that refused the trifling conformity of a pinch of incense

147

upon the altar, erected to the Caesar that arrogated to himself the title and honor of 'divine,' or a heathen statue. History is filled with the record of bloody sacrifices which holy men who feared God rather than men, have not withheld, on account of what seemed to cruel persecutors but trifling observances and concessions. . . . Conscience, if your honors please, is a tender thing, and tenderly to be regarded; and in the same proportion in which a man treasures his own moral integrity, -- sets up the light of conscience within him as the glory of God shining in him to discover to him the truth, -- so ought he to regard the conscience of every other man, and apply the cardinal maxim of Christian life and practice, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them.'"

Senator Blair. -- Should those who conscientiously believe in free love be allowed to indulge in it?

Mr. Jones. -- There is no point in that. Where is there any conscientious conviction in free love? I cannot discover it. There is no room for any.

Senator Blair. -- But there must be laws which prohibit immorality?

Mr. Jones. -- I ask you to define what immorality is, and then I will answer your question.

Senator Blair. -- If you do not know what the expression means, I shall not undertake to enlighten you.

Mr. Jones. -- I know what it means.

Senator Blair. -- Then why do you ask me to define it? Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. Jones. -- Because there are modified meanings of the word which make it refer to crime. Immorality is itself a violation of the law of God, and civil government has no right to punish any man for a violation of the law of God as such. I do say, therefore, that that which, properly speaking, is immorality, the civil law cannot prohibit, and that it has no right to attempt it. Morality is defined as follows: --

148

"Morality: The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule. . . . The conformity of an act to the divine law."

As morality is the conformity of an act to the divine law, it is plain that morality pertains solely to God, and with that, civil government can have nothing to do.

Again: Moral law is defined as --

"The will of God, as the supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action as obligatory on the conscience or moral nature." The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai."

These definitions are evidently according to Scripture. The Scriptures show that the ten commandments are the law of God; that they express the will of God; that they pertain to the conscience, and take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and that obedience to these commandments is the duty that man owes to God. Says the Scripture, --

"Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13.

And the Saviour says, --

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca [vain fellow, margin], shall be in danger of

the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Matt. 5:21,22.

The apostle John, referring to the same thing, says, --

0 "Whosoever hateth his brother is murderer." 1 John 3:15.

149

Again, the Saviour says, --

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Matt 5:27, 28.

Other illustrations might be given, but these are sufficient to show that obedience to the moral law is morality; that it pertains to the thoughts and intents of the heart, and therefore, in the very nature of the case, lies beyond the reach or control of the civil power. To hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman is adultery; - - these are all equally immoral, and violations of the moral law, but no civil government seeks to punish for them. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees, -- he may keep it up all his days; but so long as these things are confined to his thought, the civil power cannot touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be; yet the State cannot punish him. It does not attempt to punish him. This demonstrates again that with morality or immorality the State can have nothing to do.

But let us carry this further. Only let that man's hatred lead him, either by word or sign, to attempt an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him; only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his own, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him; only let his impure thought lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet bear in mind that even then the States does not punish him for his immorality, but for his incivility. The immorality lies in the heart, and can be measured by God only. The State punishes no man because he is immoral. If it did, it would have to punish as a murderer

150

the man who hates another, and to punish as an idolater the man who covets, and to punish as an adulterer the one who thinks impurely; because according to the true standard of morality, hatred is murder, covetousness is idolatry, and impurity of thought is adultery. Therefore is clear that in fact the State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is uncivil. It cannot punish immorality; it must punish incivility.

This distinction is shown in the very term by which is designated State or national government; it is called civil government. No person but a theocrat ever thinks of calling it moral government. The government of God is the only moral government. God is the only moral governor. The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governments of men are civil governments, not moral. The laws of States and nations are civil laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government pertains the punishment of incivility, that is, the transgression of civil law. It is not theirs to punish immorality. That pertains solely to the Author of the moral law and of the moral sense, who is the sole judge of man's moral relation. All this must be manifest to every one who will think fairly upon the subject, and it is confirmed by the definition of the word civil, which is this: --

"Civil: Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens, or to the State."

Thus it is made clear that we owe to Caesar (civil government) only that which is civil, and that we owe to God that which is moral or religious, and that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality. Whoever attempts, it, usurps the prerogative of God. The

Inquisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality; because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The papacy, asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequence. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would wring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the Inquisition was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition; for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

Thus much on the subject of morality and the State in the true and genuine sense of the word morality. But as I said at the beginning, there is an accommodated sense in which the word morality is used, in which it is made to refer only to men's relations to their fellow-men; and with reference to this view of morality, it is sometimes said that the civil power is to enforce morality upon a civil basis. But morality on a civil basis is only civility, and the enforcement of morality upon a civil basis is the enforcement of civility, and nothing else. Without the Inquisition, it is impossible for civil government ever to carry its jurisdiction beyond civil things, or to enforce anything but civility.

But it may be asked, Does not the civil power enforce the observance of the commandments of God, which say, "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "Thou shalt not bear false witness"? Does not the civil

152

power punish the violation of these commandments of God? I answer: The civil power does not enforce these, nor does it punish the violation of them, as commandments of God. The State does forbid murder and theft and perjury, and some States forbid adultery, but not as commandments of God. From time immemorial, governments that knew nothing about God, have forbidden these things. If the State is to enforce these things as the commandments of God, it will have to take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; but this is not within the province of any earthly power.

By all these evidences is established the plain, common-sense principle that to civil government pertains only that which the term itself implies, -- that which is civil. The purpose of civil government is civil, and not moral. Its function is to preserve order in society, and to cause all its subjects to rest in assured safety, by guarding them against all incivility. Morality belongs to God; civility, to the State. Morality must be rendered to God; civility, to the State. Immorality must be punished -- can be punished -- only by the Lord. Incivility must be punished -- and no more than that can possibly be punished -- by the State.

Here, then at the close of my remarks, we are brought to the enunciation of the eternal principle with which I began, upon which we now stand, and upon which we forever expect to stand, -- the principle embodied in the United States Constitution forbidding religious tests, and forbidding Congress to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, -- the principle established by Jesus Christ: Render therefore UNTO CAESAR the things which are CAESAR'S; and UNTO GOD THE THINGS THAT ARE GOD'S.

153

REMARKS BY REV. A. II. LEWIS, D. D.

Dr. Lewis. -- Mr. Chairman. The objection raised by Prof. Jones against the exemption in favor of Sabbath-keepers, seems to me wholly imaginary. So far as any Seventh-day Baptists are concerned, I know it would be impossible for any man opening a saloon on Sunday to present the excuse that he was a Seventh-day Baptist. A saloon-keeping Seventh-day Baptist is an unknown thing throughout their history of more than two centuries. Such a man could not obtain recognition, much less church membership, in any Seventh-day Baptist community or church. Nor do I believe from what I know of the Seventh-day Adventists, that such a case could occur in connection with that people. The possibility of any such deceitful claim could easily be guarded against by a provision

requiring that in any case of doubt the one claiming to have observed the seventh day should be required to bring official certificate of his relation to a Sabbath-keeping church. Such a provision would end all difficulty.

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman. It is certainly true that, so far, a saloon-keeping Seventh-day Baptist, or Seventh-day Adventist, either, is an unknown thing. But if Sunday laws are enforced with an exemption clause in favor of those who keep the seventh day, this would not be an unknown thing much longer. It is true, also, that such a man could not obtain membership in any Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist church. But what is to prevent the saloon keepers from organizing Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist churches of their own, and for themselves? What is to prevent them, or any class of business men, from organizing their own churches, electing their own officers, and even ordaining their own pastors, and calling themselves

154

Seventh-day Baptists or Seventh-day Adventists? There is nothing to prevent it unless, indeed, the State itself shall take charge of all seventh-day churches and doctrines, and attend to their organization and the admission of members. This is precisely what was done before. In the days of the New England theocracy, Massachusetts enacted a law that, --

"For the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same."

There were considerable numbers of men who were not members of any of the churches, and who could not be, because they were not Christians. These men then took to forming themselves into churches of their own. Then the next step for the authorities to take, and they took it, was to enact a law that, --

"Forasmuch as it hath bene found by sad experience that much trouble and disturbance hath happened both to the church and civil State by the officers and members of some churches, wch have bene gathered . . . in an undue manner, . . . it is . . . ordered that . . . this Court doeth not, nor will hereafter, approue of any such companyes of men as shall henceforthe ioine in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first acquainte the magistrates and elders of the greatr pte of the churches fellowship, without their intencons, and have their approbacon herein." -- *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, pp. 28-30.

By this, gentlemen, you will see that the enactment of this Sunday law, though the first step, will not be by any means the last step, and that in more directions than one. Their offer of an exemption clause is a voluntary confession that the enforcement of the

law without one would be unjust; but if that exemption clause be embodied and maintained, the State is

155

inevitably carried beyond its proper jurisdiction; and if the exemption clause is retained and not maintained in its strictness, the whole law is at once nullified. Congress would better learn wisdom from this prospect, and utterly refuse to have anything at all to do with the subject. The whole subject is beyond the jurisdiction of the civil power, and the civil power can do no better than to let it entirely alone.

But Dr. Lewis proposes to guard against all difficulty, by "requiring" every observer of the seventh day "to bring official certificate of his relation to a Sabbath-keeping church." This would not end the difficulty; for, as I have shown, it would inevitably devolve upon the State to decide what was a genuine Sabbath-keeping church. But that is not the worst feature in this suggestion. If Dr. Lewis officially represents the Seventh-day Baptist denomination, and for the denomination proposes thus voluntarily to put himself and all his people on "ticket of leave," I have no particular objection; that is their own business; yet it seems to me an extremely generous proposition, if not an extraordinary proceeding. I say they may do this, if they choose. But as for me and for the Seventh-day Adventists generally, not only as Christians, but as American citizens, we repudiate with scorn and reject with utter contempt every principle of any such suggestion. As citizens of the United States, and as Christians, we utterly and forever refuse to put ourselves upon "ticket of leave" by any such proposition.

NOTE. -- That my argument at first was not so unfounded nor so "wholly imaginary" as Dr. Lewis supposed, has been conclusively demonstrated, even to himself, since this hearing was held. The "Pearl of

156

Days" column of the New York Mail and Express, the official organ of the American Sunday Union, in March, 1889, gave the following statement from the Plainfield [N. J.] Times [no date]: --

"As a rule, Plainfield, N. J., is a very quiet city on Sunday. Liquor, provision, and cigar stores are closed by the enforcement of a city ordinance. If a resident wants a cigar, he will either have it given to him by one of the many pharmacists who refuse to sell on Sunday, or he will go to the two dealers who are allowed to open their places on Sunday because they observe Saturday as their Sabbath. Some time ago a man of Catholic faith, who had an eye to Sunday business in that line, became a regular attendant at the Seventh-day Baptist church. Eventually he asked to be admitted into the fellowship of the church. A member of the official board was advised that the applicant for membership was only working for business ends. He was closely examined by the church officers, and

he finally admitted that he wanted to open a cigar store and do business on Sunday. The man appeared at the wrong place for aid in carrying out his mercenary purposes. He was not received into membership."

It looks somewhat like the "irony of fate" that this thing should fall to they very people whom Dr. Lewis represented, and in the very town where Dr. Lewis himself lives.

REMARKS BY MRS. J. C. BATEHAM.

Mrs. Batcham. -- I should like to say that the point which has been made was a point carefully considered by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and we saw the danger. Yet we wished to be exceedingly fair. I consulted nine persons of different classes of Seventh-day people, to know whether they wished such an exemption, and whether they would be satisfied with what was proposed. They represented themselves as being in approval of some such provision as has been suggested,

157

and we thought it could be done perhaps in such a way as to afford them the exemption which they desire, because they said that such an exemption is necessary.

Senator Blair. -- Let me ask you a few questions, Mrs. Bateham, to see if the Woman's Christian Temperance Union understood exactly the relation of what they propose to do in this legislation. Here is a bill which relates to interstate commerce, to postal work, to the army, and to the navy. It relates to that subject-matter which is carved out of the independent, full jurisdiction of a nation by the States, which were once complete sovereignties, and transferred to the general Government. The occupations I have mentioned are all of public nature; and to carry them on, the nation has such an opportunity to invade the Sabbath-rest laws of every State in such a way as to nullify them. The nation at large is unrestrained by any Sabbath law whatever. If it may carry on its post-office business on the Sabbath, it may go to any extent, and it does go already to a very great extent, and an increasingly great extent; so in regard to interstate commerce, and so with the army and the navy.

Now, you go to our Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist friends, for instance, and propose to introduce a principle by which they can carry on the post-office department on the Sabbath, just as completely as they see fit. In other words, you propose to exempt them from the operation of the law so far as it prohibits post-office work on the Sabbath. Suppose you have a Seventh-day Baptist man for postmaster. Suppose you fill up every post-office in the country on the Sabbath with Seventh-day Baptist people. You have the post-office department in operation by virtue of this exemption, because they can do the work conscientiously on that day. If you limit it by saying the

158

bill shall not apply to the Adventists and others, the bill provides that already.

Mrs. Bateham. -- If you remember the clause, we do not propose to provide that they shall be able to do this work, but that they shall be exempt from the penalty. They are not allowed to do the work, but they are to be exempt from the penalty. Therefore, unless they could prove that they had not done the work to the disturbance of others, it would be impossible for them to carry on post-office matters, for instance, or any other public employment, on Sunday.

Senator Blair. -- Is not that equivalent to saying that if the penalty shall not be enforced against them, there shall be no law against them? Because the law without the penalty is simply an opinion; it is not a law.

Mrs. Bateham. -- The law could provide that they should not open a post-office, for instance, or any place of business; and if there was a fine imposed, they would be compelled to close such places on Sunday. It was, of course, only thrown out as a suggestion from us that if it could be done, we should like to have such a provision in the bill. We are satisfied that people want the law, and if the law can, in your wisdom, be arranged with such an exemption, then we wish it; otherwise we do not. We are all glad, I think, to have the gentlemen admit that they do not want such an exemption, for that releases us from the place where we were.

Senator Blair. -- This is not to be a general Sunday law. These people all live in States, and they can work at their private occupations just the same under similar amendments to the State law, if the State saw fit to make such amendments. Prof. Jones says it did not work well in Arkansas, and I should think it did not, from his description. But these are public occupations, or quasi public occupations, we are dealing with; that of interstate commerce, for instance, carried on by

great corporations which are public in their relation to the working-men, because they are exercising a great public function in carrying on transportation which appertains to everybody all over the country.

This proposed law undertakes to prohibit the nullification of all Sunday-rest laws in the States so far as to provide that interstate commerce shall not be carried on, in violation of the law, upon the Sabbath. When you come to the private occupations which are regulated by the States, if they choose to allow the Seventh-day Baptist people to work on Sunday in those private occupations, on the farm, in the workshop, in the factory, this measure does not interfere with them at all.

Mr. Bateham. -- I have not the words before me, but my impression is that there is a clause in the bill providing that the jurisdiction of Congress shall be exercised over the

Territories in this matter. There is something of that kind in the bill, and this proposed exemption was designed to reach those cases, rather than apply to the general governmental action.

Senator Blair. -- You think the exemption might be made with reference to the Territories?

Mrs. Bateham. -- Yes; that was the point we had in mind in this general action. I have not the words of the bill before me, but there is something of that kind in it which we had in mind. I wish to say also that one of the requests of our National Woman's Christian Union was that the word promote should be changed to protect, in the title of the bill, so that it should have no appearance of what all Americans object to, any union of church and state. That amendment was proposed and accepted by the American Sabbath Union, the organized body which has just been in session in this city.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think that the word protect implies power to command and compel? An army protects.

160

Mrs. Batcham. -- All our laws protect us, do they not?

Senator Blair. -- You would make this a law?

Mrs. Batcham. -- I suggest that the bill be made a law, and that it be a law which shall protect the civil Sabbath, not promote religious worship, but protect the day as a day of rest and religious worship.

Senator Blair. -- It seems to me that the word protect is a stronger and more interfering word than promote. However, all these suggestions are important.

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Bateham in her first address this morning, in telling who they are that are in favor of this Sunday law, said that she believed "the great majority of the people will approve such a law." She mentioned as opposed to it only "the daily newspaper press," the railroad managers," "steamboat companies," "saloonists and their backers," "a class of foreigners who prefer the continental Sunday," and "the very small sect of Seventh-day Baptists."

Hon. G. P. Lord in his remarks said that "not more than three million of our population work on Sabbath, and most of this number are unwilling workers." He said that "the balance, or more than fifty-seven million of our population, abstain from toil on the Sabbath."

Taking these statements as the truth, it appears that the overwhelming majority of the American people are not only in favor of the Sunday law, but they actually keep that day as a rest day.

Now, gentlemen, is it not rather singular, and a doctrine altogether new in a government of the people, that the majority need to be protected? From whom are they to be protected? -- From themselves, most assuredly, because by their own representation they are so vastly in the majority that it would be impossible for

161

them to be oppressed by anybody else. But in a government of the people, when the majority are oppressing themselves, how can laws prevent it when the laws must be made by the majority, that is, by the very ones who are carrying on the oppression? If to them my argument seems unsound, I would cite, entirely for their benefit, the words of the Supreme Court of Ohio, that the "protection" guaranteed in our Constitutional provisions "means protection to the minority. The majority can protect itself. Constitutions are enacted for the purpose of protecting the weak against the strong, the few against the many."

This is sound sense, as well as sound Constitutional law. Now, suppose in accordance with this sound Constitutional principle, and under cover of their own statements, we, seventh-day observers, whom they themselves designate as being so entirely in the minority as scarcely to be worthy of recognition, -- suppose we should come to Congress asking for protection (and as all my argument has shown, if anybody needs protection in this matter, assuredly it is ourselves), -- suppose, then, we come to Congress asking for protection in the same way that they ask for it, -- suppose we should ask Congress to enact a law compelling all people to do no work on Saturday, in order to protect us in our right to keep Saturday; what would be thought of that? what would these people themselves think of it? what ought anybody to think of it, but that it was a piece of unwarranted assumption of authority to force upon others our ideas of religious observances? That is all it would be, and it would be utterly inexcusable. And I risk nothing in saying that these people themselves, as well as everybody else, would pronounce it unwarrantable and inexcusable. But if that would be so in the case of a minority who actually need to be protected, what, then, ought not to be thought of these people

162

who claim to be in the overwhelming majority, in their mission here, asking Congress to compel everybody to rest on Sunday for their protection!

Gentlemen, it is not protection, but power, that they want.

REMARKS BY JOHN B. WOOD.

Mr. Wood. -- Mr. Chairman. As a member of the society of Friends, a Quaker, I should like to say a few words.

I have a great deal of sympathy with people who talk about the right of conscience. I do not think the United States Government has any right over the conscience. We, as Friends, deny their right over our consciences while we act in accordance with the revealed will of God, the Bible.

In looking at this Sunday question, I see nothing in the Bible -- there is no word in it -- in which it is stated that we shall have to work on the first day of the week. Therefore, I do not think the Seventh-day Baptists have any right to object to the proposed legislation. The only thing they lose is one more day's work out of the week.

The society of Friends has always denied the right to fight. The result has been that in the United States they have never lost a life by that means, not even during the last war. The Lord Jesus Christ has always protected them.

I think that any Saturday Baptist who believes honestly that the Sabbath is Saturday, can depend upon the Lord's providing for him in five days of the week just as well as if he worked six, and he will have two Sundays instead of one, and be that much better off.

163

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- In answer to the question raised by Mr. Wood, that conscientious convictions do not require us to work on the first day of the week, one of the six working days, I wish to say, --

First, we deny his right, as well as the right of the State, to assume the prerogative of deciding for us what the Bible teaches, or what our conscientious convictions do, or do not, require.

Secondly, we deny the right of the State to cause us to lose the whole, or any part, of a day's work out of every week. And I turn this point upon him as I turned it upon the others, Why have we not as much right to ask for a law compelling them to rest on the day that we keep, as they have to compel us to rest on the day which they keep? "The only thing they would lose is one more day's work out of the week." Then they could "have two Sundays instead of one, and be that much better off." Why is it not as good for them as it is for us? Or is this a benefit reserved solely for those who do not keep

Sunday? How this invades the Constitutional right of acquiring and possessing property, and does deprive us of property without due process of law, I have already discussed.

Thirdly, upon this point I wish to read Judge Cooley's opinion.

Mr. Wood. -- I referred to the Bible.

Mr. Jones. -- The Bible says, "Six days shalt thou labor." While I do not insist that this is an absolute command that we shall actually work the whole six days, I do insist that it is a God-given permission, and therefore our God-given right, to work six days of every week. And we deny forever the right of the State to forbid us to do that which, to say the very least, God has given us the express right to do.

164

As this is a matter of legislation and therefore of law, Judge Cooley's opinion is of weight upon the subject. He says: --

"The Jew [and the seventh-day Christian as well] who is forced to respect the first day of the week, when his conscience requires of him the observance of the seventh also, may plausibly urge that the law discriminates against his religion, and by forcing him to keep a second Sabbath in each week, unjustly, though by indirection, punishes him for his belief."

I have shown --

Senator Blair. -- He says "plausibly." That word plausibly indicates that there are some counter views somewhere.

Mr. Jones. -- As to the exact sense in which he uses the word plausibly, of course we cannot tell without consulting Mr. Cooley himself; but I do not see why we should put the strongest meaning into the word, especially as farther on he shows that the argument of the Seventh-day keeper is unanswerable. I am inclined to think that the Judge uses the word there in the sense of fairly, rightly, or feasibly.

Next he says: --

"The laws which prohibit ordinary employments on Sunday are to be defendant, either on the same grounds which justify the punishment of profanity, or as establishing sanitary regulations based upon the demonstration of experience that one day's rest in seven is needful to recuperate the exhausted energies of body and mind."

That is one of the pretended grounds of this petition for this national Sunday law; but the answer of the Supreme Court of California to that is this: --

"This argument is founded on the assumption that mankind are in the habit of working too much, and thereby entailing evil upon society; and that, without

165

compulsion, they will not seek the necessary repose which their exhausted natures demand. This is to us a new theory, and is contradicted by the history of the past and the observations of the present. We have heard in all ages of declamations and reproaches against the vice of indolence; but we have yet to learn that there has ever been any general complaint of an intemperate, vicious, unhealthy, or morbid industry. On the contrary, we know that mankind seek cessation from toil, from the natural influences of self-preservation, in the same manner and as certainly as they seek slumber, relief from pain, or food to appease their hunger. . . . If we cannot trust free agents to regulate their own labor, its times and quantity, it is difficult to trust them to make their own contracts. If the legislature could prescribe the days of rest for them, then it would seem that the same power could prescribe the hours to work, rest, and eat." -- Ex parte Newman, 9 Cal. 509, 518.

And Judge Cooley's answer to it is this: --

"The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania have preferred to defend such legislation on the second ground rather than the first, but it appears to us that if the benefit of the individual is alone to be considered, the argument against the law which he may make who has already observed the seventh day of the week, is unanswerable."

Senator Blair. -- But he also holds that for the general, the public good, Sunday laws are Constitutional.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes; and to be sustained upon authority. For the next sentence says: --

"But on the other ground, it is clear that these laws are supportable on authority, notwithstanding the inconvenience which they occasion to those whose religious sentiments do not recognize the sacred character of the first day of the week."

It is something unusual for persons to undertake to answer an unanswerable argument. But Judge Cooley employs here the only means by which an unanswerable

166

argument can ever be answered: and that is, "on authority." That is the way the papacy has done it from the days of Pope Zosimus, A. D., 418, who, when asked for the reasons for certain of this arrogant actions, exclaimed: "So it has pleased the Apostolic See!" That was a sufficient answer to all inquiries, and even to unanswerable arguments.

England fastened upon the American colonies the Stamp Act. Our fathers presented unanswerable arguments against it; but the Stamp Act, like Judge Cooley's Constitutional Sunday laws, was supportable "on authority," and that was enough. England proposed to enforce it. But our revolutionary fathers refused assent to any such method of answering unanswerable arguments. So we refuse our assent to Mr. Cooley's answer to that which he himself pronounces an unanswerable argument.

Senator Blair. -- It does not follow that there is no unanswerable argument in support of Sunday laws, I take it.

Mr. Jones. -- There is the authority.

Senator Blair. -- There is authority for the Sunday laws. It does not follow because the Sunday laws are supported by authority that therefore there is no sufficient argument upon which to base them.

Mr. Jones. -- What authority is there for Sunday laws?

Senator Blair. -- That is what you have been discussing; but you seem to say that because Sunday laws are supported "by authority," it is the only argument in favor of a bad law that there is authority for it. But there may be good authority for the Sunday law.

Mr. Jones. -- That is what is shown here, that there is no good authority for it when it unjustly punishes a man for his belief. There cannot be any good authority

167

for unjustly punishing any man for anything, much less for unjustly punishing him for his belief.

Senator Blair. -- He does not say it is bad.

Mr. Jones. -- But it is bad. Is there any good answer to an unanswerable argument?

Now, I propose to find out what authority there is for Sunday laws.

I before referred to the decision of the Supreme Court of Arkansas, and have shown from a statement of the committee on "law and law reform," of which the members of the Supreme Court were members, that decision was unconstitutional. I have shown that the principle upon which their decision rested was that of the omnipotence of parliament. In this, however, the State of Arkansas only followed the decisions of other States. In 1858, the Constitution of California said, in Section 4: "The free exercise and

enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State." There was a statute passed by the legislature enforcing the observance of "the Christian Sabbath," on the first day of the week. A Jew in Sacramento kept his store open on Sunday; he was arrested, convicted, and sent to jail. He sued out a writ of habeas corpus on the ground of "the illegality of his imprisonment by reason of the unconstitutionality of the law." The majority of the court sustained the plea by decisions separately written, whose soundness, both upon Constitutional principles and upon the abstract principle of justice itself, can never be successfully controverted. Mr. Stephen J. Field, now Associate-Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was then a member of the California Court. He rendered a dissenting opinion, taking the same position as the Supreme Court of Arkansas as to the omnipotence of the legislature, and soberly maintaining that the term "Christian

168

Sabbath" in the act was not a discrimination or preference in favor of any religious profession or worship. He declared that "moralists and statesmen," "men of science and distinguished philosophers," have pronounced the rule of "one day's rest in seven" to be "founded upon a law of our race." But he omitted to state what scientist or philosopher or moralist or statesman has ever pronounced upon what law is founded the rule of two days' rest in seven for the man who chooses to rest some other day than Sunday!

In his written opinion, Mr. Field said that he had found that in twenty-five States of the Union, Sunday laws had been held to be Constitutional. That this is so there can be no doubt. On this subject, as on that of blasphemy, which I have already noticed, the younger States, both in legislation and judicial decisions, have followed the example of the older States; these have followed the decisions of the oldest, and the oldest followed the example and the precedents of the colonies; and every one of the colonies had Sunday laws because every one had an established religions. These followed the precedents of the English system, which is wholly a church-and-state system. The church-and-state system of England severed itself from the papal rule when Henry VIII. renounced allegiance to the pope, and put himself at the head of the church of England in the place of the pope. The British system at that time was the papal system; the papal system was established by the mutual craft, flattery, and policy of Constantine and the ambitious bishops of his time, when the first Sunday law was enacted. This, in a word, is the genealogy of the Sunday laws of the United States. They belong with an established religion, -- a union of church and state. And in this country they have been almost universally sustained, either upon the British principle of the omnipotence of parliament,

169

or upon the church and state principles of the colonies, of the British government, and of the papacy.

The law of Pennsylvania, sustained by the decision referred to by Judge Cooley, was virtually a colonial law, which was a part of the system in which nobody who did "not confess and acknowledge one Almighty God to be the Creator, upholder, and ruler of the world," could be a citizen.

The Supreme Court of New York sustains Sunday laws by at once declaring Christianity to be the established religion of that State. This is based upon Chief Justice Kent's decision before referred to, which cited a law of the colony which declared that "the profanation of the Lord's day was 'the great scandal of the Christian faith.'" That decision of Judge Kent's made Christianity the established religion of the State of New York, by citing the precedents of the papal institutions of modern Europe and the pagan nations of antiquity.

This, again, proves Sunday laws to belong with established religions, with the union of church and state, finding their basis in papal and pagan institutions.

In every statute book in America, with scarcely an exception, Sunday laws are found under the head of "offenses against religion." This springs naturally from the colonial legislation, where each colony deemed itself the special guardian of God and of some particular form of religion.

But according to the word of Christ, the civil power has nothing to do with either God or religion, nor with offenses against God or religion. Religion is defined by Webster as "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience." Another definition, given by the National Reform Association itself, is "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." Civil government has nothing to do with a man's personal

relation of faith and obedience to God. If he has no faith at all, and makes no pretensions to obedience to God, that is nothing to the civil government, so long as the man conducts himself civilly. Neither has civil government anything to do with offenses against God; the Lord himself can attend to that. A man is responsible alone to God for the offenses which he commits against God. Civil government has no business to establish a religion, and then make offenses against it criminal; nor has it any business to put itself in the place of God, and presume to declare that an offense against the governmental idea of God is an offense against God. How is the civil government to know whether an act offends God or not? The fact of the matter is, that just as soon as Sunday laws are investigated at all in the light of truth, or justice, or law it is found that they are inseparable from an established religion, -- inseparable from a union of church and state.

This is further shown by a mere glance at the British system, as set forth by Blackstone in his chapter on "Offenses against God and religion." There "profanation of the Lord's day" is classed with such things as "apostasy," "heresy," "reviling the ordinances

of the church," "non-conformity to the worship of the church," "witchcraft," "conjurament," "enchantment," "sorcery," "religious imposture, such as falsely pretending an extraordinary commission from heaven," adultery as an ecclesiastical offense cognizable by the spiritual court, and such confusion of civil and religious ideas as the punishment of drunkenness as an offense against God and religion. This is the company with which Sunday laws belong. The penalty for apostasy was, first, burning to death; this fell into disuse after a while. Then the penalty was that "for

171

the first offense the offender should be rendered incapable to hold any office or place of trust."

At such legal nonsense as this the United States Constitution struck a death blow in the clause which declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government." And by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, this Government utterly separated itself from the whole system of offenses against God and religion so long maintained by the British government, by the colonies, and even yet by many of the States, and which is characteristic of all church-and-state governments -- governments of established religion -- by declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is sound American principle, and accords with the word of Jesus Christ. And the effort ought to be, throughout this whole nation, to lift the constitutions, the legislation, and the jurisprudence of the States up to the level of that of the national Constitution. But instead of doing that, and so carrying this whole nation bodily onward in the march of liberty, enlightenment, and progress, these people go about to bring down our national system of Constitution and laws to the level of that of the States, which is the level of that of the colonies, which is the level of that of the British system, which is the level that of the papacy, which is the system of paganism under cover of the Christian name.

Dr. Elliott here to-day cited Edgar, Athelstan, and Alfred in support of Sunday laws. To be sure! And with equal force he can cite these and many others of the Dark Ages in support of tithes to the clergy, the supremacy of the monks in civil affairs, the "holy anointing" of kings by the pope, and for any and every

172

other thing that belongs with the papal system. He can carry his Sunday-law precedents farther back than that: he can go back to the time of Theodosius and Constantine. He can find, and so can you or anybody else, that as Pontifex Maximus of the old pagan system, Constantine "had the plenary power of appointing holy days;" he can find that by virtue of this power, Constantine established the first Sunday-law of all time, in honor of the "venerable day of the sun," whose special devotee he was; and also that, as "bishop of externals" of the new pagan system, -- the papal, -- which office he assumed by virtue of

his political conversion to the political Christianity of his time, he played into the hands of the ambitious bishops by giving them in that Sunday law their coveted "use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims" to compel men to accept the decrees, and submit to the dictates, of the church. He, and all others, will find that this is the literal truth of the origin of Sunday laws.

All this is supported by abundance of testimony of undoubted authority. So eminent a divine as Dean Stanley declares plainly that the retention of the old pagan name of "dies solis," or Sunday, for the weekly Christian festival, "is owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution.'

This same mode of harmonizing paganism with Christianity was further illustrated by his imperial coins, bearing on one side the name of Christ, and on the other the figure of the sun god, with the inscription, "the unconquerable sun." This confusion of pagan and Christian ideas and practices is what made the

173

papacy, the union of church and state, and the confusion of civil and religious things, from which, with the exception of the government of the United States, the nations have not even yet freed themselves. This, sir, is the authority, and the only authority, for Sunday laws. Sunday has no basis whatever as a civil institution; it never had any. And the only basis it has, or ever had, as a religious institution is in that confusion of paganism and Christianity which made the papacy, with all that it is or ever was.

As authority for Sunday, and as the basis of this legislation, Dr. Johnson here to-day appealed to the fourth commandment. The "American Sabbath Union," now in session in this city, and which is working for the passage of this bill, likewise declares the basis of their whole movement to be the fourth commandment. It is proper, therefore, to inquire, What authority is there for Sunday laws, in the fourth commandment? As this is a question of legislation and of law, I shall examine it from the stand-point of law. Suppose, then, that this bill has become a law, and the courts in construing it take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment as the basis of the law.

Courts are guided by certain well-established rules in the construction of laws. According to these rules, what would be the result of the judicial construction of such a law upon the basis of the fourth commandment?

1. "What a court is to do, is to declare the law as written."

The fourth commandment as written is as follows; --

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

174

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."

That commandment as written says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Consequently, at the very first step the first day of the week, as declared in the bill, and as these people demand, would be completely shut out. But if any should innocently inquire, The seventh day of what? the commandment itself is ready with an explicit answer. It is the day upon which the Lord rested from the work of creation. In that work he employed six days, and the seventh day he rested, and that alone, as Dr. Johnson has said, established the weekly division of time. As those seven days formed the first week of time, the seventh of those seven was the seventh day of the week, and that is the seventh day fixed in the commandment. This is confirmed by the Scriptures throughout. The New Testament itself declares that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. Mark 16: 1, 2, says: --

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun."

Those people mentioned in this Scripture came to the sepulcher very early in the morning of the first day of the week; yet the Sabbath was past. This national Sunday-bill which is here under discussion proposes to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week. But such a thing can never be done, because according to the scripture, the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. It matters not how early persons may come to the first day of the week and its observance, they will be too late

175

to find the Sabbath in it; because by the word of the Lord it is past before the first day of the week comes.

This is made yet more positive, if need be, by the record in Luke 23:56 and 24:1, which says: --

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

Here it is declared that certain people rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment, and then on the first day of the week did what they would not do on the Sabbath day. This proves conclusively that the Sabbath day according to the commandment which these men cite, and which it is supposed that the courts will have to interpret when this becomes a law, -- this proves that Sabbath day is the day before the first day of the week, and therefore plainly demonstrates that the seventh day named in the commandment is nothing else than the seventh day of the week. Therefore, if courts, in the interpretation of this commandment as the basis of a Sunday law, declare the law as written and as defined by the plain word of the Lord, they will have to declare that the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, is the Sabbath.

2. "In the case of all law, it is the intent of the lawgiver that is to be enforced."

What, then, was the intent of the Lawgiver when the fourth commandment was given? Did the Lawgiver declare or show in any way his intention? -- He did. When the Lord gave that law at Sinai he did not leave it to the people to interpret it to suit themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week, kept up continuously for nearly forth years, he showed his intent in the law. The people were fed by manna in their forth years' wanderings. But on the

176

seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion, and that which was gathered on that day would keep over the seventh, which it could not be made to do at any other period, or over any other day in the week.

By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of observing the day mentioned in that law; and keeping it up continuously for so long a time made it utterly impossible that his intent should be mistaken.

Therefore, if the courts of the United States shall ever take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment, which is held forth by these people as the basis and the authority for their movement, according to this rule, the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared the Sabbath.

3. "When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction: they must be followed."

Are the words of the fourth commandment plain words? -- They are. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the commandment.

Then, according to this rule, if ever that question becomes one of judicial cognizance in the courts of the United States, the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared to be the Sabbath. That is all that the courts can declare.

Therefore, the conclusion of the whole matter thus far is that if our courts are to remain courts of law and are to be guided by the established rules for the construction of law, they never can uphold any law for the enforcement of the Sabbath or the Lord's day on the first day of the week.

Just here, however, another element comes into court, and that is the theological. The theologians step in right here and declare that the intention of the fourth commandment has been changed, and that now, instead of that commandment's requiring the observance of the

177

seventh day in remembrance of creation, it requires the observance of the first day of the week in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ. To reach this point they first declare that the phrase "the seventh day" in the commandment is indefinite; that it does not enjoin the observance of any particular day, but only of one day in seven. But such a construction is not only clearly in violation of established rules for the construction of law, but it involves an assumption of power on their part that can never be allowed. Admitting for argument's sake that that phrase in the commandment is indefinite, it must be admitted that the Lord, when he wrote it, intentionally made it indefinite, because the Scripture says that when he had spoken these words, he added no more; he had nothing more to say on the subject. What he said then was final. If, then, that statement be indefinite, he intended it so, and no other than the Lord ever can, or ever has the right to, make it definite. But the theologians, just as soon as they make it indefinite to escape the obligation which it enjoins to observe the seventh day, then make it definite in order to sustain the supposed obligation to keep the first day of the week. Consequently, when they make it definite after having declared that the Lord made it indefinite, they assume the power and the prerogative to do what the Lord intentionally declined to do; and in that they put themselves above God.

So much for their theological assumptions. Such a course is not only theologically an assumption of almighty power, but on the basis of law it is a violation of the rule which declares that --

4. "No forced or unnatural construction is to be put upon the language of a statute."

To make the phrase "the seventh day" in that commandment indefinite, and mean any one day in seven and not any seventh day in particular, is nothing else

than to put a forced and unnatural construction upon the language, not only of the commandment itself throughout, but on all the language of the Scriptures upon the subject of the commandment.

Further, to make that commandment support the observance of the first day of the week in commemoration of the resurrection, is not only to put a forced and most unnatural construction upon it, but is a direct violation of that other rule of law which declares that --

5. "A constitution [or statute] is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable . . . The meaning of the constitution [or statute] is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it."

As I have clearly proved, the meaning of the fourth commandment when it was given was that the seventh day of the week should be observed, and for the reason that God rested that day from the work of creation, and blessed the day and hallowed it. That Sabbath day for that reason was established before man had sinned, and before there was any need of the resurrection of Christ. If man had never sinned, the day would have been observed, for the reason given, in commemoration of the rest of the Creator from his work of creation. That being the meaning of the commandment when the commandment was given, that must be the meaning of the commandment so long as the commandment remains. And according to this rule it can never be made to mean anything else; although to the theologians who wish to have it so, the circumstances concerning the resurrection may seem to make it desirable.

Here the question very pertinently arises, Shall the Congress and the courts of the United States adopt the wishes of the theologians, and, in violation of the rules

of law, undertake to make the statute of God mean that which it was never intended to mean? In contemplation of this demand which is now made by the theologians, the words of Judge Cooley -- "Constitutional Limitations," p. 67 -- are worthy of consideration by Congress, as well as by the judges of the United States courts. He says: --

"A court of legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

The theologians have given to the fourth commandment a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the Commandment. They come to the national legislature, and ask it to allow itself to be influenced by these theological sentiments in giving to that written constitution of the government of God, a construction which is not warranted by the intention of Founder of that constitution. As Judge Cooley says, such a thing done to a human constitution, an earthly statute, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty. But if this is true in the case of things wholly human and earthly, what should be thought of such an action with reference to the divine constitution, and heavenly law?

Will the national legislature allow this theological sentiment to influence it to commit an act with reference to the constitution and laws of the living God, which, if committed with reference to the laws of men, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty? Not only do I ask, Is the national legislature ready to do this? but is it ready also by doing it to force the United States courts into the sanctioning of it in direct violation of the plainest principles of every rule for the construction of law? Is the national legislature ready to take the step which would turn all

180

our courts of law into courts of theology? For such would be the only effect of the enactment of such a law as is here demanded by the theologians; because when the law comes to be interpreted by the courts upon the basis upon which the law is enacted, the first day of the week as the Sabbath can never be sustained by rules of law or by the principles of interpretation established in law. The only way it can ever be sustained is by principles established by the theologians and by theological distinctions, in total disregard of the rules of law; and the effect of it can be nothing else than to turn our courts of law into courts of theology.

More than this, the Scriptures plainly and logically show the seventh day to be the Lord's day. The actual expression, "the Lord's day," is used but once in the Bible, and that in Rev. 1:10, saying, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." But that text does not say what day of the week the Lord's day is. Other texts in the Bible, however, speak on the subject in such a way as logically to show what day is meant by the expression, "the Lord's day." The Lord himself said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28.

The Lord also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Here are two plain Scripture statements which may form the premises of a syllogism; thus; --

Major: The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath.

Minor: The seventh day is the Sabbath.

The only conclusion that can ever be drawn from these premises is, --

Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

That conclusion is just as sound as these two statements of Scripture are, and the two statements of Scripture are as plain and positive on that subject as any two statements ever can be made. Forming another

181

sylllogism, of which the above conclusion shall be the minor, we have this: --

Major: Whatever day it is of which the Son of man is Lord, is the Lord's day.

Minor: The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

Therefore, the Lord's day is the seventh day.

This logic is unquestionable; this conclusion is just as true as the Scripture itself. Therefore, as surely as courts undertake the interpretation of any statute enforcing the observance of the Lord's day, and enter upon an inquiry as to what day is the Lord's day, they will, if logical, be brought face to face with the fact as demonstrated by the word of the Lord himself, that the seventh day, and not the first day, is the Lord's day.

But it will probably be said that the courts are not to enter upon the interpretation of Scripture; they are to interpret the law as it has been enacted, and as it is written; and the law as enacted says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and that is as far as the courts can go. Suppose that be granted. Then that puts the United States Government into the place where it establishes an institution as the Lord's and enforces its observance, which not only the Lord has not established, but which is directly contrary to the plain word of the Lord upon the subject of this institution and its observance.

One or the other of these alternatives therefore the United States Government will be forced to adopt as surely as this bill or any one like it shall ever become a law. The Government will either have to become the authoritative interpreter of Scripture for all the citizens of the Government, or else it will have to put itself in the place of God, and authoritatively declare that observances established by the State and which it calls the Lord's are the Lord's indeed, although the word of the Lord declares the contrary. Is the United

182

States Government ready to take either of these positions? Is the Congress of the United States ready to force the Government of the United States to the alternative of taking one or the other of these positions?

The taking of either of these positions by the Government would be nothing else than for this enlightened nation, in this period of the nineteenth century, to assume the place, the power, and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the church.

Thus, from whatever point this subject of Sunday laws may be viewed, it plainly appears that aside from the papacy there is no authority whatever for Sunday laws, nor even for Sunday keeping; and that the only effect that a national Sunday law can ever have, will be only evil, and that continually. Let Congress now and forever decidedly and utterly refuse to have anything to do with it in any way whatever; and let all the people, instead of sanctioning a movement to bring the national legislation down to the degraded level of the States on this subject, put forth every effort to bring the legislation of the States up to that place where it shall be limited as the power of Congress is limited by the declaration of the national Constitution, that it "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Now, in the name of law, Constitutional and statutory, moral and civil; in the name of enlightenment and progress; in the name of reason and the revelation of Jesus Christ, I seriously ask, Why should the people of such a nation as this, living under such a constitution as is our national Constitution, be asked to return to the papal system in the Dark Ages, which was only the inevitable outcome of the wicked scheme that was conceived in sin, -- "the man of sin," -- and brought forth

183

in iniquity, -- "the mystery of iniquity," -- in the days of Constantine? Why should such a people as this, dwelling under the best Constitution and the most enlightened influences of all ages, be asked to return to the wicked system that characterized the Middle Ages?

No, sir; the noble men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, when they established our Constitution, separated, as they supposed forever, this nation from all the wicked influences of the church-and-state systems of the colonies, of England, and of all other nations of all times. And under this Constitution, in true liberty, civil and religious, in genuine enlightenment and progress, this nation has deservedly stood as the beacon light of the world for a hundred years. Let this splendid nation ever still look forward and not backward; let it still hold its honored place before all the nations; and God forbid that by any such effort as is now being made in behalf of this Sunday law, this glorious nation should be brought down from her high place, and made to follow in the papal train.

Gentlemen, no further argument is needed to show that the Sunday laws of all the States, and the principles of the decisions of the Supreme Courts which sustain them, are wholly wrong, springing from the papal principle of church and state, and supported by the equally un-American principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. They are

totally subversive of American principles. Yet Sunday laws have never been, and can never be, sustained on any other principle. And this is only to say that which is the sum of all this discussion: There is no foundation in justice, in right, or even in expediency, for any Sunday laws, or Lord's-day laws, or Sabbath laws, UNDER ANY GOVERNMENT ON THIS EARTH.

*Page 123 Yet in the very legislature, that of 1889, the church managers tried their best again to repeal the exemption clause. It was then discovered that they had elected men to the legislature pledged to repeal the exemption clause. The bill passed the Senate, but was killed in the House. This proves my position, that there is no liberty in an exemption clause.

APPENDIX A

THE American Sabbath Union in its "Monthly Documents," has tried to make it appear that, in my argument before the Senate Committee, I admitted the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good. The effort was not only made by the Association in its own documents, but the document and statements were reprinted in *Our Day*. To counteract the influence of this effort, as well as to make the point yet clearer, if possible, and expose another method which the Sunday-law workers employ to secure support for their movement, I insert the following --

OPEN LETTER

To the Rev. J. H. Knowles, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union.

DEAR SIR: In the monthly documents of the American Sunday Association, edited by yourself, you have chosen to charge me with insincerity; and you have also done your best to make it appear that I "admit all that the friends of the Sunday-rest law generally claim -- the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good."

You have garbled extracts from the report of my speech before the Senate Committee on the Sunday law, and then have italicized certain words and sentences in one passage to try to make it appear that I admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good.

You have quoted from my speech the following words in the following way --

"Whenever any civil government attempts to enforce anything in regard to any one of the first four commandments, it invades the prerogative of God, and is to be disobeyed (I do not say resisted, but disobeyed). . . . The State, in its legislation, can never legislate properly in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue; but if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments he invades the rights of his neighbor, then the civil government says that is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious or because it is immoral? -- Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only. [Italics ours. -- ED]"

It is in the italicizing of these words that your effort is made to make me admit what I continually and consistently denied before the committee, and do deny everywhere else. You have inserted in the above quotation three periods, indicating that a portion has been left out; and you know full well, sir, that in the portion which is there left out, is the following: --

Senator Blair. -- 'You oppose all the Sunday laws of the Country, then?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Yes, sir.'

"Senator Blair. -- 'You are against all Sunday laws?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed.'

"Senator Blair. -- 'State and national alike?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'State and national, sir.'"

Not only were these words there, but in that portion which you have printed following the italicized words, you yourself have printed my plain denial of the right of any nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of a thousand to compel the thousandth man to rest on the day on which the majority rest, in the following from: --

0 "Senator Blair. -- 'The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society; and if

Caesar regulates society, then the majority has a right in this country to say what shall be rendered to Caesar.'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'If nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of every thousand in the United States kept the seventh day, that is, Saturday, and I deemed it my choice and right to keep Sunday, I would insist on it, and they would have no right to compel me to rest on Saturday.'"

"Senator Blair. -- 'In other words, you take the grounds that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath, if it disturbs others?'"

"Mr. Jones. -- 'No, sir.'"

"Senator Blair. -- 'You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.'"

That last expression of mine, saying "No, sir," is in accord, and was intended when spoken to be in accord, with Senator Blair's inquiring statement whether society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath. My answer there means, and when it was spoken it was intended to mean, that society may not do so. As to its disturbing others, I had just before proved that the common occupations of men who choose to work on Sunday or any other day do not disturb and cannot disturb the rest of the majority who choose to rest that day.

Again: A little farther along you print another passage in which are the following words: --

"Senator Blair. -- You would abolish any Sabbath in human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?"

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.'"

Now, I should like for you in a monthly document, or by some other means, to show how by any fair means, or by any sincere purpose, you can, even by the use of

italics, make in that speech admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good. You know, sir, that in that speech I distinctly stated that any human laws for the enforcement of the Sabbath, instead of being "for the good of society, are for the ruin of society."

Again: You know, for you printed it in one of your documents, that Senator Blair said to me: "You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath." You know that in another place he said again to me: "You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or nation either."

Now, sir, I repeat, you have charged me with insincerity. Any one making such a charge as that ought to be sincere. Will you, therefore, explain upon what principle it is that you claim to be sincere in this thing, when in the face of these positive and explicit statements to the contrary and Senator Blair's confirmation of them to that effect, you can deliberately attempt to force into my words a meaning that was never there, that was never intended to be there, and that never can by any honest means be put there?

More than this: It can hardly be thought that Senator Blair will very highly appreciate the compliment that you have paid to his logical discernment, when in the fact of his repeated statement that I was logical all the way through, you force into my words a meaning that could have no other effect than to make me illogical all the way through.

I have no objection to your printing my words as they were spoken; but I do object to your forcing into them a meaning directly contrary to that which the words themselves convey, and which they were intended to convey; and I further object to your so garbling my statements as to make it possible for you

188

to force into them a meaning that they never can honestly be made to bear.

In that speech also I said that if an idol-worshiper in this country should attempt to offer a human sacrifice, the Government should protect the life of its subject from the exercise of that man's religion; that he has the right to worship any idol that he chooses, but that he has not the right to commit murder in the worship of his idol, and the State forbids the murder without any reference at all to the question as to whether that man is religious or whether he worships or not, with no reference at all to the commandment which forbids idol-worship, and with no thought whatever of forbidding his idolatry. I stated also that if anybody claiming apostolic example should practice community of property, and in carrying out that practice should take your property or mine without our consent, the State would forbid the theft without any reference at all to the man's religious opinions, and with no thought of forbidding the practice of community of property. You know that it was with direct reference to these words that I used the words which you have italicized. I there distinctly denied that the State can ever of right legislate in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But, if any man in the exercise of his rights under the first four commandments, and in this case under the fourth commandment, should invade the right of his neighbor, as I have expressed it, by endangering his life, his liberty, or his property, or attack his character, or invade his rights in any way, the government has the right to prohibit it, because of the incivility; but with never any question as to whether the man is religious or irreligious, and with never a purpose or a thought of forbidding the free exercise of any man's right to work on any day or all days, as he chooses.

189

This is precisely what every State in this Union already does by statutes which punish disturbances of religious worship or religious meetings, or peaceable assemblies of any sort. But there is a vast difference between such statutes as these and the ones which you desire shall be enacted. These are strictly civil statutes, prohibiting incivility, and are far from anything like the enforcement of religious observances. The Sunday-law workers complain of the disturbance of their worship on Sunday. If they are sincere in this, why don't they enforce the laws already on the statute books prohibiting disturbance of worship? California, for instance, prohibits disturbance of worship, under penalty of five hundred dollars' fine and six months in jail. But instead of having such legitimate laws enforce, you propose to prohibit the disturbance of your worship on Sunday by compelling everybody to keep Sunday. Upon this same principle you would have the State forbid the offering of human sacrifices by an idolworshiper, by compelling him to keep the second commandment. In short, the principle is that you would have the State prohibit incivility by compelling everybody to be religious. And you are so enraptured with this distorted view, that you have chosen in your sincerity and by italics to force me to sanction the wicked principle. But it will not work. I say always, If your worship is disturbed on Sunday or at any other time, let the State punish the person or persons who create the disturbance. Let the State punish them by such strictly legitimate statutes as the States already have on this subject. But let the State never attempt to prohibit disturbance of worship by trying to compel men to worship, nor attempt to prohibit incivility by enforcing religious observances. This is just what I had in view, and is precisely what I meant, in the words which you have italicized.

All this is further shown in the argument which I made, in that, Immediately following the words which you have italicized I proved that Sunday work does not disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday. And the conclusion of that is, therefore, that there is no basis for Sunday laws on that ground. This I prove by the fact that the people who make this the ground of their demand for Sunday laws, do not recognize for an instant that work on Saturday disturbs the rest or the worship of the people who keep Saturday. I there showed that if your work on Saturday does not disturb my rest or my worship, my work on Sunday cannot disturb your rest or your worship. I made this argument not only on this principle, but from actual experience. I know, from an experience of fifteen years, that other people's work on Saturday does not disturb either my rest or my worship on that day. There are Seventh-day Adventists in every State and Territory of this nation, in Canada, nearly every country of Europe, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, South America, China, South Africa, and other places. They all rest every Saturday; they all keep it as the Sabbath unto the Lord. But no person has ever yet heard of a Seventh-day Adventist who ever complained that his rest on the Sabbath was disturbed by other men's work. Not only is this so, but the Seventh-day Adventists have organized churches in the great majority of the States and Territories of this Union. These churches are found in country places, in villages, in towns, and in cities. They meet for worship every Saturday; and although, as everybody knows, Saturday is the busiest day

of the week, in the midst of such busy cities as Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Kansas City, these churches of Seventh-day Adventists assemble regularly for worship; and no person has ever yet heard of any Seventh-day Adventists' making a complaint that their worship was

191

disturbed by the work, the business, or the traffic that is carried on by other people on that day. The fact is, our worship is not disturbed by these things.

Now, sir, if all the labor, the business, and the traffic that is done on Saturday, the day which is acknowledged by all to be the busiest day of the week. -- if all this, In such cities as I have named, does not disturb our rest or our worship, will you please explain how it is that your rest and your worship are disturbed on Sunday, when there is not one-thousandth part as much labor, or business, or traffic done on that day as is done on Saturday?

This, dear sir, is only an additional argument, but one which rests on the living experience of thousands of people every seventh day, conclusively showing that your whole theory and claim for Sunday laws break down utterly at every point.

ALONZO T. Jones.

192

APPENDIX B.

THE following letter from Cardinal Gibbons to Mr. D. E. Lindsey, of Baltimore, shows from the Cardinal himself, that the counting of all the Roman Catholics of the country in favor of the Sunday law on the Cardinal's indorsement, as Dr. Crafts and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union have done, was wholly unwarranted. This is exactly as I argued before the Senate Committee, and as we have argued everywhere else. We have never blamed Cardinal Gibbons for that which Dr. Crafts and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union put upon him.

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, } 408 NORTH CHARLES ST.,
BALTIMORE, Md., } Feb. 27, 1889.

"MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor dated Feb. 25, 1889, duly received, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons desires me to write to you, that whatsoever countenance His Eminence has given to the 'Sunday law' referred to in your favor, as he had not the authority. so he had not the intention, of binding the archbishops, the bishops, or the Catholic laity of the United States. His Eminence bids me say to you that he was moved to write a letter favoring the passage of the bill, mainly from a consideration of the rest

National Sunday Law- A.T Jones

and recreation which would result to our poor overworked fellow-citizens, and of the facility which it would then afford them of observing the Sunday in a religious and decorous way.

"It is incorrect to assume that His Eminence, in the alleged words of Senator Blair set forth in your favor `singed the bill, thus pledging seven millions two hundred thousand Catholics as indorsing the bill.'

"I have the honor to remain, with much respect yours faithfully, J. P.
DONAHUE, "Chancellor.

"To D. E. Lindsey, Esq., 708 Rayner Avenue, Baltimore, Md."

The Great Empires of Prophecy From Babylon to the Fall of Rome

"To the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men."

Alonzo Trevier Jones

Review and Herald Publishing Company.
Battle Creek, Michigan
Chicago, Ill. Atlanta, GA
1898

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1891, by

Alonzo Trevier Jones,

In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Prepared by
144000.com
www.144000.com/SundayLaw

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

The Empire of Babylon -- Nebuchadnezzar 1
Predominance of Babylon -- God's Purpose with Israel -- Religious Imposture Exposed
-- There is a God That Revealeth Secrets -- The Siege of Tyre -- Egypt Given to
Nebuchadnezzar -- Nebuchadnezzar's Great Golden Image -- The Supremacy of
Conscience -- The Most High Ruleth -- The City of Babylon -- A Great Builder.

CHAPTER II.

Empire of Babylon -- From Evil-Merodach to Belshazzar 25
The Reign of Nabonadius -- Belshazzar's Household. The World's Great Kingdoms --
The Three Great World Kingdoms -- The Coming of Medo-Persia.

CHAPTER III.

The Empire of Media and Persia -- The Fall of Babylon 36
The Doom of Babylon -- Cyrus Drains the Gyndes -- Cyrus Drains the Euphrates --
Belshazzar's Feast -- The City Taken -- Cyrus's Inscription -- Babylon Is Fallen, Is
Fallen.

CHAPTER IV.

Empire of Media and Persia -- Darius the Mede and Cyrus 50
Daniel's Business Faithfulness -- The Rights of Conscience -- Cyrus Acknowledges
God -- Opposition of the Samaritans -- Death of Cyrus.

CHAPTER V.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Cambyses and "Smerdis" 61
Death of Cambyses -- Death of "Smerdis."

CHAPTER VI.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Darius 67
Darius Supports the Jews -- The Provinces and Revolts -- A Lover of Truth-Telling

CHAPTER VII.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Darius 74
In Scythia -- The Burning of Sardis -- Destruction of the Fleet -- Second Expedition
Against Greece -- Marathon -- The Persians Return to Asia -- Death of Darius.

CHAPTER VIII.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Xerxes 88
Xerxes Starts to Greece -- The Great Bridge of Boats -- Xerxes Rides Forth -- The
Nations Arrayed -- Xerxes Reviews His Army.

CHAPTER IX.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Xerxes 101
At Thermopylae -- The Greeks Betrayed -- Thermopylae Is Taken.

CHAPTER X.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Xerxes 109
Athens Taken and Burnt -- Defence of the Isthmus -- The Greeks Make Ready -- The
Greeks Victorious -- Xerxes Flees.

CHAPTER XI.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Xerxes 121
The Battle of Plataea -- The Greeks Victorious.

CHAPTER XII.

Empire of Persia and Media -- Artaxerxes to Darius Codomanus . 127
Jerusalem Rebuilt -- Apostasy in Jerusalem -- The Samaritans -- The Battle of Cunaxa -
- The Anabasis -- The Last Native King of Egypt.

CHAPTER XIII.

Empire of Grecia -- Reign of Phillip 141
Demosthenes Against Philip -- The Sacred War -- Philip the Head of Greece -- Philip
Generalissimo.

CHAPTER XIV.

Empire of Grecia -- Alexander 151
Demonstrates His Capabilities -- Alexander Generalissimo -- Alexander's Matchless
Celerity -- Final Departure from Greece.

CHAPTER XV.

Empire of Grecia -- Alexander 160
 Battle of the Granicus -- Takes All Asia Minor -- Darius's Army -- Battle of Issus --
 Alexander Takes Tyre -- Alexander's Vision -- Holiday and Triumph in Egypt -- The
 Battle of Arbela.

CHAPTER XVI.

Empire of Grecia -- Alexander 177
 Alexander's Court and Carousals -- Grand Entry into Babylon -- Alexander's Wide
 Dominion -- Alexander's Swiftness of Conquest -- A Man of Providence.

CHAPTER XVII.

Empire of Grecia -- Alexander's Successors 188
 The Governors and Generals -- Plot and Counterplot -- "King" Aridaeus Is Murdered --
 Seleucus Obtains Babylon -- The Siege of Rhodes -- Four Kingdoms Did Stand Up.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Empire of Grecia -- Alexander's Successors 200
 Lysimachus Takes Macedonia -- The Two Divisions -- The Kingdom of Pergamus --
 "The King's Daughter of the South" -- Berenice's Hair -- The Battle of Gaza -- Ptolemy
 and the Jews -- The Romans Appear.

CHAPTER XIX.

Rome -- The Republic 217
 Pyrrhus in Italy -- Philip and Hannibal -- Embassies to Rome -- Roman Freedom to the
 Greeks -- Profitable to the Romans -- Antiochus and the Romans -- War with Antiochus
 Magnus -- The Day of Magnesia -- Heliodorus and the Temple of God -- Death of
 Hannibal -- Antiochus Epiphanes in Egypt -- Rome Saves Egypt -- Empire of Grecia
 Perishes -- Rome's Profound Policy -- The World's Tribunal -- Rome Fulfils the
 Prophecy.

CHAPTER XX.

Rome -- The Failure of The Republic 250
 Rome's Plunder and Luxury -- Territory and Government -- Money the One Thought --
 The Rich Richer, the Poor Poorer -- Distribution of the Land -- Public Granaries
 Established -- War with Mithradates -- Sulla's "Reforms" -- Rise of Pompey and Caesar

-- Mithradates on the Romans -- Pompey Subdues Judea -- Antipater the Idumaean -- Rullus and Cicero.

x

CHAPTER XXI.

Rome -- The First Triumvirate 276
Pompey and the Senate -- Caesar and the Senate -- Caesar's Land Laws -- Reform by Law -- The Senate Wins Pompey -- Legal Government Ended -- Pompey and the Nobles -- Antipater and Herod -- The Senate Flatters Caesar -- The Senate Murders Caesar.

CHAPTER XXII.

Rome -- The Second Triumvirate 296
Rise of Octavius -- Plot, Counterplot, and War -- The Triumvirate Formed -- The Triumvirs' Proscription -- "The Saviors of their Country" -- Antony and Cleopatra -- Herod Made King.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Rome -- The Empire 311
Rome Ruled the World -- The Only World Power -- The World's Homage to Rome -- "The Iron Monarchy."

CHAPTER XXIV.

Rome -- The Monarchy 320
The World-Prison -- Augustus and His Family -- Everything "High Treason" -- A Furious and Crushing Despotism -- Caligula's Popularity -- Caligula's Prodigality -- Caligula's Deadly Cruelty -- Claudius's Popularity -- Messalina and Agrippina -- Roman Society -- Ultimate Paganism.

CHAPTER XXV.

Rome -- Against Christianity 343
Antagonistic Principles -- The Roman Idea of Ethics -- Vox Populi, Vox Dei -- God and Caesar -- Christians and the State -- Pliny and the Christians -- Roman Religious Life -- The Roman Laws -- Sources of Persecution -- The Priests and Artisans -- The Governors and Emperors -- The Governmental System at Fault -- Ground of Governmental Persecution -- Christianity Victorious -- The "Ten Persecutions."

CHAPTER XXVI.

Rome -- The Great Apostasy 374
That Man of Sin -- Men Speaking Perverse Things -- The Mysteries -- Worshiping
Toward the East -- Ambition of the Bishop of Rome -- The New Platonists -- School of
Clement and Origen -- The Two Pagan Streams -- Political Designs -- The New
Paganism -- The Two Streams Unite; a New Religion.

xi

CHAPTER XXVII.

Rome -- Exaltation of the Bishopric 396
One Is Master, Even Christ -- Lover of Pre-eminence Begins -- The Church of Rome
Claims Supremacy -- The Bishop the Infallible Judge -- An Episcopal Punic War --
Paul of Samosata.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Rome -- The Rise of Constantine 409
The Persecution by Diocletian -- Condition of the Church -- The Persecution Stopped --
The City of Rome Offended -- Six Emperors at Once -- Battle of the Milvian Bridge --
Victory of Christian Principles.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Rome -- The Religion of Constantine 424
Constantine a Sun-Worshiper -- The Labarum -- Dies Solis and the Haruspices. Murder
of Crispus and Fausta -- The "True Cross" and Constantine -- Is This Paganism or
Christianity? -- A Murder Even in Death.

CHAPTER XXX.

Rome -- Constantine and the Bishops 439
Constantine a New Moses -- The New "Israel Delivered" -- Constantine's Tabernacle --
Bishops at the Imperial Banquet -- Constantine Sent to Heaven -- The Mystery of
Iniquity.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Rome -- The Union of Church and State 453
Restoration of the Church Property -- Which Was the Catholic Church -- The Donatist
Controversy -- The Council at Arles -- The State a Religious Partizan -- Liberty to the
Donatists -- Clergy Exempt from Public Offices -- The Church of the Masses -- The
Church a Mass of Hypocrites.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Rome -- The Original Sunday Legislation 472
True and False Theocracies -- The New, and False, Theocracy -- Constantine's Famous Sunday Law -- The New Kingdom of God -- The Sunday Law only Religious -- By Authority of Pontifex Maximus -- Sunday in the Council of Nice -- Sunday Work Made Sacrilege -- The Church Obtains the Monopoly -- Origin of the Inquisition.

xii

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Rome -- Establishment of the Catholic Faith 493
The Trinitarian Controversy -- homoousion or Homoiousion? -- The Secret of the Controversy -- Constantine's Design -- The Council of Nice -- Grand Entry of the Emperor -- The Parties in the Council -- The Making of the Creed -- The Dissenters Banished -- The True Estimate of the Council.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Rome -- Arianism Becomes Orthodox 515
Athanasius Banished, Arius Returned -- Athanasius Returned and Again Banished -- Installation of Bishop Macedonius -- Council of Sardica -- Councils of Arles and Milan -- Arianism Now Orthodox -- Hosius Forced to Become Arian -- Athanasius Again Removed -- Liberius Becomes Arian -- Double Council, Rimini and Seleucia -- The World Finds Itself Arian -- Arianism Is "Catholic."

CHAPTER XXXV.

Rome -- The Catholic Faith Re-established 540
The Emperor Julian -- Valens, Gratian, and Theodosius -- The Order of the Hierarchy -- Gregory Bishop of Constantinople -- Basil Applies to Rome -- The Council of Constantinople -- The Council of Aquileia -- "Inquisitor of the Faith" -- The Empire "Converted."

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Rome -- Church Usurps the Civil Authority 558
Aspirations of the Bishop of Rome -- The Clergy Made Civil Judges -- The Bible Made the Code -- The Bishopric a Political Office -- The Worst Characters Become Bishops -- The Episcopal Dictatorship -- Civil Government Vanishes.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Rome -- The Ruin of the Empire 572
Grandeur of the Bishop of Rome -- Pride of Bishops and Clergy -- Vices of Clergy and
People -- Abominations of Sun-Worship Continued -- Heathen Practises in the Church -
- Monkish "Virtue" Prevalent -- Sheer Unmingled Naturalism -- Destruction and
Devastation -- Worse than Barbarian and Heathen.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Rome Divided 591
The Place of the Ten Divisions -- The Ancient Germans -- German Respect for
Woman.

xiii

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Rome Divided -- The Alemanni and the Franks 599
The Alemanni Take Vindelicia -- Alemanni and Franks Enter Gaul -- From the Rhine
to the Seine -- The Franks and the Alemanni of To-day.

CHAPTER XL.

Rome Divided -- The Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians . . . 608
Radagaisus Invades Italy -- Final Settlement of the Burgundians -- Final Settlement of
the Suevi -- The Vandals Enter Africa -- The Roman Armies Defeated -- Carthage
Captured.

CHAPTER XLI.

Rome Divided -- The Visigoths 621
Entrance of the Goths into History -- The Visigoths Taken Over the Danube -- Under
Alaric They Ravage Greece -- Alaric Master-General of Illyricum -- Honorius Prepares
the Way -- Siege of Rome -- Rome's Ransom -- The Sack of Rome -- The Visigoths
Leave Italy -- In Gaul and Spain -- In Spain Their Final Settlement.

CHAPTER XLII.

Rome Divided -- The Angles and Saxons 644
The Original Englishmen -- Angles on the Sea -- Beginning of English History --
Britain Becomes England.

CHAPTER XLIII.

Rome Divided -- The Ostrogoths Enter the Western Empire . . . 652

Why Attila Invaded Gaul -- The Battle of Chalons -- Battle of the Netad -- Theodoric the Ostrogoth -- The Ostrogothic Dominion.

CHAPTER XLIV.

Rome Divided -- The Lombards 662
Their Native Region -- After the Battle of Netad.

CHAPTER XLV.

Rome Divided -- The Herulian Kingdom 667
The Heruli in Italy -- Odoacer Made King -- The Western Empire Extinguished -- The Empire of Rome Is Perished.

xiv

CHAPTER XLVI.

The Ten Kingdoms 677
The Ten Stand at One Time -- Mede's List of the Kingdoms -- Sir Isaac Newton's List -
- Lists of Bishops Newton and Chandler -- Hunnish Empire Extinguished -- The
Gepidae and the Avars -- What Machiavelli Himself Says -- Bishop Lloyd's Dates --
The Conclusion.

Appendix 697

xv

LIST OF MAPS.

NO.	OPP.	PAGE
1.	ASSURE-BANI-PAL	1
2.	DIVISIONS OF ASSYRIA	2
3.	BABYLON OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR	15
4.	MEDO-PERSIA -- DARIUS THE MEDE AND CYRUS	49
5.	MEDO-PERSIA -- CAMBYSES	62
6.	PERSIA AND MEDIA -- DARIUS AND XERXES	88
7.	ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE	182
8.	ALEXANDER'S MARCH	185
9.	GRECIA -- THE FOUR DIVISIONS	199
10.	KING OF THE NORTH AND KING OF THE SOUTH	203
11.	THE ROMAN EMPIRE	319
12.	THE BODIES OF THE FOUR EMPIRES	593
13.	THE WESTERN EMPIRE OF ROME	598
14.	THE ALEMANNI AND THE FRANKS	606
15.	THE SUEVI, VANDALS, AND BURGUNDIANS	620
16.	THE VISIGOTHS	643
17.	THE ANGLES AND SAXONS	651
18.	DOMINION AND CAMPAIGNS OF ATILA	654
19.	THE OSTROGOTHS	658

20. THE LOMBARDS	665
21. THE HERRULI	673
22. THE TEN KINGDOMS	676

1. THE EMPIRE OF BABYLON NEBUCHADNEZZAR

Before the Babylonian Empire of the Bible and of Nebuchadnezzar arose to power, the empire of Assyria ruled the world, as described in Eze. 31 : 1-6, and illustrated in the map on the opposite page.

2. In 625 B. C. there was a revolt of the countries of Media, Babylon, and Egypt, all at once. The king of Assyria in person subdued the revolt in Media; while he sent his trusted general, Nabopolassar, to bring Babylon into subjection again. Both were entirely successful, Nabopolassar performing his part so well as to merit and receive from his sovereign the honorable title "king of Babylon." This Nabopolassar was the father of Nebuchadnezzar.

3. Affairs in the government of Assyria went from bad to worse, so that in 612 B. C. there was another grand revolt on the part of the same three countries, led this time by Nabopolassar himself. This one was completely successful: Ninevah was made a heap of ruins; and the Assyrian Empire was divided into three great divisions, -- Media holding the northeast and the extreme north, Babylon holding Elam and all the plain and valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris, and Egypt holding all the country west of the Euphrates. The seal of this alliance between Babylon and Media was the marriage of Amyitis, the daughter of the King of Media to Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar.

4. It was in the performance of his part in the alliance against Assyria that Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria to first against Carchemish by Euphrates, when King Josiah of Judah went out to fight with him, and was slain at Megiddo.¹ Then, as all this western territory pertained to the king

2

of Egypt, it was in exercise of his legitimate sovereignty, gained by conquest, that he removed Shallum, the son of Josiah, from being king of Judah; and appointed Eliakim king of Judah in his stead, changing his name to Jehoiakim; and laid a tax upon the land.²

5. Pharaoh-Necho, however, was not left very long to enjoy his share of the vanished empire of Assyria. In the year 607 B. C., Nabopolassar associated Nebuchadnezzar with himself as king, and sent him on an expedition in invasion of the territory of Pharaoh-Necho. Thus it was that "in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim [607 B. C.] king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it;" and took part of the vessels of the house of God, and a number of captives, among whom was Daniel, and carried them to Babylon.

6. This, of course, was resented by Pharaoh-Necho. Accordingly, "in the fourth year of Jehoiakim" he came out of Egypt, on an expedition against Babylon. He went no farther than to Carchemish, however; for there he was met by Nebuchadnezzar, as is related in Jer. 46: 1-10. "Necho was overcome and put to flight; one single battle stripped him of all

his conquests, and compelled him to retire into Egypt." -- Lenormant. "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land: for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt."³

7. Not long after the destruction of Nineveh and the Assyrian Empire, there was war between Media and Lydia; but during a great battle there occurred an eclipse of the sun, which so awed both armies that they ceased fighting. This lull was seized upon by Nabopolassar to intervene and ask both kings to come to an agreement, out of respect to the gods that had so manifestly shown their displeasure by darkening the sun. He was successful. Peace was established, and the agreement was sealed by the marriage of the daughter of the king of Lydia to the son of the king of Media. Thus Babylon, both by the prestige of her ancient and mighty name, and by the good offices of Nabopolassar, strengthened herself in the position to hold a controlling influence over the two strong kingdoms of

3

Media and Lydia. And when, shortly after this, Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, conquered Necho of Egypt at Carchemish by the Euphrates, drove him back to Egypt, and took possession of all his territories even up to the River of Egypt itself, Babylon secured the decidedly predominant power over all.

8. Thus matters stood when, in 604, Nabopolassar died, and was succeeded immediately by Nebuchadnezzar, who had already been associated with him in the rulership of the kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar, having already so signally displayed his ability in war by the defeat of the king of Egypt and the conquest of all Palestine and Syria, easily maintained the dignity and predominance of Babylon before all nations. In addition to this, the family relationship of Babylon with Media and Lydia was now closer than before; for Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was son-in-law to the king of Media, and brother-in-law to the heir of the throne of Media, who was son-in-law to the king of Lydia. All these influences give Babylon, at the very beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, an easy predominance, which was only strengthened at every step throughout the long reign of the mighty Nebuchadnezzar.

9. In 607, when Nebuchadnezzar first besieged Jerusalem, in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, he carried to Babylon some of the vessels of the temple of God in Jerusalem, and put them in the temple of his own god in Babylon. He selected "certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes," also to take with him to Babylon. These were carefully selected by "Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs," by a very close examination, both physical and mental; for the king required that those who were chosen should be "children in whom was no blemish, but well favored, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them." These were thus chosen and taken to Babylon in order that to them, in Babylon "they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans," and this in order that they might finally be attendants upon the king. Among these were Daniel,

Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, whom the king named, respectively, Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. These boys spent three years under

4

Chaldean instruction, at the end of which time they were again examined personally by the king, "and in all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm."⁴

10. From this time to the destruction of Jerusalem, in 588, the principal events in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar were the successful sieges of that place in the reign of Jehoiakim (or Jeconiah) and Zedekiah, as related in Jeremiah, Ezekiel 1-24; 2 Kings 24; 2 Chronicles 36. During the reign of Zedekiah, Jeremiah the prophet, at the command of the Lord, had made bonds and yokes, and put them upon his own neck, and then sent them "to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which came to Jerusalem unto Zedekiah king of Judah," and commanded "them to say unto their masters, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel; Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet to me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come: and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves to him.

11. "And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand. Therefore hearken not ye to your prophets, nor to your diviners, nor to your dreamers, nor to your enchanters, nor to your sorcerers, which speak unto you, saying, Ye shall not serve the king of Babylon: for they prophesy a lie unto you, to remove you far your land: and that I should drive you out, and ye should

5

perish. But the nations that bring their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him, those will I let remain still in their own land, saith the Lord; and they shall till it, and dwell therein."⁵

12. This was a perfectly fair proposition to all those nations. The same had been made, over and over again, to the kingdom of Judah; but Judah would not believe. She would not recognize the sovereignty of Nebuchadnezzar. Accordingly, her city was destroyed, the nation was carried captive, and the land was left desolate; and when the people whom the Lord specially called His own, and who on their own part specially claimed to be the

Lord's people above all people, would not believe the word of the Lord, it is not strange that the other nations, who knew not God, should also refuse to believe, and so be obliged, themselves, to go through the like experience of Judah and Jerusalem. They would not, in obedience to God, voluntarily put their necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and so dwell in peace in their own land; therefore by the sword, siege, and famine they were obliged to do it, because for their good and the honor of God both then and in the ages to come, it must be done.

13. God had brought Israel out of Egypt, and had planted them in the land of Canaan, "the glory of all lands," to be the light of the world. At that time, and for ages afterward, Palestine was the pivot of the known world. At this pivot He placed His people to be a light to all the nations, that those nations might know of the true God. By having God abiding with them, He intended that His people should influence all the nations for good. But not only would they be "like all the nations;" they became even "worse than the heathen." The land could no longer bear them; it must spew them out, as it had been compelled to do with the heathen before them.

14. As Israel had frustrated God's purpose to enlighten all the nations by them in the land where He had planted them, He would fulfil his purpose, and enlighten all the nations by them in the lands where He had scattered them. As Israel had lost the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations, that the nations might consider God and His wonderful ways and works with the

6

children of men, God would now use them to enlighten those who had acquired the power to arrest and command the attention of all the nations, and thus cause all nations to consider the wonderful ways and works of God with the children of men. This is the whole philosophy of the captivity of Judah; of the position of Daniel in Babylon; and of the place of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors in the world's empires and in the Bible. For "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will."

15. God had brought Nebuchadnezzar to the place of authority over all the nations. But Nebuchadnezzar did not yet know the Lord. He must be given the opportunity to know Him. And then if he would acknowledge God, he, being in the place of authority over all the nations, could call the attention of all the nations to the Lord whom he had come to know. And thus the knowledge of God, by means of His people in captivity in Babylon, would be brought to the attention of all the nations.

16. By the excellency of the learning and ability of the youthful Daniel and his three companions, they were brought into immediate connection with Nebuchadnezzar: "they stood before the king." Thus the captive people of God were the means of divine enlightenment to those who ruled the world, that this divine enlightenment might be given to the world. But Israel might have done this themselves from the pivot of the world in their own land, if only they had always honored the Lord in their own land, as these young men, and others, honored Him in their captivity.

17. In the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar alone, B. C. 603, he "dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him," which very much impressed him, in which he was exceedingly interested, but which he could not possibly recall. He therefore "commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king."⁶ He asked of them that they should tell him the thing that he had dreamed, and they answered by asking him to tell them the dream,

7

and they would tell the interpretation. But the king had not asked for any interpretation. What he wanted was to know what he had dreamed. If he had himself known the dream, he could have made an interpretation for it as easily as they could. But the dream itself had gone from him when he awoke, yet the impression of the fact that he had dreamed of something remarkable so remained with him that he could not rest. He therefore said to them again, "The thing is gone from me." Then he demanded of them that they should make known to him both the dream and the interpretation. They, in turn, repeated their request: "Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation of it."

18. By this time the king had caught the true point in the situation, and said to them: "Tell me the dream, and I shall know that ye can show me the interpretation thereof." This was their test, and it was only a fair one; for if they were really able truly to interpret the dream had they known it, they were able to discover the dream when the king did not know it. And if they could not discover the dream, and tell it to the king in such a way that he would recognize it as the thing which he had dreamed, this was evidence enough that any interpretation they might give, even though they knew it, would be mere guesswork. They therefore surrendered, so far as they themselves were concerned, by declaring: "There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter."

19. But not content with thus clearing themselves, they cast reflection upon the king, by saying, "Therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked such things at any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean." More than this, they proceeded to give away their case again by declaring not only that it was "a rare thing that the king requireth," but that "there is none other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh."

20. Now the very gist of the profession of these magicians, astrologers, and Chaldeans was that they held such relationship to the gods that it was their peculiar prerogative to discover the will of the gods, and communicate it both to king and to people.

8

21. The magicians pretended, and were supposed, to be the interpreters and expounders of divine things. They pretended to be able by their art -- magic -- to "control the actions of spiritual or superhuman beings."

22. The astrologers pretended, and were supposed, to be able to declare the will of the gods from the stars. The word "astrologer" is from aster, a "star," and logos, "word," -- the word, or instruction, of the stars. And as the stars were the gods, and these astrologers were the ones who pretended to declare the word of the stars, they simply pretended to declare the word and will of the gods.

23. The sorcerers were of the same order as the magicians, only that these had more peculiarly to do with evil spirits.

24. The Chaldeans were the priestly caste, who had control of the books in which was contained the instruction in magic, and sorcery, and all pertaining to the gods. Thus they were the instructors in all the wisdom and knowledge of the gods. They were the chief claimants to divine knowledge; they were the very chief guardians of such knowledge. If any men could be supposed to be able to declare secret and divine things, it would have been these.

25. When all these together declared that none but the gods could tell this thing that was wanted, and that the gods were not near enough to men to allow this to be understood from them, this was nothing less than to confess that their whole profession was a fraud. And this was further to confess that all their conjurations, divinations, magic, sorcery, and "revelations" in times past were simply a fraud and an imposture upon the king and the people.

26. When this truth flashed upon the mind of Nebuchadnezzar, and he clearly saw that he and his people, and their fathers before them, had been systematically and continuously duped by these men, he was so disgusted, humiliated, and outraged that he thought the only fair thing to do was to wipe from the earth at once this whole combination of impostors. He therefore instantly "commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon. And the decree went forth that the wise men should be slain."

27. Daniel and his brethren had been placed in the schools of these impostors, and were, indeed, reckoned among them; therefore

the executioners "sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain." When Arioch, the captain of the guard, had found them, and told them what was to be done, Daniel said to him, "Why is the decree so hasty from the king?" Arioch told him the whole story. "Then Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him time, and that he would show the king the interpretation," both as to the dream and the meaning of it. This was granted. Then Daniel went to his house, and informed Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, and

suggested that they should "desire mercies of the God of heaven concerning this secret." "Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision."

28. After giving grateful thanks to God that he had made known to them "the king's matter," "Daniel went in unto Arioch, whom the king had ordained to destroy the wise men of Babylon," and said to him, "Destroy not the wise men of Babylon: bring me in before the king, and I will show unto the king the interpretation." Arioch hurried away to the king, and said to him, "I have found a man of the captives of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation." Daniel was called, and the king asked, "Art thou able to make known unto me the dream which I have seen, and the interpretation thereof?" Then "Daniel answered in the presence of the king, and said, The secret which the king hath demanded can not the wise men, the astrologers, the magicians, the soothsayers, show unto the king; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days.

29. "Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these: Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors;

10

and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.

30. "This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath He given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone

was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure

31. "The king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldest reveal this secret. Then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts, and made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors

11

over all the wise men of Babylon. Then Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon: but Daniel sat in the gate of the king."⁷

32. The first of the nations after Judah to be brought to terms and under the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar was the mighty Tyre, "situate at the entry of the sea," "a merchant of the people for many isles,"⁸ "a mart of nations;"⁹ and "which had never as yet submitted to any foreign empire." -- Prideaux.¹⁰ This was rather the irony of fate, too, because when Jerusalem had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, Tyre had exulted in view of the immense traffic that would now be turned to her. She exclaimed: "Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people: she is turned unto me: I shall be replenished, now she is laid waste."¹¹

33. Therefore the Lord caused this message to be written: "For thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people. He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field: and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee. And he shall set engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers. By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust shall cover thee: thy walls shall shake at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, when he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city wherein is made a breach. With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all thy streets: he shall slay thy people by the sword, and thy strong garrisons shall go down to the ground."¹²

34. Accordingly, in the year 586, Nebuchadnezzar overran Syria, invaded Phenicia, and laid siege to Tyre. It cost him, however, a thirteen-years' siege to capture the city. Yet the siege was carried forward so regularly, and the battering-rams were applied so persistently, that "every head was made bald" by the continuous wearing

12

of the helmets, and "every shoulder was peeled"¹³ by the persistent working of the rams. At last, however, the city was taken. "But before it came to this extremity, the inhabitants had removed most of their effects into an island about half a mile distant from the shore;"

and "when Nebuchadnezzar entered that which he had so long besieged, he found little there wherewith to reward his soldiers in the spoil of the place which they had so long labored to take; and therefore, wreaking his anger upon the buildings and the few inhabitants who were left in them, he razed the whole city to the ground, and slew all he found therein." -- Prideaux.14

35. The following contract drawn up and dated at Tyre July 7, 557 B. C., is additional indisputable evidence of the dominion of King Nebuchadnezzar over Tyre: --

"On the fifteenth day of the month Iyyar [April-May], Milki-idiri, Governor of Kidis, will get three cows and their young, and will give them to Abla, son of Nadin-akhi, descendant of the priest of the Sungod. If he can not get (them), Milki-idiri will give to Abla, son of Nadin-akhi, son of the priest of the Sungod, five mana of silver

"Witnessing: Bunduti, son of Nabu-ukin, descendant of Nabutu; Musezib-Marduk, son of Abla, descendant of the fisherman; Marduksakin-sumi, son of Marduk-edhir, descendant of Edheru; and the scribe, Pir'u, son of Sula. Tyre, month Tammuz [June-July], day 22nd, year 40th [557 B. C.], Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon."15

36. "Tyre once taken, Nebuchadnezzar, before returning to Babylon, attacked the people of Idumaea, and Ammon, who had associated themselves with the last Jewish attempt at revolt, and compelled them to submit. He made also a campaign in Arabia, passed victoriously through Hedjaz and Nedjid, and penetrated as far as the Sabeian kingdom of Yemen. These wars, predicted by the prophets, terminated the series of Chaldean conquests in Western Asia." -- Lenormant.16

37. As we have seen, when Nebuchadnezzar, after so long a siege, had finally captured the city of Tyre, he found himself defrauded of the expected spoil by the fact that great numbers of the

13

people had taken refuge in an island a short distance from the city. The Lord noticed this disappointment, and said, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus: every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: yet had he no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it: therefore thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for his army. I have given him the land of Egypt for his labor wherewith he served against it, because they wrought for me, saith the Lord God."17

38. At the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, 588 B. C., he gave directions to Nebuzar-adan, the captain of the guard, to let Jeremiah go wheresoever he would. Jeremiah went "unto Gedaliah the son of Ahikam to Mizpah; and dwelt with him among the people that were left in the land," for Gedaliah was made governor of the land, and

"Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard" left certain of the poor of the land for vinedressers and for husbandmen. And when "all the Jews that were in Moab, and among the Ammonites, and in Edom, and that were in all the countries, heard that the king of Babylon had left a remnant of Judah, and that he had set over them Gedaliah; . . . even all the Jews returned out of all places whither they were driven, and came to the land of Judah, to Gedaliah, unto Mizpah, and gathered wine and summer fruits very much."18

39. Shortly afterward Gedaliah was murdered by a certain apostate Jew named Ishmael, who was the servant of Baalis, king of the Ammonites. Then all the people who had been left in the land, and who had returned from the surrounding countries to dwell in the land, fearing that they would be held responsible for the murder of the governor, departed from the land, and went into Egypt. This was done, however, against the earnest protest of the Lord by the prophet Jeremiah. "So they came into the land of Egypt; for they obeyed not the voice of the Lord: thus came they even to Tahpanhes."19 Yet when, against all protest, all the people of the land,

14

"every person," determined to go to Egypt, Jeremiah and Baruch went with them rather than stay alone in the desolate land.

40. "Then came the word of the Lord unto Jeremiah in Tahpanhes, saying, Take great stones in thine hand, and hide them in the clay in the brick-kiln, which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes, in the sight of the men of Judah; and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will send and take Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will set his throne upon these stones that I have hid; and he shall spread his royal pavilion over them. And when he cometh, he shall smite the land of Egypt, and deliver such as are for death to death; and such as are for captivity to captivity; and such as are for the sword to the sword. And I will kindle a fire in the houses of the gods of Egypt; and he shall burn them, and carry them away captives: and he shall array himself with the land of Egypt, as a shepherd putteth on his garment; and he shall go forth from thence in peace. He shall break also the images of Beth-shemesh, that is in the land of Egypt; and the houses of the gods of the Egyptians shall he burn with fire."20

41. Accordingly, about the year 572, "Nebuchadnezzar, taking the advantage of the intestine divisions which were then in that country by reason of the revolt of Amasis, marched with his army thither, and overrunning the whole land from Migdol, or Magdolum (which is at the first entering into Egypt), even to Syene (which is at the farthest end of it toward the borders of Ethiopia), he made a miserable ravage and devastation therein, slaying multitudes of the inhabitants, and reducing a great part of the country to such a desolation as it did not recover from in forty years after. After this, Nebuchadnezzar having loading himself and his army with the rich spoils of this country, and brought it all in subjection to him, he came to terms with Amasis; and having confirmed him in the kingdom as his deputy, returned to Babylon." -- Prideaux.21

42. With the conquest of Egypt, the wars of Nebuchadnezzar ended, for his power was now firmly established, and was recognized, over all the nations between Central Asia and the Aegean Sea and

15

Ethiopia, -- Persia, Susiana, Elam, Media, Lydia, Syria of Damascus, Phenicia, Palestine, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Arabia, and Egypt, -- and even beyond this; because when Tyre was captured and made tributary, "the colonies which Tyre then possessed on the northern coast of Africa and in Spain, such as Carthage (not yet independent) and Gades (now Cadiz), recognized the suzerainty of the conqueror of the mother country." -- Lenormant.²²

43. At a period of his reign not clearly defined, King Nebuchadnezzar began again to think upon the problem of the kingdoms of the world. In the interpretation of the remarkable dream that was given to King Nebuchadnezzar, the Lord had said to him that the head of gold of the great image represented the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar himself; and that after him should arise another kingdom inferior to his, and a third kingdom inferior to this, and yet another, a fourth kingdom, inferior even to this, and after that a condition of things yet further inferior. First there was gold, then silver, next brass, after that iron, and last of all, "iron mixed with miry clay." This dream was given to the king because that while upon his bed, thoughts had come into his mind as to "what should come to pass hereafter." From what came to pass afterward with him, it is evident that his thoughts as to "what should come to pass hereafter," were to the effect that the mighty kingdom which he ruled, this "lady of kingdoms," "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," would in its greatness and glory continue on and on indefinitely.

44. To correct this view, and show him the truth of the matter, the dream of the great image was shown to him. This told him that the golden glory of his kingdom would continue but a little while, and then another would arise, and another, and another, and then there would be division, with all these descending in a regular scale of inferiority, and then at last "the God of heaven" would "set up a kingdom," and this alone would be the kingdom that should stand forever, and not be given to other people. But the king could not accept this view of the subject; and after thinking upon it for a long time, he formulated his own idea in a great image about a hundred

16

feet tall and ten feet broad, all of gold from head to feet; and "set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon," to be worshiped. This was a positive setting up of his own idea against that of God. This was to declare to all people that his golden kingdom was to endure forever, that there was to be no such thing as another kingdom arising separate from his and inferior to his, -- a kingdom of silver and another of brass, and then one of iron, and after that even descend so low as iron mixed with miry clay. NO! there

should be only his golden kingdom of Babylon, and that should never be broken nor interrupted.

45. He therefore set up, to be worshiped by all, his great golden image as the just representation of what his great kingdom should continue to be. A great day was appointed for the dedication of the image; and "the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces" were gathered to do honor to the occasion and the image. Then the royal herald proclaimed: "To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up: and whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."²³

46. In a number of points all this was an open challenge to the Lord. It was the assertion that Nebuchadnezzar's idea of the kingdoms of men should be accepted as the true and divine idea instead of that of God. It was the assertion that the embodiment of this idea should be worshiped as God. And all this was indeed the putting of Nebuchadnezzar himself in the place of God as the ruler in the kingdom of men, the head of all religion and the director of all worship. Yet the Lord employed it all, not only to instruct the king, but to instruct all nations at that time and forever after. The situation created by Nebuchadnezzar for his own glory, the Lord would use in accomplishing His great purpose of giving to all nations the knowledge of the glory of God.

17

47. In the great crowd that was assembled, there were the three faithful servants of God -- Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. And when, at the voice of the royal herald, and the sound of harp, flute, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, the great crowd of princes, governors, counselors, sheriffs, and all the people "fell down and worshiped the golden image," these three young men stood bolt upright, and gave no notice whatever to the image. Then "certain Chaldeans came near, and accused the Jews." They said to the king: "There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

48. "Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury" commanded that the three men should be brought before him. He said to them, "Is it of purpose, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?" He then in person repeated his command that they should worship the image, and the penalty upon disobedience, that "if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace; and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver

us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

49. The furnace was heated to sevenfold its usual strength, and the men were cast into it, and "fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace." But suddenly the king, fairly petrified with astonishment, rose up in haste from his throne, and cried to his counselors: "Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." The king called them forth, and said:

18

"Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent His angel, and delivered His servants that trusted in Him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God."24

50. God had commanded all nations to serve King Nebuchadnezzar, and had said that whatsoever nation would not serve that same king, the Lord would punish.25 Yet here he wrought a wonderful miracle to deliver these men who had openly and directly refused to obey a positive command of the king. Why was this? Did God contradict himself? -- Not at all. This command of the king was wrong. He was requiring a service which he had no right to require. He had given a command which he had no right to give. In making him king of the nations, the Lord had not made him king in the religion of the nations. In making him the head of all the nations, God had not made him the head of religion. But being an idolater, and having grown up amid idolatrous systems, Nebuchadnezzar did not know this. With idolaters, religion always has been, and still is, a part of the government; in heathen systems, religion and the government are always united: while in the true system -- the divine, the Christian, system -- they are always separate.

51. And this was the instruction which the Lord gave to King Nebuchadnezzar in this great transaction. In a way in which it was impossible not to understand, the Lord showed him that he had nothing whatever to do with the religion, nor in directing the worship, of the people. The Lord had brought all nations under this king's yoke as to their bodily service; but now, by an unmistakable evidence, this same Lord showed to King Nebuchadnezzar that He had given him no power nor jurisdiction whatever in their souls' service. The Lord thus showed the king that while in all things between nation and nation or man and man, all people, nations, and languages had been given to him to serve him, and he had been made ruler over them all; yet in things between men and God, he was given plainly and forcibly to understand that he had nothing whatever to do. The God of heaven there taught to the king and to all nations forever, that in the presence of the rights of

19

conscience of the individual, the word of the king must change, the decree of the king is naught. And this was all written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

52. And there being present and beholding it all, "the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces" of all his realm, this great truth, with the knowledge of the power and glory of the true God, was by this one mighty impulse spread among all the peoples, nations, and languages throughout the whole mighty and wide-spread empire.

53. Nor did this great thought end here. A few years afterward, when Nebuchadnezzar's conquests were accomplished, and his great city of Babylon had been finished and decorated with the wonderful buildings, gardens, etc., and he was proudly exulting in it all, as that which he had built by the might of his power and for the honor of his majesty, he had another remarkable dream. In his dream he saw a great tree standing alone in the earth, so high that it "reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth." "The beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it." Then he saw in his dream, "and, behold, a Watcher and an Holy One came down from heaven; He cried aloud, and said thus, Hew down the tree, and cut off his branches: nevertheless leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth: let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him; and let seven times pass over him. This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: TO THE INTENT THAT THE LIVING MAY KNOW THAT THE MOST HIGH RULETH IN THE KINGDOM OF MEN, AND GIVETH IT TO WHOMSOEVER HE WILL, and setteth up over it the basest of men."26

54. Daniel was called, and interpreted for the king his dream thus: "This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of

20

the Most High, which is come upon my lord the king: That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will. -- And whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots; thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule. Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity."27

55. A year afterward, as he was walking in his beautiful palace and grounds, exulting in the glory of great Babylon which he had built by the might of his power and for the honor of his majesty, even "while the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from

heaven, saying, O King Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken; The kingdom is departed from thee."28 Then there came upon him that which he had seen foreshadowed in his dream, and which had been told him in the interpretation of it; and at the end of the time he was restored to his kingdom. Then he issued the following decree: "Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth: Peace be multiplied unto you. I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God had wrought toward me. How great are His signs! and how mighty are His wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and His dominion is from generation to generation." Here follows in the decree the full account of the dream, the interpretation, and the fact, and it closes thus: "Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and His ways judgment: and those that walk in pride He is able to abase."29

56. And thus was again made known to all people, nations, and languages of all the earth the honor and glory of the Most High God; with the great truth that He rules in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will.

21

57. Nebuchadnezzar was not only a wise ruler and a mighty conqueror, but was one of the greatest builders of any age. To him alone more than all others put together, Babylon owed her greatness of every kind, and still owes her fame. Even in Holy Writ Babylon is described as "the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," "the golden city," and "the lady of kingdoms."30 Her great buildings, her wonderful hanging gardens, and her "artificial mountains" of walls, made her the wonder of the world, even to this day. This great city was "enriched with the spoils of foreign conquest. It owed as much to Nebuchadnezzar as Rome owed to Augustus. The buildings and walls with which it was adorned, were worthy of the metropolis of the world." -- Sayce.31

58. Of the building of the walls and fortresses of the city, and the length of the wall, Nebuchadnezzar himself wrote, "Ingur-bel and Nivit-bel, the great walls of Babylon, I built them square . . . I repaired, with bitumen and bricks, the sides of the ditches that had been dug. I caused to be put in order the double doors of bronze, and the railings and the gratings, in the great gateways. I enlarged the streets of Babylon so as to make them wonderful. I applied myself to the protection of Babylon and Vale Saggatu (the pyramid), and on the most elevated lands, close to the great gate of Ishtar, I constructed strong fortresses of bitumen and bricks, from the banks of the Euphrates down to the great gate, the whole extent of the streets. I established their foundations below the level of the waters. I fortified these walls with art. I caused Ingur-bel, the great wall of Babylon, the impregnable, such as no king before me had made, to be measured, four thousand mahargagar." "This measurement corresponds exactly with the four hundred and eighty stades [sixty miles] given by Herodotus as the circuit." -- Lenormant.32

59. "The city stands on a broad plain, and is an exact square, one hundred and twenty furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is four hundred and eighty furlongs. While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other city that approaches to it. It

is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall fifty royal cubits in width, and two hundred in height. (The royal cubit is longer by three fingers' breadth than the common cubit.)" It was surrounded by a wall three hundred and fifty feet high and about eighty-five feet thick at the top.³³ On the top of the wall at irregular intervals were built towers to guard the most accessible parts. Of these towers there were two hundred and fifty. The open space on the wall, within the line of these towers, was of sufficient breadth to allow a four-horse chariot to turn with safety. Twenty-five gates pierced the wall on each side, making one hundred gates in all in the outer wall. These were double gates of solid brass, with brazen lintels and posts, and fastened with bars of iron. Around the wall on the outside ran a moat, corresponding in width and depth to the greatness of the wall. Under the wall and diagonally through the city, from corner to corner, so as to obtain the greatest length of water, ran the river Euphrates. On each side of the river, inside of the city, was built a strong wall, each wall being pierced with twenty-five gates opening into the streets that ran from the outer gates. These were also brazen gates like those in the outer wall. The banks of the river were lined throughout with brick laid in bitumen, with sloping landing-places at the gates. Boats were always ready at these landing-places by which to pass from side to side of the river. Over the river about the middle of the city was a drawbridge thirty feet wide, supported on stone piers. At the two ends of the bridge were the two grand palaces of the city. Of course the vast area within the city was not built up solidly with houses, as is a modern city. There were gardens, orchards, and fields interspersed among the houses, and about the palaces and temples. It was expected that if ever the city should be besieged, they could grow sufficient provisions within the walls to support the population, so

that they might shut their gates, man the towers, and dwell securely, with no fears of ever being overcome by any besieging force. Such, briefly outlined, was the Babylon of the days of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, and largely as it was when Herodotus visited it about a hundred years later. It is safe to say that no city on earth has ever equaled it in greatness and grandeur.

61. "Nebuchadnezzar is the great monarch of the Babylonian Empire, which, lasting only eighty-eight years, -- from B. C. 625 to B. C. 538, -- was for nearly half the time under his sway. Its military glory is due chiefly to him, while the constructive energy, which constitutes its especial characteristic, belongs to it still more markedly through his character and genius. It is scarcely too much to say that but for Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonians would have had no place in history. At any rate, their actual place is owing almost entirely to this prince, who to the military talents of an able general added a grandeur of artistic conception and skill in construction which place him on a par with the greatest builders of antiquity." -- Rawlinson.³⁵

62. "His last days were as brilliant as his first; his sun set in an unclouded sky, shorn of none of the rays that had given splendor to its noonday. Nebuchadnezzar expired at Babylon in the forty-fourth year of his reign, B. C. 561, after an illness of no long duration. He was probably little short of eighty years old at his death." -- Rawlinson.³⁶

1 [Page 1] 2 Kings 23: 29; 2 Chron. 35: 20

2 [Page 2] 1 Chron. 3:15; 2 Kings 23:31-35.

3 [Page 2] 2 Kings 24:7.

4 [Page 4] Dan. 1:3-5, 17-20.

5 [Page 5] Jer. 27:1-11.

6 [Page 6] Dan. 2:1.

7 [Page 11] Dan. 2:31-49.

8 [Page 11] Eze. 27:3.

9 [Page 11] Isa. 23:3.

10 [Page 11] "Connexion," under An. 586.

11 [Page 11] Eze. 26:2.

12 [Page 11] Eze. 26:7-11.

13 [Page 12] Eze. 29:18.

14 [Page 12] "Connexion," under 514 B.C.

15 [Page 12] "Records of the Past," New Series, Vol. iv, pp. 99, 100.

16 [Page 12] "Ancient History of the East," book ii, chap. v. sec. iii, par. 6.

17 [Page 13] Eze. 29: 18-20.

18 [Page 13] Jer. 40: 11, 12.

- 19 [Page 13] Jer. 42; 43: 1-7.
- 20 [Page 14] Jer. 43: 8-13.
- 21 [Page 14] "Connexion," under 573 B. C., par. 3.
- 22 [Page 15] "Ancient History of East," book iv, chap. v, sec. iii, par. 6.
- 23 [Page 16] Dan. 3: 4-6.
- 24 [Page 17] Dan. 3: 13-28.
- 25 [Page 18] Jer. 27: 1-8.
- 26 [Page 19] Dan. 4: 10-17.
- 27 [Page 20] Dan. 4: 24-27.
- 28 [Page 20] Dan. 4:31.
- 29 [Page 20] Dan. 4: 1-3, 37.
- 30 [Page 21] Isa. 13:19; 14:4; 47:5.
- 31 [Page 21] "Ancient Empires of the East," chap. ii, pars. 44, 45.
- 32 [Page 21] "Ancient History of the East," book iv, chap. v, sec. iii, par. 16. See also "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. v, p. 127.
- 33 [Page 22] In these days of general skepticism, some writers would cast doubt upon the great height and breadth of these walls. But there is no just ground for doubting it, even upon the human records; and when the Scriptures sustain it, as they do in Jer. 51:53, 58, all doubt is sheer skepticism and vanity. For the authorities, see "Rawlinson's Herodotus," book i, chap. cixxviii, and notes; and "Appendix" to book i, essay viii, par. 13, and notes.
- 34 [Page 23] Encyclopedia, art. Nebuchadnezzar, par. 6; and art. Babylonia, History, par. 6.
- 35 [Page 23] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. viii, par. 23.
- 36 [Page 24] Id., par. 38.

2. EMPIRE OF BABYLON -- FROM EVIL-MERODACH TO BELSHAZZAR.

EVIL-MERODACH was the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, and reigned two years -- 561-560. The history of the empire, both while Nebuchadnezzar reigned and afterward, is vividly sketched in the symbol of Dan. 7:4, -- first "a lion which had eagle's wings;" then "the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it." With Nebuchadnezzar departed the strength, boldness, and swiftness of the lion with eagle's wings; and with his successors the lion's heart and attitude were changed to that of a man.

2. The first thing of importance that Evil-Merodach did was to release Jehoiachin king of Judah out of the prison where he had been kept all the thirty-seven years from the time of his captivity in 599. Evil-Merodach "spake kindly unto him, and set his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon, and changed his prison garments: and he did continually eat bread before him all the days of his life. And for his diet, there was a continual diet given him of the king of Babylon, every day a portion until the day of his death, all the days of his life." 1

3. A tradition has been recorded in explanation of this kindness of Evil-Merodach to the captive king Jehoiachin, to the effect that during the time in which Nebuchadnezzar was absent from his throne and kingdom on account of his malady, Evil-Merodach was in charge of the affairs of the empire, and that he conducted himself so badly that when Nebuchadnezzar had recovered, and again took his throne, he imprisoned Evil-Merodach in the same prison where

26

King Jehoiachin was confined. Then when Nebuchadnezzar died and Evil-Merodach succeeded to the actual possession of the throne and kingdom, he remembered his own fellowship with Jehoiachin in prison, and now raised Jehoiachin to fellowship with himself in the throne. 2

4. This is not only the first, but indeed the only, important act recorded of the reign of Evil-Merodach; for he proved to be so very profligate and so altogether vicious that his own relations conspired against him, and put him to death at the end of his second year's reign: his sister's husband being one of the chief conspirators.

5. Neriglissar was the name of this brother-in-law to Evil-Merodach. The name is the same as the Nergal-sharezer, the Rabmag, of Jer. 39:3; but whether he was the same person is not certainly known, though it is possible that he was. In the first year of his reign, Media revolted, and was joined by Persia. Three years were employed by Neriglissar in forming new alliances and renewing old ones, and making preparations for the inevitable war. In the fourth year the war came; and in the fierce first battle

Neriglissar was slain. The following contract concerning the marriage of this king's daughter is of interest: --

"Nabu-sum-ukim, priest of Nebo, director of E-zida, son of Siriktum-Marduk, descendant of Isde-ilani-danan, said to Neriglissar, king of Babylon: 'Give Gigitum, thy virgin daughter, to wifehood, and let her be a wife.' Neriglissar [said] to Nabu-sum-ukin, priest of Nebo, director of E-zida . . . [28 lines illegible, after which is following list of witnesses]

. . . son of Nabu-sum-lisir ri, son of Nabu-surra-utsur, the judge (??)
Nabu-sum-utsur, the scribe, son of Assur Babylon, month Nisan, day 1st, year
1st, [Neriglis]sar king of Babylon. Copy of E-zida." 3

6. Laborosoarchod, the son of Neriglissar, succeeded his father in the throne of Babylon. He "let himself loose in the utmost excess, without any manner of restraint whatsoever, as if the regal office which he was now advanced to were for nothing else but

27

to give him privilege of doing without control all the vile and flagitious things that he pleased." Therefore even "his own people conspired against him, and slew him, after he had reigned only nine months." -- Prideaux. 4 These nine months all fell in the year 556 B. C., the first three months of which were the beginning of the fourth year of Neriglissar, so that the death of Laborosoarchod occurred about the end of the year.

7. Nabonadius, or Nabonidos, was raised to the sovereignty over Babylon, at the beginning of 555. B. C., by the conspirators who accomplished the death of Laborosoarchod. He was a man of rank, for in one of his own inscriptions he relates that his father had held the important office of Rab-mag. Even in his first year he was invited by the king of Lydia to an alliance with that power, which was then on the eve of a war with the rapidly rising power of Media and Persia. He accepted the invitation; but the king of Lydia rashly began the war without waiting for the forces of Babylon, and was defeated. His kingdom was overrun, and he himself was captured by the forces of Media and Persia, before Nabonadius really had any opportunity of fulfilling his part in the alliance. Yet that which he had done in consenting to the alliance was, of course, held as a cause of war against him, though the war, in fact, did not occur till fourteen years later.

8. An inscription left by Nabonadius, touching the time from his seventh to his eleventh year, runs as follows: --

"The 7th year the king (was) in Teva; 5 the king's son, the nobles, and his soldiers (were) in the country of Akkad. [The king in the month Nisan] did not go to Babylon. Nebo did not go to Babylon; Bel came not forth; the [new year's] festival [took place]; sacrifices in E-Saggil and E-Zida (to) the gods of Babylon and Borsippa as [peace-offerings] they offered. The priest inspected the painted work (?) of the temple.

The 8th year. 6

The 9th year Nabonidos the king (was in) Teva. The king's son, the nobles and the soldiers (were) in the country of Akkad. The king in the month Nisan to Babylon

28

did not go. Nebo did not go to Babylon; Bel came not forth; the new year's festival took place.

Sacrifices in E-Saggil and E-Zida (to) the gods of (Babylon) and Borsippa as peace-offerings they offered.

The 5th day of the month Nisan the mother of the king who was in the fortress of the camp (on) the Euphrates above Sippara died. The king's son and his soldiers mourned for three days. There was lamentation. In the month Sivan in the country of Akkad there was lamentation over the mother of the king.

* * * * *

The 10th year the king (was) in Teva; the king's son, the nobles and his soldiers (were) in the country of Akkad; the king in the month [Nisan did not go to Babylon]. Nebo did not go to Babylon; Bel came not forth. The new year's festival took place. Sacrifices in E-[Saggil and E-Zida] (to) the gods of Babylon and Borsippa as peace-offerings they offered. On the 21st day of the month Sivan . . . of the country of Elam, in the country of Akkad . . . a governor in the city of Erech . . . The 11th, year the king was in Teva; the king's son, the nobles and his soldiers (were) in the country of Akkad; [in the month Nisan the king did not go to Babylon]."

9. The following inscription of Nabonadius is of interest, because of its mention of some of the most ancient kings, and also of Belshazzar, his eldest son, who is named in the Scriptures: --

"Nabo-imduk king Babylon
restorer of Bit-Saggathu
and Bit-Zida,
worshiper of the great gods, I am he.
The building of King Ram-sidi,
called the Tower of the temple of 'the great tree,'
which is in the city of Ur,
which Urukh, a King who lived long ago,
had begun, but had not completed,
but Ilgi his son
had completed the superstructure:
in the inscriptions of Urukh
and Ilgi his son I read

that this tower
Uruk had begun to build,
but had not completed it,
and Ilgi its superstructure

29

completed.
In my days that tower
had disappeared entirely.
Upon the old timin,
which Uruk and Ilgi
his son had made
of that tower,
like unto the ancient one
in bitumen and brick
a restoration I made.

* * * * *

[Column 2.]

* * * * *

Myself, Nabo-nid, King of Babylon,
in the fear of thy great divinity
preserve me !
My life unto distant days
abundantly prolong !
and of Bel-sar-ussur,
my eldest son,
the offspring of my body,
the awe of thy great divinity
fix thou firmly in his heart,
that he may never fall
into sin,
and that his glory may endure !" 8

10. The three following documents are also important, because of what they tell of Belshazzar. The first one is a contract concerning the renting of a house for three years to Belshazzar's secretary, the second is a contract concerning the sale of wool belonging to Belshazzar himself; and the third is a contract concerning the loaning of money and taking security for it, by the steward of the house of Belshazzar: --

No. 1.

" A house belonging to Nebo-akhi-iddin the son of sula, the son of Egibi, which adjoins the house of Bel-nadin the son of Bimut, the son of the soldier [?] has been handed over (by Nebo-akhi-iddin) for three-years to Nebo-yukin-akhi, the secretary of Belshazzar, the son of the kings for one and one-half manehs of silver, sub-letting of the house being forbid den, as well as interest of the money. (Nebo-yukin-akhi) undertakes to

30

plant trees and repair the house. At the expiration of the three years Nebo-akhi-iddin shall repay the money, namely one and one-half manehs, to Nebo-yukin-akhi, and Nebo-yukin-akhi shall quit the house in the presence of Nebo-akhi-iddin. The witnesses (are) Kabtiya, the son of Tabena, the son of Egibi; Tabik-zira, the son of Nergal-yusallim, the son of Sin-karabi-isime; Nebo-zira-ibni, the son of Ardia; and the priest Bel-akhi-basa, the son of Nebo-baladhsu-iqbi. (Dated) Babylon, the 21st day of Nisan, the fifth year [551 B. C.] of Nabonidos king of Babylon."

No. II.

"The sum of twenty manehs of silver for wool, the property of Belshazzar, the son of the king, which has been handed over to Iddin Merodach, the son of Basa, the son of Nur-Sin, through the agency of Nebo-tsabit the steward of the house of Belshazzar, the son of the king, and the secretaries of the son of the king. In the month Adar, of the eleventh year (of Nabonidos), he gives the money, namely twenty manehs. The house of . . . the Persian and all his property in town and country shall be the security of Belshazzar, the son of the king, until he shall pay in full the money aforesaid. The money which he shall Meanwhile make upon [the property] (?), he shall pay as interest. Witnessed by Bel-iddin, the son of Rimut, the son of the soldier (?); Etilpi, the son of . . . the son of the father of the house; Nadin, the son of Merodach-[sum-utsur], the son of the superintendent of the works; Nergal-yusallim, the son of Merodach-[edir], the son of Gasura; Merodach-natsir, the son of Samas . . . , the son of Dabibi; and the priest Bel-akhi-iddin, the son of Nebo-baladhsu-iqbi. (Dated) Babylon, the 20th day of the month . . . , the eleventh year [545 B. C.] of Nabonidos king [of Babylon]."

No. III.

"One maneh sixteen shekels of silver capital and interest, the property of Nebo-tsabit-ida, the steward of the house of Belshazzar, the son of the king, which (he owes) to Bel-iddina, the son of Bel-sum-iskun, the son of Sin-tabni, and the seed grown in sight of the chief gates (of Babylon) which has been taken as security (for it). The money, namely one maneh sixteen shekels, Nebo-tsabit-ida, by the agency of Itti-Merodachbaladhu, the

son of Nebo-akhi-iddin, the son of Egibi, has presented to Bel-iddina. The witnesses (are) Nebo-iddina, the son of Rimutu, the son of Kiki; Bel-iddina, the son of Bel-sum-iskun, the son of Sin-tabni; Nebo-zira-esir, the son of Ina-essu-edir, the son of the Umuk; Nadinu, the son of Merodach-iddin-akhi; Nergal-yusallim, the priest, the son of Merodach-edir, the son of Gasura. (Dated) at Babylon, the 27th day of the second Adar [Ve-Adar], the twelfth year [554 B. C.] of Nabonidos king of Babylon." 9

31

11. These documents show that in 551 B. C. Belshazzar was old enough to have a secretary; and that in 545 B. C. he was old enough to have an establishment of his own, having a house with a steward, and property of his own.

12. "In the first year of Belshazzar " in his office as associate king, to Daniel was given the great vision, and the explanation of it, which is recorded by that prophet in the seventh chapter of his book. "Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and man's heart was given to it. And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. After this I beheld, and to another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before, it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.

13. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as shown, and the hair of His head like the pure wool: His throne was like the fiery flame; and His wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even

32

till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an

everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

14. "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.

15. "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

16. "Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and

33

they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him." 10

17. "In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar," there was given to Daniel the vision recorded in the eighth chapter of his book. At the time when the vision occurred, Daniel was in the province of Elam, and in the palace at Shushan (or Susa) the capital. But in the vision he was out by the river of Ulai, which flowed through the city. He says: "Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.

18. "And as I was considering, behold, an he goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his

eyes. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. Therefore the he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little born, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and

34

stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered."

19. "And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision. So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision. Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.

20. "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand." 11

21. Nabonadius and Belshazzar were jointly the last kings of Babylon. The city fell if not actually in the third year of Belshazzar, very shortly after the end of that year. But as this great event is essentially a part of the history of another power, the account of it will be postponed to the place where it naturally comes.

22. In the interpretation of the dream which Nebuchadnezzar had of the great image, after telling the king that he was the head

35

of gold, it was said, "After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee," and that following this there should be two others in succession which should bear rule over all the earth: making, in all, four universal empires from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the setting up of the kingdom of God in the earth. In the vision of the first year of Belshazzar, these four empires are symbolized by the four great beasts -- the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the great and terrible nondescript beast. The lion of the vision in the first year of Belshazzar, therefore, corresponds to the head of gold of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and consequently represents Babylon.

23. Being first "a lion with eagle's wings," it well represents the mighty power and swiftness of the conquests of the Babylon of the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Then it was "that bitter and hasty nation," whose horses were "swifter than the leopards," and whose horsemen should "fly as an eagle that hasteth to eat." 12 And afterward the same lion with his wings plucked, and lifted up from the earth and made to stand on his feet as a man, with a man's heart, well represents the same kingdom of Babylon shorn of its vigor, its power, and its majesty, as it was after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, through the reigns of the five weak and wicked kings whom we have been obliged to notice in that period.

24. As the lion corresponds to the head of gold of the great image, and so represents Babylon, so the bear of this vision corresponds to the "other kingdom inferior" to Babylon, represented in the breast and arms of silver of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Then in the vision of the third year of Belshazzar, which occurred in the very last day of Babylon, just as it was about to pass away, only three symbols are used -- the ram, the goat, and the little horn which became "exceeding great;" and the first of these is plainly declared by the angel to be "the kings of Media and Persia." This demonstrates, therefore, that the kingdom of the Medes and Persians was represented by the symbol of the bear, and was the one referred to when Daniel, in explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image, said to him, "After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." Accordingly, the empire of the Bible whose history is next to be written and studied, is that of the Medes and Persians.

1 [Page 25] Jer. 52:31-34; 2 Kings 25:27-30.

2 [Page 26] See Prideaux's "Connexion," under 561 B. C.

3 [Page 26] "Records of the Past," New Series, Vol. iv, p. 102.

4 [Page 27] "Connexion." under 556 B. C.

5 [Page 27] A quarter of Babylon on the western bank of the Euphrates.

6 [Page 27] B. C. 548.

7 [Page 28] For Uruk and Ilgi, see Vol. i, chap. vi, pars. 18-24.

8 [Page 29] "Records of the Post," old Series, Vol. ii, pp. 145-148.

9 [Page 30] "Records of the Past," New Series, Vol. iii, pp. 125-127.

10 [Page 33] Dan 7:2-27.

11 [Page 34] Dan. 8:5-12, 15-25.

12 [Page 35] Habakkuk 1:6-8.

3. THE EMPIRE OF MEDIA AND PERSIA -- THE FALL OF BABYLON.

At the time when, in the reign of Neriglissar, Media separated altogether from allegiance to Babylon, Media and Persia were in alliance. Cyamares was king of Media, and Cambyses was king of Persia; Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, of Persia, was commander of the allied forces. In the alliance, Media was first recognized as the predominant power, which is shown in the expression, "the Medes and Persians," which was always used while the two forces maintained this relationship; but which was reversed, and became "the Persians and the Medes," and "Persia and Media," when the relationship became so changed that Persia held the predominance of power.

2. Between the death of Neriglissar, 556 B. C., and the sixteenth year of Nabonadius, 540, Cyrus had become king of Persia by the death of his father, and on behalf of the allied powers of Media and Persia had succeeded in conquering all the tribes of Central Asia; the powerful kingdoms of Armenia and Lydia, with all

37

the other peoples to the north and northwest clear to the Black Sea and the Aegean; and also Syria and Arabia. And now, in 540, he was ready to make a descent upon the mighty Babylon itself, which, if it should prove successful, would give to the united forces of Media and Persia the dominion of the world.

3. Babylon occupies so large a place in the Bible that the particular points of interest in her fall are given in the Bible better than anywhere else. The principal items gathered from the different histories of this event, written long afterward, reveal the fact that they are but the complement of the words of the prophets written long before. On this account no more will be attempted here than to set together the words of the prophecies, written long before, and the words of the histories, written at the time or long afterward.

4. From the prophets we know what powers they were which should march against Babylon to destroy it; we know who should lead the armies; we know how the city should be taken; and we know what would be the condition of things in the city when the invading forces should enter. For God mustered the forces, directed the siege, and led the leaders; and by His prophets His plans were all revealed from sixty to one hundred and seventy-five years before the city and the kingdom of Babylon fell. The way is all clear before us in this -- the prophecy is plain, so also is the history.

5. In the fourth year of Zedekiah, B. C. 595, "Jeremiah wrote in a book all the evil that should come upon Babylon," which "the Lord spake against Babylon and against the land of the Chaldeans;" and sent it to Babylon by the hand of Seraiah when he went on an embassy "on the behalf of Zedekiah the king of Judah." When Seraiah should have come to Babylon, he was to stand in the midst of the city, by the river, and read all the words of the Lord as written in the book. Then he was to say, "O Lord, thou hast spoken against

this place, to cut it off, that none shall remain in it, neither man nor beast, but that it shall be desolate forever." Then he was to bind a stone to the book, "and cast it into the midst of Euphrates," and exclaim, "Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her: and they

38

shall be weary." The words that were written in the book are those which are now found in chapters 50 and 51 of the book of Jeremiah.

6. Of the nations that would overthrow the kingdom of Babylon, we read: "Make bright the arrows; gather the shields; the Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes; for His device is against Babylon, to destroy it; because it is the vengeance of the Lord, the vengeance of His temple." "Prepare against her the nations with the kings of the Medes, the captains thereof, and all the rulers thereof, and all the land of his dominion."²

7. But the Medes were not to be alone. Isaiah cries, "Go up, O Elam; besiege, O Media." "And Elam bare the quiver with chariots of men and horsemen." And Jeremiah exclaims, "Set ye up a standard in the land, blow the trumpet among the nations, prepare the nations against her, call together against her the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz; appoint a captain against her; cause the horses to come up as the rough caterpillars."³

8. Elam, the Susiana of ancient geography and history, was a province of the Babylonian Empire as late as the third year of Belshazzar;⁴ but on the rise of the Persian power, it threw off the yoke of Babylon, joined itself to Persia, became the chief province of the Persian kingdom, and its capital, Susa (the Shushan of Scripture), became finally one of the capitals of the whole Medo-Persian Empire. The sequel of the revolt of Elam and of its mention in this prophecy lies in this, that Cyrus was of Elamite origin and the recognized chief of the Susianians,⁵ and when he became king of Persia and began to spread his conquests, the Susianians (Elamites) only waited for the opportune moment to revolt from Babylon, and join the standard of Cyrus. But this time never came till Cyrus started to the conquest of Babylon in 539 B. C.; because Cyrus and his forces, for nearly twenty years, until this time, were away to the northwest, the north, and the east, far away from the borders of Elam.⁶ But when he started from Ecbatana,⁷ his Median capital, to the conquest of Babylon,

39

he had to cross the province of Elam; then came the time when they could join their chosen and hereditary chief; then Elam could "go up," Media could "besiege."

9. God had not only long beforehand named the nations that should destroy Babylon, he had also called by name the general that should lead them: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight; I will break in

pieces the gates of brass; and cut in sunder the bars of iron; and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places."⁸ This was written about 712 B. C. Cyrus started against Babylon in 539 B. C., and took it in 538 B. C., when he was about sixty-one years old.⁹ Thus the Lord called him "by name" one hundred and thirteen years before he was born; and told what he would do, one hundred and seventy four years before he did it.

10. "When at last it was rumored that the Persian king had quitted Ecbatana [539 B. C., spring], and commenced his march to the southwest, Nabonadius received the tidings with indifference. His defenses were completed; his city was amply provisioned; if the enemy should defeat him in the open field, he might retire behind his walls, and laugh to scorn all attempts to reduce his capital either by blockade or storm."

11. "Cyrus on his way to Babylon came to the banks of the Gyndes, a stream which, rising in the Matienian Mountains, runs through the country of the Dardanians, and empties itself into the river Tigris When Cyrus reached this stream, which could only be passed in boats, one of the sacred white horses accompanying his march, full of spirit and high mettle, walked into the water and tried to cross by himself; but the current seized him, swept him along with it, and drowned him in its depths. Cyrus, enraged at the insolence of the river, threatened so to break its strength that in

40

future even women should cross it easily without wetting their knees. Accordingly he put off for a time his attack on Babylon, and, dividing his army into two parts, he marked out by ropes one hundred and eighty trenches on each side of the Gyndes, leading off from it in all directions; and, setting his army to dig, some on one side of the river, some on the other, he accomplished his threat by the aid of so great a number of hands, but not without losing thereby the whole summer season. Having, however, thus wreaked his vengeance on the Gyndes by dispersing it through three hundred and sixty channels, Cyrus, with the first approach of the ensuing spring, marched forward against Babylon." - Herodotus.¹⁰

12. This local, merely incidental, and seemingly trivial, occurrence caused the delay of the whole army of Media and Persia for a whole year. yet there was a matter of deep importance wrapped up in this delay, and even in the delay continuing from one year to another. God's people were in Babylon, and they must know when its fall would be, that they might save themselves. Sixty years before this the Lord had said: "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." Then, too, he gave them the sign by which they should know when her destruction was at hand. "And lest your heart faint, and ye fear for the rumor that shall be heard in the land; a rumor shall both come one year, and after that in another year shall come a rumor, and violence in the land, ruler against ruler."¹¹ Thus when Cyrus started out in the spring of 539 B. C., Babylon heard the "rumor" and made all ready. But Cyrus stopped and stayed all summer, through the fall, and all winter, then when spring came again, again he started, and again a "rumor" was heard in Babylon, followed swiftly by "violence in the

land," and "ruler against ruler." And that is why he stayed there at the river so long. God was over it all. He had said that two rumors, a year apart, should reach Babylon, that His people should certainly know when to go out of the midst of her, and deliver "every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord."

41

13. "Having wintered on the banks of the Gyndes in a mild climate, where tents would have been quite a sufficient protection for his army, he put his troops in motion at the commencement of spring, crossed the Tigris apparently unopposed, and soon came in sight of the capital. Here he found the Babylonian army drawn out to meet him under the command of Nabonadius himself, who had resolved to try the chance of battle. An engagement ensued, of which we possess no details; our informants simply tell us that the Babylonian monarch was completely defeated, and that, while most of his army sought safety within the walls of the capital, he himself with a small body of troops threw himself into Borsippa, an important town lying at a short distance from Babylon toward the southwest.

14. "It might have been supposed that his absence would have produced anarchy and confusion in the capital; but a step which he had recently taken with the object of giving stability to his throne, rendered the preservation of order tolerably easy. At the earliest possible moment he had associated with him in the government, his son Belshazzar, or Bel-shar-uzur, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar, then probably about fourteen years of age.¹² This step, taken most likely with a view to none but internal dangers, was now found exceedingly convenient for the purposes of the war. In his father's absence, Belshazzar took the direction of affairs within the city, and met and foiled for a considerable time all the assaults of the Persians. He was young and inexperienced, but he had the counsels of the queen-mother¹³ to guide and support him, as well as those of the various lords and officers of the court. So well did he manage the defense that after a while Cyrus despaired, and as a last resource ventured on a stratagem in which it was clear that he must either succeed or perish."

15. "Withdrawing the greater part of his army from the vicinity of the city, and leaving behind him only certain corps of observation, Cyrus marched away up the course of the Euphrates for a certain distance, and there proceeded to make a vigorous use of the spade. His soldiers could now appreciate the value of the experience which they had gained by dispersing the Gyndes, and perceive that the

42

summer and autumn of the preceding year had not been wasted. They dug a channel or channels from the Euphrates by means of which a great portion of its water would be drawn off, and hoped in this way to render the natural course of the river fordable." ["A drought is upon her waters; and they shall be dried up." "And I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry." Jer. 50:38; 51:36.]¹⁴

16. "When all was prepared, Cyrus determined to wait for the arrival of a certain festival during which the whole population were wont to engage in drinking and reveling ["Prepare the table, watch in the watchtower, eat, drink." Isa. 21: 5], and then silently, in the dead of night, to turn the water of the river and make his attack. ["Arise, ye princes, and anoint the shield." Isa. 21:5.] All fell out as he hoped and wished. The festival was held with even greater pomp and splendor than usual; for Belshazzar, with the natural insolence of youth, to mark his contempt of the besieging army, abandoned himself wholly to the delights of the season, and himself entertained a thousand lords in his palace."

17. "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. Belshazzar, while he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father [grandfather, margin] Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king and his princes, his wives and his concubines, might drink therein. . . . They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone." Dan. 5: 1-4. ["For it is the land of graven images . . . and they are mad upon their idols." Jer. 50:38.] "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote." Dan. 5:5. ["The night of my pleasure hath he turned into fear unto me." Isa. 21:4.] "Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against

43

another." Dan. 5:6. ["My heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me: . . . Therefore are my loins filled with pain; pangs have taken hold upon me, . . . I was bowed down at the hearing of it; I was dismayed at the seeing of it." Isa. 21: 4, 3.]

18. "The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers . . . but they could not read the writing nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof. Then was King Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonished. ["Let now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee . . . none shall save thee." Isa. 47:13, 15.] Now the queen, by reason of the words of the king and his lords, came into the banquet house; and the queen spake and said, . . . There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods; . . . now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation. Then was Daniel brought in before the king. . . . Then Daniel answered and said before the king, Thou . . . hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of His house before thee, and thou and thy lords, thy wives and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know; and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified; then was the part of the hand sent from Him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.

TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." Dan. 5: 7-28.

19. "Elsewhere the rest of the population was occupied in feasting and dancing. Drunken riot and mad excitement held possession of the town; the siege was forgotten; ordinary precautions were neglected. Following the example of their king, the Babylonians gave themselves up for the night to orgies in which religious frenzy and drunken excess formed a strange and revolting medley." --

44

Rawlinson.¹⁵ ["And I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men; and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the King, whose name is the Lord of Hosts." "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:57, 39.]

20. "We are told in Daniel that Babylon was captured on the night of a great feast to the idol gods, at which the wives and concubines joined in a wild revelry. But the women were not in the habit of feasting with men -- how is this? An account, by Cyrus himself, of his capture of Babylon, was dug up only a few years ago. In it he declares that Babylon was captured 'without fighting,' on the fourteenth day of the month Tammuz. Now the month Tammuz was named in honor of the god Tammuz, the Babylonian Adonis, who married their Venus, or Ishtar; and the fourteenth of Tammuz was the regular time to celebrate their union, with lascivious orgies. On this day of all days the women took part in the horrible rites; and it was in this feast of king, princes, wives, and concubines that Babylon was taken and Belshazzar slain. The Bible is here fully and wonderfully corroborated." -- Wm. Hayes Ward, D. D.¹⁶

21. "Meanwhile, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. ["Set up the watchmen, prepare the liers in wait." Jer. 51:12, margin.] Anxiously they noted the gradual sinking of the water in the river-bed; still more anxiously they watched to see if those within the walls would observe the suspicious circumstance, and sound an alarm through the town. Should such an alarm be given, all their labors would be lost. If when they entered the river-bed, they found the river-walls manned and the river-gates fast-locked, they would be indeed 'caught in a trap.' Enfiladed on both sides by the enemy whom they could neither see nor reach, they would be overwhelmed and destroyed by his missiles before they could succeed in making their escape. But, as they watched,

45

no sounds of alarm reached them -- only a confused noise of revel and riot, which showed that the unhappy townsmen were quite unconscious of the approach of danger." ["Therefore shall evil come upon thee; thou shalt not know from whence it riseth; and

mischievous shall fall upon thee; thou shalt not be able to put it off; and desolation shall come upon thee suddenly, which thou shalt not know." Isa. 47.11.]

22. "At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the deep river-bed, and on the landing-places opposite the river gates clusters of men grew into solid columns. ["The Lord of Hosts hath sworn by himself, saying, Surely I will fill thee with men as with caterpillars; and they shall lift up a shout against thee." Jer. 51:14.] The undefended gateways were seized; a war-shout was raised; the alarm was spread, and with swift runners started off to show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end.' ["One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end, and that the passages are stopped, and the reeds they have burned with fire, and the men of war are affrighted." Jer. 51:31,32.]

23. "In the darkness and confusion of the night a terrible massacre ensued. ["Against him that bendeth let the archer bend his bow, and against him that lifteth himself up in his brigandine [coat of mail]; and spare not her young men; destroy ye utterly all her host. Thus the slain shall fall in the land of the Chaldeans, and they that are thrust through in the streets." "Therefore shall her young men fall in the streets, and all her men of war shall be cut off in that day, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:3, 4; 50:30.] The drunken revelers could make no resistance. ["The mighty men of Babylon have forborne to fight, they have remained in their holds; their might hath failed; they became as women; they have burned her dwelling-places; her bars are broken." Jer. 51:30.]

24. "The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful handwriting upon the wall, which too late had warned him of his peril, could do nothing even to check the progress of the assailants who carried all before them everywhere. Bursting into the palace, a band of Persians

46

made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry. ["In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain." Dan. 5:30.] Other bands carried fire and sword through the town. ["A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon the liars; and they shall dote; a sword is upon her mighty men; and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon their horses, and upon their chariots, and upon all the mingled people that are in the midst of her; and they shall become as women." "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken, and her high gates shall be burned with fire; and the people shall labor in vain, and the folk in the fire, and they shall be weary." Jer. 50: 35-37; 51:58.]

25. "When the morning came, Cyrus found himself undisputed master of the city, which, if it had not despised his efforts, might with the greatest ease have baffled them." ["Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the

two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." Isa. 45:1.] "Thus perished the Babylonian Empire." ["And it shall be, when thou hast made an end of reading this book, that thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates; and thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shalt not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her; and they shall be weary. Thus far are the words of Jeremiah." Jer. 51:63, 64.]¹⁷

26. Cyrus's own account of the conquest of Babylon, somewhat mutilated, is as follows:

--

"He [Merodach] appointed also a prince who should guide aright the wish of the heart which his hand upholds, even Cyrus the king of the city of Ansan; he has proclaimed his title; for the sovereignty of all the world does he commemorate his name.

The country of Quti (and) all the people of the Manda¹⁸ he has subjected to his feet; the men of the black heads¹⁹ he has caused his hand to conquer.

47

In justice and righteousness has he governed them. Merodach the great lord, the restorer of his people, beheld with joy the deeds of his vicegerent who was righteous in hand and heart.

To his city of Babylon he summoned his march; he bade him also take the road to Babylon; like a friend and a comrade he went at his side.

The weapons of his vast army, whose number, like the waters of a river, could not be known, were marshaled in order, and it spread itself at his side.

Without fighting and battle (Merodach) caused him to enter into Babylon; his city of Babylon he spared; in a hiding-place Nabonidos the king, who revered him not, did he give into his hand.

The men of Babylon, all of them, (and) the whole of Sumer and Accad, the nobles and the high-priest, bowed themselves beneath him; they kissed his feet; they rejoiced at his sovereignty; their faces shone.

The lord (Merodach) who through trust therein raises the dead to life, who benefits all men in difficulty and fear, has in goodness drawn nigh to him, has made strong his name. At that time I entered into Babylon in peace.

With joy and gladness in the palace of the princes I founded the seat of dominion. Merodach the great lord enlarged my heart; the son[s] of Babylon and . . . on that day I appointed his ministers(?).

My vast army spread itself peacefully in the midst of Babylon; throughout [Sumer and] Accad I permitted no gainsayer.

Babylon and all its cities in peace I governed. The sons of Babylon, [and . . . gave me ?] the fulness of [their] heart[s], and my yoke they bore, and their lives, their seat, (and) their ruins I restored. I delivered their prisoners. For my work . . . Merodach the great lord, the . . . , established a decree; unto me, Cyrus, the king, his worshiper, and Kambyases (my) son, the offspring of my heart, [and to] all my people he graciously drew nigh, and in peace before them we duly . . . All the king(s) who inhabit the high places of all regions from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea,²⁰ the inhabitants of the in[lands], the kings of Syria, (and) the inhabitants of tents, all of them brought their rich tribute and in Babylon kissed my feet. From [the city of] . . . to the cities of Assur and Istar-Sumeli (?),²¹ (and) Accad, the land of Umhas,²² the cities of Zamban, Me-Turnut, (and) Dur-ili, as far as the frontier of Quti,²³ the cities [which lie upon] the Tigris, whose seats had been established from of old,

48

I restored the gods who dwelt within them to their places, and I founded (for them) a seat that should be long-enduring; all their peoples I collected and restored their habitations.

And the gods of Sumer and Accad whom Nabonidos, to the anger of (Merodach) the lord of the gods, had brought into Babylon, by the command of Merodach the great lord, in peace in their sanctuaries I settled in seats according to (their) hearts. May all the gods whom I have brought into their own cities intercede daily before Bel and Nebo that my days be long, may they pronounce blessings upon me, and may they say to Merodach my lord: Let Cyrus the king, thy worshiper, and Kambyases his son, [accomplish the desire?] of their heart; [let them enjoy length?] of days . . . I have settled [the peoples] of all countries in a place of rest."²⁴

27. For political reasons this respect to the gods of Babylon was advisable. But later Cyrus's own religious views underwent a change; and with his successors there came another religion entirely; so that "the fall of Babylon was also the fall of an ancient, widely spread, and deeply venerated religious system. Not, of course, that the religion suddenly disappeared or ceased to have votaries, but that, from a dominant system, supported by all the resources of the State, and enforced by the civil power over a wide extent of territory, it became simply one of the many of the tolerated beliefs, exposed to frequent rebuffs and insults, and at all times overshadowed by a new and rival system --

the comparatively pure creed of Zoroastrianism. The conquest of Babylon by Persia was, practically, if not the death-blow, at least a severe wound, to the sensuous idol-worship which had, for more than twenty centuries, been the almost universal religion in the countries between the Mediterranean and the Zagros Mountain Range. The religion never recovered itself -- was never reinstated. It survived a longer or a shorter time, in places. To a slight extent it corrupted Zoroastrianism; but on the whole, from the date of the fall of Babylon, it declined. Bel bowed down; Nebo stooped [Isa. 46:1]; Merodach was broken in pieces [Jer. 50:2]. Judgment was done upon the Babylonian graven images; and the system, of which they formed a necessary part, having once fallen from its proud pre-eminence, gradually decayed and vanished."

49

["Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods hath he broken unto the ground. O my threshing, and the corn of my floor; that which I have heard of the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, have I declared unto you." Isa. 21:9, 10.]25

28. "So long as Babylon, "the glory of kingdoms," `the praise of the whole earth,' retained her independence, with her vast buildings, her prestige of antiquity, her wealth, her learning, her ancient and grand religious system, she could scarcely fail to be in the eyes of her neighbors the first power in the world, if not in mere strength, yet in honor, dignity, and reputation. Haughty and contemptuous herself to the very last, she naturally imposed on men's minds, alike by her past history and present pretensions; nor was it possible for the Persian monarch to feel that he stood before his subjects as indisputably the foremost man upon the earth until he had humbled in the dust the pride and arrogance of Babylon. But, with the fall of the great city, the whole fabric of Semitic greatness was shattered. Babylon became `an astonishment and a hissing,' -- all her prestige vanished, -- and Persia stepped manifestly into the place, which Assyria had occupied for so many centuries, of absolute and unrivaled mistress of Western Asia."26

1[Page 36] Of the career of Cyrus before the campaign against Babylon, the inscriptions give us only the two passages following: --

"In the month Nisan [547 B. C.] Cyrus, king of the country of Persia, collected his army, and below the city of Arbela crossed the Tigris, and in the month Iyyar, [marched] against the country of the `Sute. He [Istuvegu] gathered [his forces] and against Cyrus the king of Ansan Is [tuvegu][*] marched, and . . . The army of Istuvegu revolted against him and seized [him] with the hands; to Cyrus they de[livered him]. Cyrus (marched) against the country of Agamtanu, [+] the royal city. Silver, gold, goods (and) chattels, [the spoil] of the country of Agamtanu they carried away, and to the country of Ansan he brought. The goods (and) chattels were deposited in [Ansan]. "-- `Records of the Past." New Series. Vol. v. pp. 159, 160.

*[Page 36] The Astyages of the Greek writers.

+ [Page 36] Ecbatana, now Hamadan.

2 [Page 38] Jer. 51:11,28.

3 [Page 38] Isa. 21 : 2; 22:6; Jer. 51: 27.

4 [Page 38] Dan. 8:1, 2.

5 [Page 38] Sayce, "Ancient Empires," chap. iii, par. 46.

6 [Page 38] Rawlinson, Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii, pars. 9, 15, 21, 25.

7 [Page 38] Id. Fourth Monarchy, chap. viii. pars. 47, 57, note 232.

8 [Page 39] Isa. 45: 1-3.

9 [Page 39] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. viii, pars. 47, 49; Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii, pars. 25, 26.

10 [Page 40] Book i, chaps. 189, 190.

11 [Page 40] Jer. 51: 45, 46.

12 [Page 41] Jer. 27: 6, 7; Dan. 5:2, 11, 13, margin.

13 [Page 41] Dan. 5: 10-12.

14 [Page 42] For convenience, from here to the end of this account, the words of the prophecy, with the references, are inserted at the point that marks their fulfilment.

15 [Page 44] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. viii, pars. 47-51.

16 [Page 44] Sunday-School Times, Vol. xxv. No. 42, pp. 659, 660.

17 [Page 46] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. viii, pars. 52-55.

18 [Page 46] The "nomads".

19 [Page 46] The Babylonians. Epithet given to non-Semitic population of Chaldea.

20 [Page 47] From Lake Van in Armenia to the Persian Gulf.

21 [Page 47] Arbela is probably intended.

22 [Page 47] Frontier of Elam.

23[Page 47] Kurdistan.

24[Page 48] "Records of the Past," New Series, Vol. v, pp. 165-168.

25[Page 49] Id. Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii, par. 27.

26[Page 49] Id. par. 26.

4. EMPIRE OF MEDIA AND PERSIA - DARIUS THE MEDE AND CYRUS.

AND Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old;"¹ and reigned two years, 538-536 B. C.

2. Belshazzar having been associated with his father, Nabonadius, in the rulership of the kingdom, this is why it was that when he would offer the highest possible position and reward to whosoever would read for him the terrible writing on the wall, he could bestow only the position of "the third ruler in the kingdom." This was next to the king himself. If there had been but one king, Daniel, in the position to which he was raised, would have been the second ruler in the kingdom; but as there were two kings, the highest possible position for any other was "third ruler." Having thus been by the king exalted to the highest position, next to the throne, he was accordingly clothed "with scarlet," and they "put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning him, that he should be the third ruler in the Kingdom."

3. And now, these two kings being out of the way, when Darius the Median, and Cyrus the Persian, his general, came to inquire into the affairs of Babylon with respect to establishing order and reorganizing the realm, they found Daniel in his royal robe and the insignia of the highest office. And when they asked him about the affairs of the kingdom, its revenues, etc., they found him to be so thoroughly informed, and so able, that they took him into their council, and gave him the chief place in the reorganization of the kingdom. "It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred and twenty princes, which should be over the whole kingdom; and over these

51

three presidents; of whom Daniel was first: that the princes might give accounts unto them, and the king should have no damage. Then this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes, because an excellent spirit was in him; and the king thought to set him over the whole realm."²

4. A new people had now come upon the scene of action. Another kingdom and other rulers were now called by the Most High, and given a charge concerning the world. These must be taught the knowledge of the true God and the principles of His truth. God would now further use His captive people to extend to all peoples, nations, and languages, the knowledge of God and the principles of His truth. And He would make the wrath of man to praise Him.

5. When the other presidents and princes saw that Daniel was preferred before themselves, they were dissatisfied. And when they saw that he was likely to be yet further promoted, they determined to break him down utterly. Accordingly, the whole company of them formed a conspiracy, and diligently "sought to find occasion against Daniel

concerning the kingdom." But with all their diligence, and with all their suspicious and prejudiced care, "they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him."³ There was, however, one last resource which, by a trick, they might employ. They knew that he feared God. They knew that his service of the Lord was actuated by such firm principle that, in rendering that service, he would not dodge, nor compromise, nor swerve one hair's breadth, upon any issue that might be raised. "Then said these

52

men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God."

6. But even in this, there was nothing upon which they might base an "occasion." In order to find it, they would have to create it; and create it they did. Pretending to be great lovers of their country, and to have much and sincere concern for the honor of the king and the preservation of the State, they "assembled together to the king," and proposed "to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree" that whosoever should ask any petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of King Darius, should be cast into the den of lions. They presented the matter in such a plausible way, and with such evident "care for the public good," that Darius was completely deceived, and "signed the writing and the decree."

7. Daniel knew that the writing was signed. He knew that it was now the law, -- and the law of the Medes and Persians, too, which altered not. Yet, knowing all this, "he went into his house," and "kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." He knew perfectly that no law of the Medes and Persians, nor of any other earthly power, could ever of right have anything to say or do with any man's service to God. He went on just as he did aforetime, because, practically and in principle, all things were just as aforetime: so far as concerned the conduct of the man who feared God, any law on that subject was no more than no law at all on that subject.

8. "Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God." They expected to find him praying. That was precisely what they "assembled" for. And Daniel was not afraid that they would find him doing so. He did not go out and advertise that he would do so; neither did he dodge it when his regular time came to pray. He simply proceeded "as he did aforetime." They immediately hurried away to the king, and asked him: "Hast thou not signed a decree, that every man that shall ask a petition of any God or man within thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said, The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and

53

Persians, which altereth not. Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day."

9. Then the king awoke to the fact that he had been trapped, and he "was sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him: and he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him." But the conspirators were persistent to defeat every effort which the king could make. And they had a ready and unanswerable argument against everything that might be proposed. That argument was, The law, the law: "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed." There was no remedy; the law must be enforced. Accordingly, though most reluctantly, "the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions." The king gave him the parting word of faith, "Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee," and went to his palace, and passed the night in fasting and sleeplessness.

10. Thus, according to this scheme of the conspirators, and so far as all human power was concerned, Daniel was finally disposed of, and was out of the way. Just here, however, there entered an element that the conspirators had not taken account of in their calculations. In Media and Persia a new power had been brought to the dominion of all the nations. This was done by the leading of the Lord as really as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar; for, said the angel, "In the first year of Darius the Mede, I stood to confirm and to strengthen him."⁴ It was done also for the same purpose as was that -- that the knowledge of God might be proclaimed to all the nations in such a way that they must at least listen to it, because of its being a royal decree. In addition to this, "the presidents of the kingdom, the governors, and the princes, the counselors, and the captains" of Media and Persia, needed, as well as had Nebuchadnezzar, to be taught that though they had been given, by the Lord, dominion over the nations, yet this dominion was not absolute -- it did not extend to men's relationship to God. These rulers, as well as Nebuchadnezzar,

54

must be taught that there was drawn a line which they must recognize, or else set themselves positively against God himself.

11. "The king arose very early in the morning, and went in haste unto the den of lions," and "cried with a lamentable voice," "O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?" And to the delight of the king, Daniel answered: "O king, live forever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt." That is divine testimony that innocence before God is found in the man who disregards any law touching his service to God. It is also divine testimony that the man who disregards such laws, in so doing does "no hurt" to the king, to the State, nor to the government.

12. "Then King Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for He is the living God, and steadfast forever, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and His dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and He worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions."⁵

13. "Cyrus the Persian" succeeded to the throne of the Medo-Persian Empire in the year 536 B. C. The angel of the Lord stood by Darius the Mede "to confirm and to strengthen him;" and had held Cyrus by the right hand in executing the Lord's purpose and device against Babylon to destroy it. Darius had been brought to the knowledge of the true God; and now the Lord would do the same thing for Cyrus. For "there is no respect of persons with God." As we have seen, the Lord had called Cyrus by name about one hundred and seventy-four years before that king was born. And when Cyrus became sole ruler of the empire, if not before, the scriptures relating to himself were shown to him by Daniel.

14. The Persians in their religious system recognized two great principles, -- Good and Evil. This conception of good and evil,

55

however, did not rise to the height of moral and spiritual good and evil, or righteousness and sin, as is inculcated by the Lord; but rather, what would be counted by men as good and evil in prosperity and adversity, tranquillity and disturbance. Accordingly, when the Lord revealed himself to Cyrus as the only true God, He said to him: "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me. . . . I make peace, and create evil." I make tranquillity and create disturbance; I give prosperity and send adversity.

15. Again: the good principle was represented in the light, and the evil principle in the darkness. Accordingly, when the Lord revealed himself to Cyrus as the only true God, He said to him, "I am the Lord, and there is none else. . . . I form the light, and create darkness."⁶

16. In these scriptures Cyrus found the Lord God of heaven speaking personally to him: "Thus saith the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus," "I will go before thee;" "I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, Jehovah, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. I am Jehovah, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me." "I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded."⁷ This revelation of the Lord to Cyrus was so personal, so plain, and so direct, that Cyrus accepted it, acknowledged Him as "the Lord God of heaven," and declared, "He is the God."⁸

17. Then when Cyrus read the further word of God to himself, -- "that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid;" "I have raised him up

56

in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts,"⁹ -- he accepted that word, and did at once, in his very first year, what the word said.

18. Accordingly: "In the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and He hath charged me to build Him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all His people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (He is the God), which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, beside the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem."¹⁰

19. This decree of Cyrus was proclaimed "throughout his kingdom," and was put also in writing and was deposited among the archives of the kingdom in the palace at Ecbatana, the capital of Media. And under the proclamation, about fifty thousand people assembled to return from their captivity unto Jerusalem. When they were ready to depart, "Cyrus the king brought forth the vessels of the house of the Lord, which Nebuchadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem, and had put them in the house of his gods; even those did Cyrus king of Persia bring forth by the hand of Mithredath, the treasurer, and numbered them unto Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah." "All these did Sheshbazzar bring up with them of the captivity that were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem."¹¹

20. By the seventh month of 536 B. C., the people that returned to Jerusalem had become settled in the land, and had begun the restoration of the worship of the Lord at Jerusalem by setting up the altar and offering burnt offerings; and "from the first day of

57

the seventh month began they to offer burnt offerings unto the Lord. But the foundation of the temple of the Lord was not yet laid." However, in the second month of 535, "the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord." "And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid. But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy: so that the

people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people: for the people shouted with a loud shout, and the noise was heard afar off."12

21. During the time of the desolation of Judea and the captivity in Babylon, the mixed races that had been planted in the region of Samaria, had spread into the desolate land of Judea. These were, at heart, opposed to the restoration of Israel and the establishment of a government by the Jews in that land. But they decided to turn this enterprise to their own advantage in the establishment of their own power there. Accordingly, "they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esarhaddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither. But Zerubbabel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as King. Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us."13

22. When the Samaritans found their purpose thus frustrated, they set on foot a systematic and determined opposition to every thing that the Jews designed to do. They weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building." And in the very face of the decree of Cyrus, they "hired counselors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia." Daniel was still prime minister at the court of Cyrus; and, finding the work in Jerusalem hindered, and his own efforts

58

hampered in the court of Cyrus by these hired counselors, he became greatly concerned for the work of God in the earth. However, instead of attempting to carry on a counter-intrigue against these men, he appealed to God. Accordingly, he says: "In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia," "I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled."14

23. This period began on the third day of the first month of the third year of Cyrus, B. C. 534; for "in the four and twentieth day of the first month," as he was by the side of the river Tigris, the angel of God came in response to his plea and appeal, and said to him, "Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia."15

24. Thus the very first day that Daniel placed before God his appeal in behalf of the cause of God in the earth against the hired counselors at the court of Persia, his appeal was heard, and this angel was sent to the court of Cyrus, and was later joined by Michael, the first of the heavenly princes. However, the Lord did not stop with the sending of these heavenly messengers to the court of Cyrus to support His cause and work in the earth. That which was being done under the decree of Cyrus and by the people in Jerusalem,

was far more than a local issue. Its deep meaning concerned all the earth, and extended to the end of the world.

25. Accordingly, at the end of the three weeks of Daniel's earnest seeking of God, the angel left his place at the court of Cyrus, and met Daniel by the river Tigris, told him what had been done in his behalf there, and then added: "Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days." "Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia:

59

and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. But I will show thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth, and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince."16

26. Then he proceeded to give a circumstantial account of the principal events in the history of the nations from that day to the end of the world. The portion relating to Media and Persia runs thus: "Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia."17

27. Shortly after this, Cyrus determined to achieve the conquest of the country of the Massagetae, which lay east of the sea of Aral, "beyond the river Araxes." "At this time the Massagetae were ruled by a queen named Tomyris, who at the death of her husband, the late king, had mounted the throne." -- Herodotus.18 Cyrus, with his army, crossed the Araxes, marched a day's journey into the country of the Massagetae, and by a surprise destroyed or captured nearly "one third of their entire army." Then Tomyris "collected all the forces of her kingdom, and gave him battle." "Of all the combats in which the barbarians have engaged among themselves, I reckon this to have been the fiercest. The following, as I understand, was the manner of it: First, the two armies stood apart and shot their arrows at each other; then, when their quivers were empty, they closed and fought hand to hand, with lances and daggers; and thus they continued fighting for a length of time, neither choosing to give ground. At length the Massagetae prevailed. The greater part of the army of the Persians was destroyed, and Cyrus himself fell, after reigning nine and twenty years." [B. C. 529.] -- Herodotus.19

28. His body was conveyed by his retreating troops to Pasargadae, and was there deposited in a great tomb built especially for the purpose, which is still standing in an area marked by pillars

60

upon which "occurs repeatedly the inscription (written both in Persian and in the so-called Median), 'I am Cyrus the king, the Achaemenian.'" His name, titles, and descent, as recorded by himself, are as follows: --

"I (am) Cyrus the king of multitudes, the great king, the powerful king, the king of Babylon, the king of Sumer and Accad, the king of the four zones, the son of Kambyases, the great king, the king of the city of Ansan; the grandson of Cyrus the great king, the king of the city of Ansan; the great-grandson of Teispes, the great king, the king of the city of Ansan; of the ancient seed-royal, whose rule Bel and Nebo love, whose sovereignty they desire according to the goodness of their hearts."

1 [Page 50] Dan. 5:31.

2 [Page 51] Dan. 6:1-3. This arrangement of three chief officers, of whom one of the three was chief, corresponded to the governmental system established by David, -- as any one can see by reading 1 Chron. 11:6, 11, 12, 21, -- and plainly could have been adopted only at the suggestion of Daniel himself.

3 [Page 51] What a commendation is that for a man of business in public affairs! Think what a test it was that was put upon Daniel. Everything that occurred in his daily business was watched and spied upon with the closest possible scrutiny, and with the definite purpose to find every fault that could be found. Every document that passed his hand every item of business that arose in connection with his office, every direction that he gave, even every word that he spoke, was watched with the most jealous and suspicious prejudice. Yet these envious men exhausted every device and every means of information, only in vain; and were compelled to confess their complete failure. No fault, and not even an error, could be found in Daniel's conduct of the business of the empire.

4 [Page 53] Dan. 11:1.

5 [Page 54] Dan. 6:21-27.

6 [Page 55] Isa. 45:5-7. This good principle was personified under the name of "Ormazd," and the evil principle under the name of "Ahriman." Later, the sun was adopted into the worship as the embodiment of the good principle, or light; and when the sun had set, and the darkness of night came on fire was used as representing the good principle. Thus the people came at last to be sun-worshipers and fire-worshipers.

7 [Page 55] Isa. 45:1-12.

8 [Page 55] Ezra 1:3.

- 9 [Page 56] Isa. 44:26: 45:13.
- 10 [Page 56] Ezra 1:1-14.
- 11 [Page 56] Ezra 1:7, 8, 11.
- 12 [Page 57] Ezra 3:10-13.
- 13 [Page 57] Ezra 4:2, 3.
- 14 [Page 58] Dan. 10:1-3.
- 15 [Page 58] Dan. 10:12, 13.
- 16 [Page 59] Dan. 10:14, 20, 21.
- 17 [Page 59] Dan. 11: 1, 2.
- 18 [Page 59] Book i. chap. 205.
- 19 [Page 59] Book i, chap. 214.

5. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA – CAMBYSES AND "SMERDIS."

CAMBYSES, the son of Cyrus, succeeded immediately to the throne of the Medo-Persian Empire, near the beginning of the year 529 B. C. There was a second son, named Smerdis; but Cambyses caused him to be secretly murdered.

2. The Samaritans, who had opposed the building of Jerusalem and the establishment of Israel in Palestine, and who had hired counselors to frustrate that purpose "all the days of Cyrus king of Persia," continued the same opposition in the reign of Cambyses; for "in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem."¹ There is no known record that any notice was taken of their accusation; and the work of restoration in Jerusalem and Judea continued, though meeting many hindrances.

3. When Daniel saw in vision, about 539, the ram which the angel said represented Media and Persia, it was pushing westward, and northward, and southward. We have seen that before the capture of Babylon, Cyrus, in behalf of the united nations, had extended their power westward as far as the Aegean Sea and the river of Egypt. Now, 525 B. C., Cambyses carried their power southward over all Egypt, and as far as Ethiopia. "Vast warlike preparations preceded the expedition. The Greeks of Asia Minor, the Cyprians, who had just submitted, and the Phenicians had to furnish the fleet. A countryman of Herodotus, the mercenary captain Phanes of Halicarnassus, deserted from the Egyptians to the Persians, and made himself very useful in the conquest. It seems that only one great battle was fought, at Pelusium, the gateway of Egypt. The Egyptians, utterly beaten, fled to Memphis, which

62

soon fell into the enemy's hands. Thus Egypt became a province of Persia; and a pretext was soon found for executing the captured king Psammenitus. This was followed by the submission of the neighboring Libyans and the princes of the Greek cities of Cyrene and Barca."²

4. He contemplated carrying an expedition against Carthage; but this could not be done with any prospect of success without a fleet, and as his fleet was largely made up of the Phenicians, who refused to take any part in any attack upon Carthage, because the Carthaginians were originally their own colonists, this scheme had to be given up. He sent an army of fifty thousand to make the conquest of No Ammon; but the whole company perished in the sands of the desert which they were obliged to cross to reach their intended destination. Personally, he led a much larger army toward the southern frontier of Ethiopia; but for lack of supplies, was obliged to return without having accomplished anything that he intended. But from the Mediterranean Sea to Meroe, "Egypt became for a full generation the obsequious slave of Persia, and gave no more trouble to her subjugator than the meekest or the most contented of the provinces." --

Rawlinson.³ Having thus reduced to subjection the whole of Egypt and Ethiopia, Cambyses started on his return to his capital.

5. When Cambyses caused the murder of his brother Smerdis, it was done with so much secrecy that the great body of the people believed him to be still alive. This resulted in the rise of a certain Gomates, who claimed to be the true Smerdis. Because of the general belief of the people that Smerdis was alive, and because Gomates bore such a close resemblance to Smerdis, this false Smerdis was readily received as the true. Cambyses having been long absent in the far-away country of Egypt, and even Ethiopia, under all the circumstances it was easy for Gomates to fix himself firmly upon the throne of united Persia and Media.

6. The original account of this is that "Cambyses, son of Cyrus, was king. . . . This Cambyses had a brother, named Smerdis (Bardiya),

63

they had the same mother and the same father. Afterward, this Cambyses killed Smerdis. When Cambyses killed Smerdis, the people did not know that Smerdis was killed. Then Cambyses went to Egypt. The people became bad, and many falsehoods grew up in the provinces, as well as in Persia, as in Media, as in the other lands. And then a man, a Magian, named Gomates, from Pasargadae, near the mount named Arakadris, there he arose. On the 14th day of the month Viyakhna, thus he arose: To the people he told lies, and said: 'I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses.' Then all the people revolted from Cambyses, went over to him, and the Persians, and the Medes, and the other nations. He seized the kingdom. On the 9th day of the month Garmapada he took the royalty from Cambyses. . . . Gomates the Magian deprived Cambyses as well of the Persians, as of the Medians, as of the other nations; he did according to his own will, and seized the royalty over them." -- Darius.⁴

7. Cambyses, on his way back to Persia, had reached Syria, when he was met by one of the many heralds whom Gomates had sent "through all the land, to Egypt and elsewhere, to make proclamation to the troops that henceforth they were to obey Smerdis the son of Cyrus, and not Cambyses." The herald, "finding Cambyses and his army there, went straight into the middle of the host, and standing forth before them all, made the proclamation." -- Herodotus.⁵

8. "Then Cambyses died, killing himself" (Darius),⁶ having "reigned in all seven years and five months, and left no issue behind him, male or female." -- (Herodotus.⁷ This was in the end of July, B. C. 522.

9. This Gomates, the false Smerdis, was a Magian, and was largely ruled by the Magian priests. He made it his chief purpose to make the Median influence, and also the Median religion, once more predominant in the united empire. This was a point which the Samaritans found to their advantage in their opposition to the

restoration of the government in Jerusalem. Knowing that this false Smerdis, being opposed to the Persian influences, would be glad of whatever accusations he might receive; and it having been a decree of Cyrus the Persian which restored the Jews to their own land, and under which they had so far steadily carried on the work of restoration, in spite of all opposition; the Samaritans reckoned that now under the new order of things they should surely succeed in putting a stop to that work.

10. Accordingly, "in the days of Artaxerxes [the false Smerdis]8 wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of their companions, unto Artaxerxes king of Persia; and the writing of the letter was written in the Syrian tongue, and interpreted in the Syrian tongue. Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king in this sort: --

"Rehum the chancellor, and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions; the Dinaites, the Apharsathchites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Susanchites, the Dehavites, and the Elamites, and the rest of the nations whom the great and noble Asnapper brought over, and set in the cities of Samaria, and the rest that are on this side the river, and at such a time. . . . Thy servants the men on this side the river, and at such a time. Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations. Be it known now unto the king, that, if this city be builded, and the walls set up again, then will they not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and so thou shalt endamage the revenue of the kings. Now because we have maintenance from the king's palace, and it was not meet for us to see the king's dishonor, therefore have we sent and certified the king; that search may be made in the book of the records of thy fathers: so shalt thou find in the book of the records, and know that this city is a rebellious city, and hurtful unto kings and provinces, and that they have moved sedition within the same of old time: for which cause was this city destroyed. We certify the king that, if this city be builded again, and the walls thereof set up, by this means thou shalt have no portion on this side the river.

11. "Then sent the king an answer unto Rehum the chancellor, and to Shimshai the scribe, and to the rest of their companions that dwell in Samaria, and unto the rest beyond the river: --

"Peace, and at such a time. The letter which ye sent unto us hath been plainly read before me. And I commanded, and search hath been made, and it is found that this city of old time hath made insurrection against kings, and that rebellion and sedition have been made therein. There have been mighty kings also over Jerusalem, which have ruled over all countries beyond the river; and toll, tribute, and custom, was paid unto them. Give ye now commandment to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until

another commandment shall be given from me. Take heed now that ye fail not to do this: why should damage grow to the hurt of the kings?

12. "Now when the copy of King Artaxerxes' letter was read before Rehum, and Shimshai the scribe, and their companions, they went up in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power. Then ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem."⁹

13. As to his reign generally, though "he sent round to every nation under his rule, and granted them freedom from war-service and from taxes for the space of three years" (Herodotus), yet otherwise "the people feared him utterly. He killed many people who had known the former Smerdis. He killed many persons for the following reason, thinking: 'May they not acknowledge me that I am not Smerdis, son of Cyrus?' " (Darius.) His career, however, was very short. In the eighth month of his reign, a conspiracy was formed by seven chief men, of whom the leader was Darius, the son of Hystaspes, a Persian.

14. Of this transaction "Darius the king says: There was neither a man in Persia, nor a Median, nor any one of our race who would have dispossessed Gomates the Magian of the kingdom. Nobody dared to say about Gomates the Magian, anything whatever, until I came. By the grace of Ormazd, on the 10th day of the month of Bagayadis, then accompanied by a few men, I killed Gomates the Magian, and with him the men who were his principal adherents. There is a fortress, named Sikhyuvatis, in the country called Nisaea, in Media; there I killed him, I dispossessed him of the royalty, by the grace of Ormazd, I had the kingly power, Ormazd gave to me the royalty.

15. "And Darius the king says: Intaphernes by name, son of Oeospares, a Persian; and Otanes by name, son of Sochres, a

66

Persian; and Gobryas, by name, son of Mardonius, a Persian; and Hydarnes, by name, son of Megabignes, a Persian; and Megabyzus, by name, son of Dadyes, a Persian; and Ardumanes, by name, son of Ochus, a Persian; these men accompanied me, when I killed Gomates the Magian, who said: 'I am Smerdis, son of Cyrus.' And henceforth these men were my companions. Thou, who wilt be king in future times, protect always that sort of men." -- Darius.¹⁰

1 [Page 61] Ezra 4:6.

2 [Page 62] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Persia.

3 [Page 62] "Seven Great Monarchies, "Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii. par. 42.

4 [Page 63] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. vii, pp. 89.90

5 [Page 63] Book iii, chaps. 61, 62.

6 [Page 63] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. vii. p. 90.

7 [Page 63] Book iii, chap. 66.

8 [Page 64] That the Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:6-11 were none other than Cambyses and the false Smerdis, is certain from the fact that they stand there definitely between Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes, and Cambyses and the false Smerdis were the only ones between Cyrus and Darius. The difference in names between the Hebrew and the Persian records is not strange.

9 [Page 65] Ezra 4:7-24.

10 [Page 66] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. vii. pp. 90, 91, 108.

6. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA - DARIUS.

DARIUS himself took the throne, 521 B. C., early in the year. Next to Cyrus, he seems to have been the greatest of the kings of Persia. His genealogy he gives as thus: --

"I am Darius, the great king, the king of kings, the king of the Persians, the king of the lords, the son of Hystaspes, the grandson of Arsames, the Achaemenian.

"And Darius the king says: My father is Hystaspes; and the father of Hystaspes's father was Ariaramnes; and Ariaramnes's father was Teispes; and Teispes's father was Achaemenes.

"And Darius the king says: On that account we called ourselves Achaemenian of race: from ancient times we have been mighty, from ancient times we have been kings.

"And Darius the king says: Eight kings of my race have before me held the kingdom. I am the ninth, who hold the kingdom. Twice have we been kings."

2. Further, "Darius the king says: The kingdom which had been robbed from our race, I restored it. I put again in its place. AS it had been before me, thus I did. I re-established the temples of the gods which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, and I reinstituted, in favor of the people, the calendar and the holy language, and I gave back to the families what Gomates the Magian had taken away. And I replaced (the) people in their ancient state, as well the Persians, as the Medians, as the other nations, just as they had been before. I restored what had been robbed. . . . Thus I did; I made great efforts, until I established again our house in its state, as it had been before: and thus I made my efforts. . . . as if Gomates the Magian had never dispossessed our family."1

3. In the second year of Darius -- 520 B. C. -- the work of restoration at Jerusalem was again taken up with vigor, at the call of God by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. "In the sixth month,

68

in the first day of the month," "in the second year of Darius," the people were commanded and urged by the Lord through Haggai to "go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house;" and on the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month, that same year, Zerubbabel the governor, and "Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest," and "all the remnant of the people," "came and did work in the house of the Lord of Hosts, their God."2

4. No sooner was the work begun, than the Samaritans were all alive again. This time, however, the man who was governor of Samaria, and his companions, were much more fair-minded than those who had carried on the former opposition. Tatnai was now

governor of Samaria, and Shethar-boznai was his chief assistant. They and their companions came up to Jerusalem, and inquired, "Who hath commanded you to build this house, and to make up this wall?" and, "What are the names of the men that make this building?"³ They tried to stop the work on the building; but the decree of the false Smerdis was of no avail any more, since he was dead. And the Jews having the decree of Cyrus, whom they knew was respected by Darius; and, knowing the work of restoration that was being carried on by Darius against the reaction attempted by the Magians through the false Smerdis, they were rather anxious that this cause should be brought to the notice of Darius. And being still urged on by the prophets, they refused to receive any commands from the Samaritans or to pay any attention to their wishes.

5. The twenty-first day of the seventh month of this same year, came the word of the Lord again to Haggai, "Be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work: for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts."⁴ In the eighth month of this year, came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah the prophet, also urging the people to the work.⁵

6. The Samaritans, seeing the work going prosperously on in spite of them, drew up a letter to Darius, of which the following is a copy: --

"Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king, that we went into the province of Judea, to the house of the great God, which

69

is builded with great stones, and timber is laid in the walls, and this work goeth fast on, and prospereth in their hands. Then asked we those elders, and said unto them thus, Who commanded you to build this house, and to make up these walls? We asked their names also, to certify thee, that we might write the names of the men that were the chief of them. And thus they returned us answer, saying,

"We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and build the house that was builded these many years ago, which a great king of Israel builded and set up. But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed this house, and carried the people away into Babylon. But in the first year of Cyrus the king of Babylon the same King Cyrus made a decree to build this house of God. And the vessels also of gold and silver of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took out of the temple that was in Jerusalem, and brought them into the temple of Babylon, those did Cyrus the king take out of the temple of Babylon, and they were delivered unto one, whose name was Sheshbazzar whom he had made governor; and said unto him, Take these vessels, go, carry them into the temple that is in Jerusalem, and let the house of God be builded in his place. Then came the same Sheshbazzar, and laid the foundation of the house of God which is in Jerusalem: and since that time even until now hath it been in building, and yet it is not finished.

"Now therefore, if it seem good to the king, let there be search made in the king's treasure-house, which is there at Babylon, whether it be so, that a decree was made of Cyrus the king to build this house of God at Jerusalem, and let the king send his pleasure to us concerning this matter."⁶

7. "Then Darius the king made a decree, and search was made in the house of the rolls, where the treasures were laid up in Babylon. And there was found at Achmetha [Ecbatana], in the palace that is in the province of the Medes, a roll, and therein was a record thus written: --

"In the first year of Cyrus the king, the same Cyrus the king made a decree concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits, with three rows of great stones, and a row of new timber: and let the expenses be given out of the king's house: and also let the golden and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which is at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which is at Jerusalem, every one to his place, and place them in the house of God."

70

8. Upon this Darius wrote: "Now therefore, Tatnai, governor beyond the river, Shetharboznai, and your companions the Apharsachites, which are beyond the river, be ye far from thence: let the work of this house of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in his place.

9. "Moreover I make a decree what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews for the building of this house of God: that of the king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the river, forthwith expenses be given unto these men, that they be not hindered. And that which they have need of, both young bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for the burnt offerings of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the priests which are at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail: that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savors unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king, and of his sons.

10. "Also I have made a decree, that whosoever shall alter this word, let timber be pulled down from his house, and being set up, let him be hanged thereon; and let his house be made a dunghill for this. And the God that hath caused his name to dwell there destroy all kings and people, that shall put to their hand to alter and to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem. I Darius have made a decree; let it be done with speed.

11. "Then Tatnai, governor on this side the river, Shetharboznai, and their companions, according to that which Darius the king had sent, so they did speedily. And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo."⁷

12. The twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, in this same year, came the word of the Lord to Haggai again, saying : "Consider now from this day and upward, from the four and twentieth day of the ninth month, even from the day that the foundation of the Lord's temple was laid, consider it. Is the seed yet in the barn? yea, as yet the vine, and the fig-tree, and the pomegranate, and the olive tree, hath not brought forth: from this day will I bless you."⁸ Also the word of the Lord came again to Haggai that same day.

71

13. The twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month of this same year, came the word of the Lord a second time to Zechariah, "in the fourth day of the ninth month, in Chisleu," at which time there was given that portion of scripture contained in the last seven chapters of Zechariah. And "in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king" (517 B. C.), "this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar [the twelfth month]."⁹

14. "And Darius the king says: These are the countries which called themselves mine: . . . Persia and the Amardes (Susians), and the Babylonians, and the Assyrians, and the Arabs, and the Egyptians, and the maritime people, and the Sapardes, and the Ionians, and the Medes, and the Armenians, and the Cappadocians, and the Parthians, and the Sarandians, and the Arians, and the Chorasmians, and Bactria, and the Sogdians, and the Paropamisus, and the Saces, and Sattagydia, and Arachosia, in all twenty-three provinces. These are the provinces which called themselves mine. . . . To me they made subjection, brought tribute to me, what was ordered by me unto them in the night-time as well as in the daytime, that they executed In these provinces, the man who was a friend, I cherished him, the man who was an enemy, I punished him thoroughly In these lands, my law was observed: what was ordered unto them by me, that they executed.

15. "And Darius the king says: When I killed Gomates the Magian, then a Susian, named Assina, son of Umbadaranma, rose in Susiana, and said: 'I have the kingdom over the Susians.' Then the Susians revolted from me and went over to this Assina, and he had the kingdom over the Susians. And also a man named Nidintabel, a Babylonian, son of Ainairi, he arose in Babylon, and spoke thus to the people, lying: 'I am Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabonadius.' Then all the people of the Babylonians went over to this Nidintabel. Then the Babylonians made defection, and he seized the kingly power over the Babylonians.

16. "And Darius the king says: Then I sent an ambassador to the Susians. This Assina was taken, bound, and brought to me: then I killed him. Then I marched against Babylon, against this Nidintabel,

72

who said: 'I am Nebuchadnezzar.' The army of Nidintabel was ranged on the river named Tigris. It occupied the banks of the Tigris, and was massed on ships. Then my army was divided into small groups. The one I put on camels, the other I made ride on horseback . .

. . We crossed the Tigris. There I killed the army of Nidintabel. On the 26th day of the month Athriyadiya, then it was that we fought the battle, then I killed a great quantity of people. Then I went to Babylon. I had not yet arrived under (the walls) of Babylon, when, at the town named Zazana, on the bank of the Euphrates, Nidintabel who said, 'I am Nebuchadnezzar' went against me, with his army, in order to fight a battle . . . I destroyed the army of this Nidintabel. It was on the second day of the month Anamaka that we delivered thus the battle. I killed a great deal of the army of this Nidintabel, and I made them fly into the river; in this river they were drowned. Then Nidintabel fled with a few horsemen and reached Babylon. Then I marched against Babylon . . . I took also Babylon, as I made captive Nidintabel. I killed this Nidintabel in Babylon.

17. "And Darius the king says: Whilst I was at Babylon, these provinces rebelled against me: Persia, and the Susians, and the Medes, and Assyria, and the Egyptians, and the Parthians, and the Margians, and Sattagydia, and the Saces."¹⁰

18. It would be too tedious to follow in detail the campaigns which were made in subduing all these revolts. The summary which Darius himself made and put on record will be sufficient. "Darius the king says: This is what I have done; I did it always by the grace of Ormazd. This I did: I fought nineteen battles, . . . I defeated the armies. I took nine kings: --

"One named Gaumata the Magian, who lied and said: 'I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus,' he caused the revolt of Persia.

"And a Susian, named Assina, who caused the revolt of Susians, and said: 'I exercise the kingly power over the Susians.'

"And a Babylonian, named Nidintabel, lied and said: 'I am Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabonadius,' he caused the revolt of the Babylonians.

"And a Persian, named Martiya, he lied and said: 'I am Immanes, king of the Susians,' he caused the revolt of the Susians.

73

"And a Mede, named Phraortes, who lied and said: 'I am Sattarritta, of the race of Vak-istarra,' he caused the revolt of the Medians.

"And a Sagartian, named Cithrantakhma, who lied and said: 'I exercise the kingly power, I am of the race of Vak-istarra,' he caused the revolt of the Sagartians.

"And a Margian named Frada, who lied and said: 'I exercise the kingly power over the Margians,' and he caused the revolt of the Margians.

"And a Persian, named Oeosdates, who lied and said: 'I am Smerdis, son of Cyrus,' and he caused the revolt of Persia.

"And a Babylonian who lied and said: 'I am Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabonadius,' who caused the revolt of the Babylonians.

"These are the nine kings whom I took in the battles.

19. "And Darius the king says: These are the provinces which revolted. The demon of the lie excited them to rebellion, that these provinces revolted. And afterward Ormazd gave them unto my hand, and what was my will, was executed by them. Thou, O king, who wilt be in future, who is friend, protect him always: the man who lies, always punish him severely. If thou sayest: 'So it may be,' then my land will stand forever. And thou, who in future days shalt peruse this tablet, which I made, believe that which is written in this tablet, and do not say: 'They are lies.' May I die as a Mazdaean, as this is true. I never uttered a lie in all my life."¹¹

1 [Page 67] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. vii, pp. 87, 88, 91, 92.

2 [Page 68] Haggai 1.

3 [Page 68] Ezra 5:3, 4.

4 [Page 68] Haggai 2:1-4.

5 [Page 68] Zech. 1:1.

6 [Page 69] Ezra 5:7-17.

7 [Page 70] Ezra 6:1-14.

8 [Page 70] Haggai 2:18, 19.

9 [Page 71] Ezra 6:15.

10 [Page 72] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. vii, pp. 92-95.

11 [Page 73] Id., pp. 104-106.

7. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- DARIUS.

IN SCYTHIA AND AT MARATHON.

DARIUS having put down all these aspirants to the throne, determined to extend his conquests and enlarge his dominions. In the vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel, the ram representing Media and Persia, was pushing westward, northward, and southward. Cyrus had carried their arms westward to the AEgean Sea, and Cambyses southward to Ethiopia. Now Darius fulfills the other specification and carries the boundaries of the empire yet farther westward, and also northward.

2. Controlling already all the East to the borders of India, -- for "of the greater part of Asia Darius was the discoverer" -- (Herodotus),¹ -- and there not being any room for conquest toward the south, only the west and the north remained open. Accordingly, Darius, in 516 B. C., gathered "the whole force of his empire," both army and navy, for the purpose of invading Scythia. The army, led by Darius himself, marched through Asia Minor to the shore of the Bosphorus, about half-way between the Black Sea and the point where Constantinople now lies. There his navy met him. A bridge of boats was made across the Bosphorus, upon which the army crossed. After the army had crossed, the "fleet was sent forward into the Euxine [Black Sea] to the mouth of the Danube, with orders to sail up the river two days' journey above the point where its channel begins to divide, and to throw a bridge of boats over it."

3. Darius, from the western shore of the Bosphorus, continued "his march through Thrace, receiving the submission of the various Thracian tribes in his way, and subduing others -- especially the Getae north of Mt. Haemus [the Balkans], who were compelled to

75

increase still further the numbers of his army. On arriving at the Danube, he found the bridge finished and prepared for his passage by the Ionians." Upon this second bridge of boats "he crossed this greatest of all earthly rivers [for so the Danube was imagined to be in the fifth century before Christ], and directed his march into Scythia." -- Grote. 2

4. The Scythians being a people without cities, or even houses, and not caring to engage in a pitched battle, Darius was obliged to spend the period of his invasion (more than two months) in marching through the country. (515 B. C.) Herodotus says that he marched to the east as far as the river Tanais (the Don), and then turned northward and westward; but finally becoming weary of chasing the phantom army of the Scythians, he turned from everything, and made his way as fast as possible again to the Danube, where he had left his navy and the bridge of boats. The Scythians perceiving this, started also to the Danube, and being perfectly acquainted with the country, arrived there a considerable time before Darius.

5. As the naval forces were all Greeks, the Scythians tried hard to persuade the commanders who were in charge of the fleet to break up the bridge of boats and sail away, leaving Darius to perish. The Greeks, however, remained loyal to Darius. However, in order to make a show of complying with the wish of the Scythians, and also to prevent them from forcing a passage over the bridge, the Greeks did break up the bridge for a considerable distance from the northern shore, pretending thus to have turned against Darius and to wish his destruction. They succeeded in ridding themselves entirely of the Scythians by inviting them to do their part against Darius by marching back inland to meet him. The Scythians did so; but, taking a wrong route, missed him. Darius, therefore, reached the Danube in safety, but only to find, as he supposed, the bridge gone. "It was night when they arrived, and their terror, when they found the bridge broken up, was great; for they thought that perhaps the Ionians had deserted them."

6. However, they thought of trying the expedient of calling across the water, in the hope that the voice might reach, perhaps,

76

some remnant of their supposedly vanished navy. "Now there was in the army of Darius a certain man, an Egyptian, who had a louder voice than any other man in the world. This person was bid by Darius to stand at the water's edge, and call Histaeus the Milesian. The fellow did as he was bid; and Histaeus, hearing him at the very first summons, brought the fleet to assist in conveying the army across, and once more made good the bridge.

7. "By these means the Persians escaped from Scythia, while the Scythians sought for them in vain, again missing their track. And hence the Scythians are accustomed to say of the Ionians, by way of reproach, that, if they be looked upon as freemen, they are the basest and most dastardly of all mankind; but if they be considered as under servitude, they are the faithfulest of slaves, and the most fondly attached to their lords. Darius, having passed through Thrace, reached Sestos in the Chersonese, whence he crossed by the help of his fleet into Asia, leaving a Persian, named Megabazus, commander on the European side." Herodotus. 3

8. "The Persians left behind by King Darius in Europe, who had Megabazus for their general, reduced, before any other Hellespontine State, the people of Perinthus, who had no mind to become subjects of the king." But "the Perinthians, after a brave struggle for freedom, were overcome by numbers, and yielded to Megabazus and his Persians. After Perinthus had been brought under, Megabazus led his host through Thrace, subduing to the dominion of the king all the towns and all the nations of those parts. For the king's command to him was that he should conquer Thrace." -- Herodotus. 4

9. Megabazus, having accomplished the conquest of all Thrace, "sent into Macedonia an embassy of Persians, choosing for the purpose the seven men of most note in all the army after himself. These persons were to go to Amyntas, and require him to give earth and water to Darius" as tokens of their submission to the power of Persia. The Macedonians

gave the required tokens; but at a feast which was given in their honor, the Persians acted so offensively that they were all murdered.

77

10. "Not very long afterward the Persians made strict search for their lost embassy; but Alexander [the son of Amyntas], with much wisdom, hushed up the business, bribing those sent on the errand, partly with money, and partly with the gift of his own sister Gygaea, whom he gave in marriage to Bubares, a Persian, the chief leader of the expedition which came in search of the lost men." But the Macedonian king having given to the Persians earth and water, the tokens of submission, Macedonia was held as a province of the Persian Empire.

11. After this there was a revolt of the Ionians, or Greeks of Asia Minor, 500-495 B. C., in which they were joined by their brethren of the islands along the coast, and with which the States of Greece itself, especially Eretria and Athens, so much sympathized as to be drawn into it. The Athenians and Ionians captured and burned Sardis, the capital of Lydia. Darius "no sooner understood what had happened, than, laying aside all thought concerning the Ionians, who would, he was sure, pay dear for their rebellion, he asked 'who the Athenians were,' and, being informed, called for his bow, and placing an arrow on the string, shot upward into the sky, saying, as he let fly the shaft, 'Grant me, Jupiter, to revenge myself on the Athenians!' After this speech, he bade one of his servants every day, when his dinner was spread, three times repeat these words to him, 'Master, remember the Athenians.'" -- Herodotus. 5

12. The Ionians did indeed pay dear for their rebellion. First their fleet was completely defeated and scattered by the Persians, then Miletus, their principal city, was besieged and taken, and all its people were reduced to slavery. "The naval armament of the Persians wintered at Miletus, and in the following year proceeded to attack the islands along the coast, Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos, which were reduced without difficulty. Whenever they became masters of an island, the barbarians, in every single instance, netted the inhabitants. Now the mode in which they practise this netting is the following: Men join hands, so as to form a line across from the north coast to the south, and then march through the island from

78

end to end and hunt out the inhabitants. In like manner the Persians took also the Ionian towns on the mainland, not, however, netting the inhabitants, as it was not possible.

13. "And now their generals made good all the threats wherewith they had menaced the Ionians before the battle. For no sooner did they get possession of the towns than they chose out the best favored of the boys and made them eunuchs, while the most beautiful girls they tore from their homes and sent as presents to the king, at the same time burning the cities themselves, with the temples. Thus were the Ionians for the third time reduced to slavery: once by the Lydians, and the second, and now a third time, by the Persians.

14. "The sea force, after quitting Ionia, proceeded to the Hellespont, and took all the towns which lie on the left shore as one sails into the straits. For the cities on the right bank had already been reduced by the land force of the Persians." -- Herodotus. 6

15. Having thus wreaked his vengeance on the Ionians, Darius was now ready to start an expedition to punish Athens. Accordingly he made great preparations, and "the next spring Darius superseded all the other generals, and sent down Mardonius, the son of Gobryas, to the coast, and with him a vast body of men, some fit for sea, others for land service. Mardonius was a youth at this time, and had only lately married Artazostra, the king's daughter. When Mardonius, accompanied by this numerous host, reached Cilicia, he took ship, and proceeded alongshore with his fleet, while the land army marched under other leaders toward the Hellespont. In the course of his voyage along the coast of Asia he came to Ionia; and here . . . Mardonius put down all the despots throughout Ionia, and in lieu of them established democracies. Having so done, he hastened to the Hellespont; and when a vast multitude of ships had been brought together, and likewise a powerful land force, he conveyed his troops across the strait by means of his vessels, and proceeded through Europe against Eretria and Athens.

16. "At least these towns served as a pretext for the expedition, the real purpose of which was to subjugate as a great a number as

79

possible of the Grecian cities; and this became plain when the Thasians, who did not even lift a hand in their defense, were reduced by the sea force, while the land army added the Macedonians to the former slaves of the king. All the tribes on the hither side of Macedonia had been reduced previously. From Thasos the fleet stood across to the mainland, and sailed alongshore to Acanthus, whence an attempt was made to double Mount Athos. But here a violent north wind sprang up, against which nothing could contend, and handled a large number of the ships with much rudeness, shattering them and driving them aground upon Athos. 'Tis said the number of the ships destroyed was a little short of three hundred, and the men who perished were more than twenty thousand. For the sea about Athos abounds in monsters beyond all others, and so a portion were seized and devoured by these animals, while others were dashed violently against the rocks; some, who did not know how to swim, were engulfed, and some died of the cold.

17. "While thus it fared with the fleet, on land Mardonius and his army were attacked in their camp during the night by the Brygi, a tribe of Thracians and here vast numbers of the Persians were slain, and even Mardonius himself received a wound. The Brygi, nevertheless, did not succeed in maintaining their own freedom; for Mardonius would not leave the country till he had subdued them and made them subjects of Persia. Still, though he brought them under the yoke, the blow which his land force had received at their hands and the great damage done to his fleet off Athos, induced him to set out upon his retreat; and so this armament, having failed disgracefully, returned to Asia." -- Herodotus.⁷

18. The next year, 490 B. C., Darius, in order to discover whether the Greeks "were inclined to resist him in arms or prepared to make their submission," "sent out heralds in divers directions round about Greece, with orders to demand everywhere earth and water for the king. At the same time he send other heralds to the various seaport towns which paid him tribute, and required them to provide a number of ships of war and horse-transports. These towns accordingly began their preparations, and the heralds who had

80

been sent into Greece obtained what the king had bid them ask from a large number of the States upon the mainland, and likewise from all the islanders whom they visited. Among these last were included the Eginetans, who, equally with the rest, consented to give earth and water to the Persian king.

19. "When the Athenians heard what the Eginetans had done, believing that it was from enmity to themselves that they had given consent, and that the Eginetans intended to join the Persian in his attack upon Athens, they straightway took the matter in hand. In good truth it greatly rejoiced them to have so fair a pretext, and accordingly they sent frequent embassies to Sparta, and made it a charge against the Eginetans that their conduct in this matter proved them to be traitors to Greece."⁸ The Eginetans resented this interference on the part of Athens, which brought on war between them; and while the "war raged between the Eginetans and Athenians," "the Persian pursued his own design, from day to day exhorted by his servant to 'remember the Athenians,' and likewise urged continually by the Pisistratidae, who were ever accusing their countrymen."⁹

20. "Moreover it pleased him well to have a pretext for carrying war into Greece, and so he might reduce all those who had refused to give him earth and water. As for Mardonius, since his expedition had succeeded so ill, Darius took the command of the troops from him, and appointed other generals in his stead, who were to lead the host against Eretria and Athens; to wit, Datis, who was by descent a Mede, and Artaphernes, the son of Artaphernes, his own nephew. These men received orders to carry Athens and Eretria away captive, and to bring the prisoners into his presence.

21. "So the new commanders took their departure from the court and went down to Cilicia, to the Aleian Plain, having with them a numerous and well-appointed land army. Encamping here, they were joined by the sea force which had been required of the several States, and at the same time by the horse-transports which

81

Darius had, the year before, commanded his tributaries to make ready. Aboard these the horses were embarked, and the troops were received by the ships of war; after which the whole fleet, amounting in all to six hundred triremes,¹⁰ made sail for Ionia. Thence, instead of proceeding with a straight course along the shore to the Hellespont and to Thrace, they loosed from Samos and voyaged across the Icarian Sea through the midst of

the islands; mainly, as I believe, because they feared the danger of doubling Mount Athos, where the year before they had suffered so grievously on their passage.

22. "When the Persians, therefore, approaching from the Icarian Sea, cast anchor at Naxos, which, recollecting what there befell them formerly, they had determined to attack before any other State, the Naxians, instead of encountering them, took to flight, and hurried off to the hills. The Persians, however, succeeded in laying hands on some, and them they carried away captive, while at the same time they burnt all the temples, together with the town. This done, they left Naxos, and sailed away to the other islands. While the Persians were thus employed, the Delians likewise quitted Delos, and took-refuge in Tenos. And now the expedition drew near, when Datis sailed forward in advance of the other ships, which he commanded, instead of anchoring at Delos, to rendezvous at Rhenea, over against Delos, while he himself proceeded to discover whither the Delians had fled. . . .

23. "After this he sailed with his whole host against Eretria, taking with him both Ionians and AEolians. When he was departed, Delos (as the Delians told me) was shaken by an earthquake, the first and last shock that has been felt to this day. And truly this was a prodigy whereby the god warned men of the evils that were coming upon them. For in the three following generations of Darius the son of Hystaspes, Xerxes the son of Darius, and Artaxerxes the son of Xerxes, more woes befell Greece than in the twenty generations preceding Darius, -- woes caused in part by the Persians, but in part arising from the contentions among their own chief men respecting the supreme power. . . .

82

24. "Meanwhile the Eretrians, understanding that the Persian armament was coming against them, besought the Athenians for assistance. Nor did the Athenians refuse their aid, but assigned to them as auxiliaries the four thousand landholders to whom they had allotted the estates of the Chalcidean Hippobatae. At Eretria, however, things were in no healthy state; for though they had called in the aid of the Athenians, yet they were not agreed among themselves how they should act; some of them being minded to leave the city and to take refuge in the heights of Euboea, while others, who looked to receiving a reward from the Persians, were making ready to betray their country. So when these things came to the ears of AEschines, the son of Nothion, one of the first men in Eretria, he made known the whole state of affairs to the Athenians who were already arrived, and besought them to return home to their own land, and not perish with his countrymen. And the Athenians hearkened to his counsel, and crossing over to Oropus, in this way escaped the danger.

25. "The Persian fleet now drew near and anchored at Tamynae, Choereae, and AEgilia, three places in the territory of Eretria. Once masters of these posts, they proceeded forthwith to disembark their horses, and made ready to attack the enemy. But the Eretrians were not minded to sally forth and offer battle; their only care, after it had been resolved not to quit the city, was, if possible, to defend their walls. And now the fortress was assaulted in good earnest, and for six days there fell on both sides vast numbers, but

on the seventh day Euphorbus, the son of Alcimachus, and Philagrus, the son of Cyneas, who were both citizens of good repute, betrayed the place to the Persians. These were no sooner entered within the walls than they plundered and burnt all the temples that there were in the town, in revenge for the burning of their own temples at Sardis; moreover, they did according to the orders of Darius, and carried away captive all the inhabitants.

26. "The Persians, having thus brought Eretria into subjection after waiting a few days, made sail for Attica, greatly straitening the Athenians as they approached, and thinking to deal with them as they had dealt with the people of Eretria. And because there was

83

no place in all Attica so convenient for their horse as Marathon, and it lay moreover quite close to Eretria, therefore Hippias, the son of Pisistratus, conducted them thither. When intelligence of this reached the Athenians, they likewise marched their troops to Marathon, and there stood on the defensive, having at their head ten generals, of whom one was Miltiades. -- Herodotus. 11

27. "The barbarians were conducted to Marathon by Hippias, the son of Pisistratus." "He landed the prisoners taken from Eretria upon the island that is called Aegilia, belonging to the Styreans, after which he brought the fleet to anchor off Marathon, and marshaled the bands of the barbarians as they disembarked."

28. "The Athenians were drawn up in order of battle in a sacred close belonging to Hercules, when they were joined by the Plataeans, who came in full force to their aid. The Athenian generals were divided in their opinions; and some advised not to risk a battle, because they were too few to engage such a host as that of the Medes; while others were for fighting at once, and among these last was Miltiades. He, therefore, seeing that opinions were thus divided, and that the less worthy counsel appeared likely to prevail, resolved to go to the polemarch, and have a conference with him. For the man on whom the lot fell to be polemarch at Athens was entitled to give his vote with the ten generals, since anciently the Athenians allowed him an equal right of voting with them. The polemarch at this juncture was Callimachus of Aphidnae; to him therefore Miltiades went."

29. Miltiades succeeded in gaining Callimachus, and "the addition of the polemarch's vote caused the decision to be in favor of fighting. Hereupon all those generals who had been desirous of hazarding a battle, when their turn came to command the army, gave up their right to Miltiades. He, however, though he accepted their offers, nevertheless waited, and would not fight, until his own day of command arrived in due course.

30. "Then at length, when his own turn was come, the Athenian battle was set in array, and this was the order of it. Callimachus the polemarch led the right wing, for it was at that time a

84

rule with the Athenians to give the right wing to the polemarch. After this followed the tribes, according as they were numbered, in an unbroken line; while last of all came the Plataeans, forming the left wing. And ever since that day it has been a custom with the Athenians, in the sacrifices and assemblies held each fifth year at Athens, for the Athenian herald to implore the blessing of the gods on the Plataeans conjointly with the Athenians. Now as they marshaled the host upon the field of Marathon, in order that the Athenian front might be of equal length with the Median, the ranks of the center were diminished, and it became the weakest part of the line, while the wings were both made strong with a depth of many ranks.

31. "So when the battle was set in array, and the victims showed themselves favorable, instantly the Athenians, so soon as they were let go, charged the barbarians at a run. Now the distance between the two armies was little short of eight furlongs. The Persians, therefore, when they saw the Greeks coming on at speed, made ready to receive them, although it seemed to them that the Athenians were bereft of their senses, and bent upon their own destruction; for they saw a mere handful of men coming on at a run without either horsemen or archers.¹² Such was the opinion of the barbarians; but the Athenians in close array fell upon them, and fought in a manner worthy of being recorded. They were the first of the Greeks, so far as I know, who introduced the custom of charging the enemy at a run, and they were likewise the first who dared to look upon the Median garb, and to face men clad in that fashion. Until this time the very name of the Medes had been a terror to the Greeks to hear.

32. "The two armies fought together on the plain of Marathon for a length of time; and in the mid battle, where the Persians themselves and the Sacae had their place, the barbarians were victorious, and broke and pursued the Greeks into the inner country; but on the two wings the Athenians and the Plataeans defeated the enemy. Having so done, they suffered the routed barbarians to fly at their ease, and joining the two wings in one, fell upon those who had

broken their own center, and fought and conquered them. These likewise fled, and now the Athenians hung upon the runaways and cut them down, chasing them all the way to the shore, on reaching which they laid hold of the ships and called aloud for fire.

33. "It was in the struggle here that Callimachus the polemarch, after greatly distinguishing himself, lost his life; Stesilaus too, the son of Thrasilaus, one of the generals, was slain; and Cynaegirus, the son of Euphorion, having seized on a vessel of the enemy's by the ornament at the stern, had his hand cut off by the blow of an ax, and so perished; as likewise did many other Athenians of note and name.

34. "The Athenians secured in this way seven of the vessels, while with the remainder the barbarians pushed off, and taking aboard their Eretrian prisoners from the island where they had left them, doubled cape Sunium, hoping to reach Athens before the return

of the Athenians. The Alcmaeonidae were accused by their countrymen of suggesting this course to them; they had, it was said, an understanding with the Persians, and made a signal to them, by raising a shield, after they were embarked in their ships. The Persians accordingly sailed round Sunium. But the Athenians with all possible speed marched away to the defense of their city, and succeeded in reaching Athens before the appearance of the barbarians,¹³ and as their camp at Marathon had been pitched in a precinct of Hercules, so now they encamped in another precinct of the same god at Cynosarges. The barbarian fleet arrived, and lay to off Phalerum, which was at that time the haven of Athens; but after resting awhile upon their oars, they departed and sailed away to Asia.

35. "There fell in this battle of Marathon, on the side of the barbarians, about six thousand and four hundred men; on that of the Athenians, one hundred and ninety-two. Such was the number of the slain on the one side and the other."¹⁴

36. "Now when the tidings of the battle that had been fought at

86

Marathon reached the ears of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, his anger against the Athenians, which had been already roused by their attack upon Sardis, waxed still fiercer, and he became more than ever eager to lead an army against Greece. Instantly he sent off messengers to make proclamation through the several States, that fresh levies were to be raised, and these at an increased rate; while ships, horses, provisions, and transports were likewise to be furnished. So the men published his commands; and now all Asia was in commotion by the space of three years, while everywhere, as Greece was to be attacked, the best and bravest were enrolled for the service, and had to make their preparations accordingly.

37. "After this, in the fourth year, 486 B. C., the Egyptians whom Cambyses had enslaved, revolted from the Persians; whereupon Darius was more hot for war than ever, and earnestly desired to march an army against both adversaries. Now, as he was about to lead forth his levies against Egypt and Athens, a fierce contention for the sovereign power arose among his sons; since the law of the Persians was that a king must not go out with his army, until he has appointed one to succeed him upon the throne. Darius, before he obtained the kingdom, had had three sons born to him from his former wife, who was a daughter of Gobryas; while, since he began to reign, Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus, had borne him four. Artabazanes was the eldest of the first family, and Xerxes of the second. These two, therefore, being the sons of different mothers, were now at variance. Artabazanes claimed the crown as the eldest of all the children, because it was an established custom all over the world for the eldest to have the pre-eminence; while Xerxes, on the other hand, urged that he was sprung from Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus, and that it was Cyrus who had won the Persians their freedom.

38. "Before Darius had pronounced on the matter, it happened that Demaratus, the son of Ariston, who had been deprived of his crown at Sparta, and had afterward, of his own accord, gone into banishment, came up to Susa, and there heard of the quarrel of the

princes. Hereupon, as report says, he went to Xerxes, and advised him, in addition to all that he had urged before, to plead that at the

87

time when he was born Darius was already king, and bore rule over the Persians; but when Artabazanes came into the world, he [Darius] was a mere private person. It would therefore be neither right nor seemly that the crown should go to another in preference to himself. 'For at Sparta,' said Demaratus, by way of suggestion, 'the law is that, if a king has sons before he comes to the throne, and another son is born to him afterward, the child so born is heir to his father's kingdom.' Xerxes followed this counsel, and Darius, persuaded that he had justice on his side, appointed him his successor. For my own part, I believe that, even without this, the crown would have gone to Xerxes; for Atossa was all-powerful.

39. "Darius, when he had thus appointed Xerxes his heir, was minded to lead forth his armies; but he was prevented by death while his preparations were still proceeding. He died in the year following the revolt of Egypt, and the matters here related [485 B. C.], after having reigned in all six and thirty years, leaving the revolted Egyptians and the Athenians alike unpunished. At his death the kingdom passed to his son, Xerxes." -- Herodotus.¹⁵

1 [Page 74] Book iv. chap.44

2 [Page 75] "History of Greece," chap. xxxiv, par. 10.

3 [Page 76] Book iv, chaps 141-143.

4 [Page 76] Book v. chaps, 1,2.

5 [Page 77] Book v. chap. 105.

6 [Page 78] Book vi. chaps. 31-33.

7 [Page 79] Book vi, chaps, 43-45.

8 [Page 80] Id., chaps. 48, 49.

9 [Page 80] The Pisistratidae were the descendants of Pisistratus and their partizans who had ruled Athens for fifty-one years, 560-510 B. C. and who, having been banished from Athens. had taken refuge in Persia, and were eager for reprisal upon the Athenians.

10 [Page 81] Triremes were ships propelled by three banks of oars.

11 [Page 83] Book vi, chaps. 94-98; 100-102.

12 [Page 84] The number of the Greeks was 10,000; of the Persians, 210,000.

13 [Page 85] The distance between Marathon and Athens is twenty-six miles. The Persian fleet was obliged to sail "nearly four times as far."

14 [Page 85] Book vi, chaps. 107-113, 115-117.

15 [Page 87] Book vii, chaps. 1-4.

8. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- XERXES.

THE ARMY OF INVASION.

XERXES was that fourth king after Cyrus referred to by the angel in Dan. 11:2, who should be far richer than all three of his predecessors, and who by his strength through his riches should stir up all against the realm of Grecia. He describes himself thus: "I am Xerxes, the great king, the king of kings, the king of the lands where many languages are spoken, the king of this wide earth, afar and near, the son of King Darius, the Achaemenian." The events of the last days of Darius, as recorded in the preceding chapter, are a sufficient explanation why he should desire -- and even why it was necessary -- to stir up all against the realm of Grecia.

2. "First, however, in the year following the death of Darius, 484 B. C., he marched against those who had revolted from him; and having reduced them, and laid all Egypt under a far harder yoke than ever his father had put upon it, he gave the government to Achaemenes, who was his own brother, and son to Darius."

3. "After Egypt was subdued, Xerxes, being about to take in hand the expedition against Athens, called together an assembly of the noblest Persians, to learn their opinions, and to lay before them his own designs." This was the third year of Xerxes; and this assembly was the one referred to in Esther 1:1-4: "In those days, when the king Ahasuerus sat on the throne of his kingdom, which was in Shushan the palace, in the third year of his reign, he made a feast unto all his princes and his servants; the power of Persia and Media, the nobles and princes of the provinces; being before him: when he showed the riches of his glorious kingdom and the honor of his excellent majesty many days, even an hundred and fourscore days."

89

4. "The Hebrew Ahashverosh is the natural equivalent of the old Persian Khshayarsha, the true name of the monarch called by the Greeks Xerxes, as now read in his inscriptions." ¹ Only a few inscriptions of Xerxes have been found, and all these unimportant: the only "real resulting fact is the name of the king, Khshayarsha, which proves to be identical with the Ahasuerus of Holy Scripture." -- Oppert. ² After much counsel, deliberation, and debating pro and con, Xerxes was inclined to change his mind, and make no expedition at all against Greece; but by several dreams was finally confirmed in carrying on his enterprise.

5. The great question being at last decided, and the governors, nobles, and princes being about to return to their provinces, to gather the levies of troops, Xerxes closed the assembly with a grand banquet, the account of which well illustrates the great riches of this king: "And when these days were expired, the king made a feast unto all the people that were present in Shushan the palace, both unto great and small, seven days, in the

court of the garden of the king's palace; where were white, green, and blue, hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble: the beds were of gold and silver, upon a pavement of red, and blue, and white, and black, marble. And they gave them drink in vessels of gold, (the vessels being diverse one from another,) and royal wine in abundance, according to the state of the king. And the drinking was according to the law; none did compel: for so the king had appointed to all the officers of his house, that they should do according to every man's pleasure. Also Vashti the queen made a feast for the women in the royal house which belonged to King Ahasuerus."³

6. "Reckoning from the recovery of Egypt, Xerxes spent four full years in collecting his host, and making ready all things that were needful for his soldiers. It was not till the close of the fifth year [481 B. C.], that he set forth on his march, accompanied by a mighty multitude. For of all the armaments whereof any mention

90

has reached us, this was by far the greatest; insomuch that no other expedition compared to this seems of any account. . . . For was there a nation in all Asia which Xerxes did not bring with him against Greece? Or was there a river, except those of unusual size, which sufficed for his troops to drink? One nation furnished ships; another was arrayed among the foot-soldiers; a third had to supply horses; a fourth, transports for the horse, and men likewise for the service; a fifth, ships of war toward the bridges; a sixth, ships and provisions." "And so Xerxes gathered together his host, ransacking every corner of the continent." -- Herodotus.⁴

7. Remembering the disaster to the fleet of Darius on attempting to double the cape of Mount Athos, Xerxes determined not to run any such risk, but rather to cut a canal through the land to the north of Mount Athos,⁵ and by that to conduct his fleet safely toward Greece. It seems to have taken about a year to make this canal. Meantime, the land forces from all parts of the empire were gathering at Sardis, that city having been appointed as their place of rendezvous. As soon as Xerxes himself had arrived at Sardis, "his first care was to send off heralds into Greece, who were to prefer a demand for earth and water, and to require that preparations should be made everywhere to feast the king. To Athens, indeed, and to Sparta he sent no such demand; but these cities excepted, his messengers went everywhere. Now the reason why he sent for earth and water to States which had already refused, was this: he thought that although they had refused when Darius made the demand, they would now be too frightened to venture to say him nay. So he sent his heralds, wishing to know for certain how it would be."⁶

8. One of the essential preparations for his expedition was to build a bridge of boats over the straits. "Midway between Sestos and Madytus in the Hellespontine Chersonese, and right over against

91

Abydos, there is rocky tongue of land runs out for some distance into the sea . . . Toward this tongue of land then, the men to whom the business was assigned, carried out a double bridge from Abydos; and while the Phenicians constructed one line with cables of white flax, the Egyptians in the other used ropes made of papyrus. Now it is seven furlongs across from Abydos to the opposite coast. When, therefore, the channel had been bridged successfully, it happened that a great storm arising broke the whole work to pieces, and destroyed all that had been done.

9. "When Xerxes heard of the loss of his bridge, he was full of wrath, and straightway gave orders that the Hellespont should receive three hundred lashes, and that a pair of fetters should be cast into it. Nay, I have even heard it said, that he had the branders take their irons and therewith brand the Hellespont. It is certain that he commanded those who scourged the waters to utter, as they lashed them, these barbarian and wicked words: 'Thou bitter water, thy lord lays on thee this punishment because thou hast wronged him without a cause, having suffered no evil at his hands. Verily King Xerxes will cross thee, whether thou wilt or no. Well dost thou deserve that no man should honor thee with sacrifice; for thou art of a truth a treacherous and unsavory river.' While the sea was thus punished by his orders, he likewise commanded that the overseers of the work should lose their heads. Then they, whose business it was, executed the unpleasing task laid upon them; and other master-builders were set over the work, who accomplished it in the way which I will now describe.

10. "They joined together triremes and penteconters, 7 360 to support the bridge on the side of the Euxine Sea, and 314 to sustain the other; and these they placed at right angles to the sea, and in the direction of the current of the Hellespont, relieving by these means the tension of the shore cables. Having joined the vessels, they moored them with anchors of unusual size, that the vessels of the bridge toward the Euxine might resist the winds which blow from within the straits; and that those of the more western bridge facing the AEgean, might withstand the winds which set in from the

south and from the southeast. A gap was left in the penteconters in no fewer than three places, to afford a passage for such light crafts as chose to enter or leave the Euxine.

11. "When all this was done, they made the cables taut from the shore by the help of wooden capstans. This time, moreover, instead of using the two materials separately, they assigned to each bridge six cables, two of which were of white flax, while four were of papyrus. Both cables were of the same size and quality; but the flaxen were the heavier, weighing not less than a talent the cubit. When the bridge across the channel was thus complete, trunks of trees were sawn into planks, which were cut to the width of the bridge, and these were laid side by side upon the tightened cables, and then fastened on the top. This done, brushwood was brought, and arranged upon the planks, after which earth was heaped upon the brushwood, and the whole trodden down into a solid mass. Lastly a bulwark was set up on either side of this causeway, of such a height as to prevent the sumpter-beasts and the horses from seeing over it and taking fright at the water.

12. "And now when all was prepared, -- the bridges, and the works at Athos, the breakwaters about the mouths of the cutting, which were made to hinder the surf from blocking up the entrances, and the cutting itself, -- and when the news came to Xerxes that this last was completely finished, then at length the host, having first wintered at Sardis, began its march toward Abydos, fully equipped, on the first approach of spring."8[480 B. C.]

13. "First of all went the baggage-bearers, and the sumpterbeasts, and then a vast crowd of many nations mingled together without any intervals, amounting to more than one half of the army. After these troops an empty space was left, to separate between them and the king. In front of the king went first a thousand horsemen, picked men of the Persian nation; then spearmen a thousand, likewise chosen troops with their spearheads pointing toward the ground; next ten of the sacred horses called Nisaeen, all daintily caparisoned. (Now these horses are called Nisaeen, because they come from the Nisaeen plain, a vast flat in Media, producing horses of unusual size.)

93

After the ten sacred horses came the holy chariot of Jupiter, drawn by eight milk-white steeds, with the charioteer on foot behind them holding the reins; for no mortal is ever allowed to mount into the car. Next to this came Xerxes himself, riding in a chariot drawn by Nisaeen horses, with his charioteer, Patiramphes, the son of Otanes, a Persian, standing by his side.

14. "Thus rode forth Xerxes from Sardis; but he was accustomed every now and then, when the fancy took him, to alight from his chariot and travel in a litter. Immediately behind the king there followed a body of a thousand spearmen, the noblest and bravest of the Persians, holding their lances in the usual manner; then came a thousand Persian horse, picked men; then ten thousand, picked also after the rest, and serving on foot. Of these last one thousand carried spears with golden pomegranates at their lower end instead of spikes; and these encircled the other nine thousand, who bore on their spears pomegranates of silver. The spearmen too who pointed their lances toward the ground, had golden pomegranates; and the thousand Persians who followed close after Xerxes, had golden apples. Behind the ten thousand footmen came a body of Persian cavalry, likewise ten thousand; after which there was again a void space for as much as two furlongs; and then the rest of the army followed in a confused crowd."9

15. When he had arrived at Abydos, "Xerxes wished to look upon all his host; so, as there was a throne of white marble upon a hill near the city, which they of Abydos had prepared beforehand by the king's bidding for his especial use, Xerxes took his seat on it, and gazing thence upon the shore below, beheld at one view all his land forces and all his ships. While thus employed, he felt a desire to behold a sailing match among his ships, which accordingly took place, and was won by the Phenicians of Sidon, much to the joy of Xerxes, who was delighted alike with the race and with his army.

16. "And now, as he looked and saw the whole Hellespont covered with the vessels of his fleet, and all the shore and every plain about Abydos as full as could be of men, Xerxes congratulated

94

himself on his good fortune; but after a little while, he wept." Being asked why he wept, he replied: "There came upon me. . . a sudden pity, when I thought of the shortness of man's life, and considered that of all this host, so numerous as it is, not one will be alive when a hundred years are gone by."¹⁰

17. "All that day the preparations for the passage continued; and on the morrow they burnt all kinds of spices upon the bridges, and strewed the way with myrtle boughs, while they waited anxiously for the sun, which they hoped to see as he rose. And now the sun appeared; and Xerxes took a golden goblet and poured from it a libation into the sea, praying the while with his face turned to the sun, 'that no misfortune might befall him such as to hinder his conquest of Europe, until he had penetrated to its uttermost boundaries.' After he had prayed, he cast the golden cup into the Hellespont, and with it a golden bowl, and a Persian sword of the kind which they call acinaces. I can not say for certain whether it was as an offering to the sun god that he threw these things into the deep, or whether he repented of having scourged the Hellespont, and thought by his gifts to make amends to the sea for what he had done."

18. "When, however, his offerings were made, the army began to cross; and the foot-soldiers, with the horsemen, passed over by one of the bridges, -- that (namely) which lay toward the Euxine, -- while the sumpter-beasts and the camp followers passed by the other, which looked on the AEgean. Foremost went the Ten Thousand Persians,¹¹ all wearing garlands upon their heads; and after them a mixed multitude of many nations. These crossed upon the first day.

19. "On the next day the horsemen began the passage; and with them went the soldiers who carried their spears with the point downward, garlanded like the Ten Thousand; then came the sacred horses

95

and the sacred chariot; next Xerxes with his lancers and the thousand horse; then the rest of the army. At the same time the ships sailed over to the opposite shore. According, however, to another account which I have heard, the king crossed the last. As soon as Xerxes had reached the European side, he stood to contemplate his army as they crossed under the lash. And the crossing continued during seven days and seven nights, without rest or pause."¹²

20. "What the exact number of the troops of each nation was I can not say with certainty; for it is not mentioned by any one; but the whole land army together was found to amount to one million seven hundred thousand men. The manner in which the

numbering took place was the following: A body of ten thousand men were brought to a certain place, and the men were made to stand as close together as possible; after which a circle was drawn around them, and the men were let go: then where the circle had been, a fence was built about the height of a man's middle; and the enclosure was filled continually with fresh troops, till the whole army had in this way been numbered. When the numbering was over, the troops were drawn up according to their several nations.

21. "Now these were the nations that took part in this expedition: --

"The Persians, who wore on their heads the soft hat called the tiara, and about their bodies, tunics with sleeves, of divers colors, having iron scales upon them like the scales of a fish. Their legs were protected by trousers; and they bore wicker shields for bucklers, their quivers hanging at their backs, and their arms being a short spear, a bow of uncommon size, and arrows of reed. They had likewise daggers suspended from their girdles along their right thighs.

"The Medes had exactly the same equipment as the Persians; and indeed the dress common to both is not so much Persian as Median. They had for commander Tigranes, of the race of the Achaemenids. These Medes were called anciently by all the people Arians; but when Medea, the Colchian, came to them from Athens, they changed their name. Such is the account which they themselves give.

"The Cissians were equipped in the Persian fashion, except in one respect -- they wore on their heads, instead of hats, fillets.

"The Hyrcanians were likewise armed in the same way as the Persians.

96

"The Assyrians went to war with helmets upon their heads made of brass, and plaited in a strange fashion which is not easy to describe. They carried shields, lances, and daggers very like the Egyptian; but in addition they had wooden clubs knotted with iron, and linen corselets. These people, whom the Greeks call Syrians, are called Assyrians by the barbarians. The Chaldeans served in their ranks.

"The Bactrians went to the war wearing a head-dress very like the Median, but armed with bows of cane, after the custom of their country, and with short spears.

"The Sacae, or Scyths, were clad in trousers, and had on their heads tall stiff caps rising to a point. They bore the bow of their country and the dagger; besides which they carried the battle-ax, or sagaris. They were in truth Amyrgian Scythians; but the Persians called them Sacae, since that is the name they give to all Scythians.

"The Indians wore cotton dresses, and carried bows of cane, and arrows also of cane, with iron at the point.

"The Arians carried Median bows, but in other respects were equipped like the Bactrians.

"The Parthians and Chorasmians, with the Sogdians, the Gandarians, and the Dadicae, had the Bactrian equipment in all respects.

"The Caspians were clad in cloaks of skin, and carried the cane bow of their country, and the simitar. So equipped they went to the war.

"The Sarangians had dyed garments which showed brightly, and buskins which reached to the knee; they bore Median bows, and lances.

"The Pactyans wore cloaks of skin, and carried the bow of their country and the dagger.

"The Utians, the Mycians, and the Paricanians were all equipped like the Pactyans.

"The Arabians wore the zeira, or long cloak, fastened about them with a girdle; and carried at their right side long bows, which when unstrung bent backward.

"The Ethiopians were clothed in the skins of leopards and lions, and had long bows made of the stem of the palm-leaf, not less than four cubits in length. On these they laid short arrows made of reed, and armed at the tip, not with iron, but with a piece of stone, sharpened to a point, of the kind used in engraving seals. They carried likewise spears, the head of which was the sharpened horn of an antelope, and in addition they had knotted clubs. When they went into battle, they painted their bodies, half with chalk, and half with vermilion.

"The eastern Ethiopians -- for two nations of this name served in the army -- were marshaled with the Indians. They differed in nothing from the other Ethiopians, save in their language, and the character of their hair. For the eastern Ethiopians have straight hair, while they of Libya are more woolly-haired than any other people in the world. Their equipment was in most points like that of the Indians, but they wore upon their heads the scalps of horses, with the ears and mane attached; the ears were made to stand upright, and the mane served as a crest. For shields this people made use of the skins of cranes.

"The Libyans wore a dress of leather, and carried javelins made hard in the fire.

"The Paphlagonians went to the war with plaited helmets upon their heads, and carrying small shields and spears of no great size. They had also javelins and daggers, and wore on their feet the buskin of their country, which reached half way up the shank. In the same fashion were equipped the Ligyans, the Matienians, the Mariandynians, and the Syrians (or Cappadocians, as they are called by the Persians).

"The dress of the Phrygians closely resembled the Paphlagonian, Phrygian fashion.

"The Armenians, who are Phrygian colonists, were armed in the Phrygian fashion.

"The Lydians were armed very nearly in the Grecian manner. These Lydians in ancient times were called Maeonians, but changed their name, and took their present title from Lydus, the son of Atys.

"The Mysians wore upon their heads a helmet made after the fashion of their country, and carried a small buckler; they used as javelins, staves with one end hardened in the fire. The Mysians are Lydian colonists, and from the mountain chain of Olympus are called Olympieni.

"The Thracians went to war wearing the skins of foxes upon their heads, and about their bodies tunics, over which was thrown a long cloak of many colors. Their legs and feet were clad in buskins made from the skins of fawns; and they had for arms javelins, with light targes and short dirks. This people, after crossing into Asia, took the name of Bithynians; before they had been called Strymonians, while they dwelt upon the Strymon; whence, according to their own account, they had been driven out by the Mysians and Teucrians.

"[The Chalybians] had small shields made of the hide of the ox, and carried each of them two spears such as are used in wolf- hunting. Brazen helmets protected their heads, and above these they wore the ears and horns of an ox fashioned in brass. They had also crests on their helms; and their legs were bound round with purple bands. There is an oracle of Mars in the country of this people.

"The Cabalians, who are Maeonians, but are called Lasonians, had the same equipment as the Cilicians, -- an equipment which I shall describe when I come in due course to the Cilician contingent.

"The Milyans bore short spears, and had their garments fastened with buckles. Some of their number carried Lycian bows. They wore about their heads skull-caps made of leather.

"The Moschians wore helmets made of wood, and carried shields and spears of a small size; their spearheads, however, were long. The Moschian equipment was that likewise of the Tibarenians, the Macronians, and the Mosynoecians.

"The Mares wore on their heads the plaited helmet peculiar to their country, and used small leathern bucklers, and javelins.

"The Colchians wore wooden helmets, and carried small shields of rawhide, and short spears; besides which they had swords.

"The Alarodians and Saspirians were armed like the Colchians.

"The Islanders who came from the Erythraean Sea, where they inhabited the islands to which the king sends those whom he banishes, wore a dress and arms almost exactly like the Median.

"Such were the nations who fought upon the dry land, and made up the infantry of the Persians.

"Of all the troops the Persians were adorned with the greatest magnificence, and they were likewise the most valiant. Besides their arms, which have been already described, they glittered all over with gold, vast quantities of which they wore about their persons. They were followed by litters, wherein rode their concubines, and by a numerous train of attendants handsomely dressed. Camels and sumpter-beasts carried their provision, apart from that of the other soldiers."13

22. "The triremes amounted in all to twelve hundred and seven; and were furnished by the following nations: --

"The Phenicians, with the Syrians of Palestine, furnished three hundred vessels, the crews of which were thus accounted: upon their heads they wore helmets made nearly in the Grecian manner; about their bodies they had breastplates of linen; they carried shields without rims; and were armed with javelins.

"The Egyptians furnished two hundred ships. Their crews had plaited helmets upon their heads, and bore concave shields with rims of unusual size. They were armed with spears suited for a sea fight, and with huge pole-axes. The greater part of them wore breastplates, and all had long cutlases.

"The Cyprians furnished a hundred and fifty ships, and were equipped in the following fashion: Their kings had turbans bound about their heads, while the people wore tunics; in other respects they were clad like the Greeks. They are of various races; some are sprung from Athens, and Salamis, some from Arcadia, some from Cythnus, some from Phenicia, and a portion, according to their own account, from Ethiopia.

"The Cilicians furnished a hundred ships. The crews wore upon their heads the helmet of their country, and carried, instead of shields, light targes made of rawhide; they were clad in woolen tunics, and were each armed with two javelins, and a sword closely resembling the cutlas of the Egyptians. This people bore anciently the name of Hypachaens, but took their present title from Cilix, the son of Agenor, a Phenician.

"The Pamphylians furnished thirty ships, the crews of which were armed exactly as the Greeks. This nation is descended from those who on the return from Troy were dispersed with Amphilochus and Calchas.

"The Lycians furnished fifty ships. Their crews wore greaves and breastplates, while for arms they had bows of cornel wood, reed arrows without feathers, and javelins. Their outer garment was the skin of a goat, which hung from their shoulders; their head-dress, a hat encircled with plumes; and besides their other weapons they carried daggers and

99

falchions. This people came from Crete, and were once called Termilae; they got the name which they now bear from Lycus, the son of Pandion, an Athenian.

"The Dorians of Asia furnished thirty ships. They were armed in the Grecian fashion, inasmuch as their forefathers came from the Peloponnese.

"The Carians furnished seventy ships, and were equipped like the Greeks, but carried, in addition, falchions and daggers.

"The Ionians furnished a hundred ships, and were armed like the Greeks. Now these Ionians, during the time that they dwelt in the Peloponnese and inhabited the land now called Achaea (which was before the arrival of Danaus and Xuthus in the Peloponnese), were called, according to the Greek account, AEgialean Pelasgi, or 'Pelasgi of the seashore;' but afterward, from Ion, the son of Xuthus, they were called Ionians.

"The Islanders furnished seventeen ships, and wore arms like the Greeks. They too were a Pelasgian race, who in later times took the name of Ionians for the same reason as those who inhabited the twelve cities founded from Athens.

"The AEolians furnished sixty ships, and were equipped in the Grecian fashion. They too were anciently called Pelasgians, as the Greeks declare.

"The Hellespontians from the Pontus, who are colonists of the Ionians and Dorians, furnished a hundred ships, the crews of which wore the Grecian armor. This did not include the Abydenians, who stayed in their own country, because the king had assigned them the special duty of guarding the bridges.

"On board of every ship was a band of soldiers, Persians, Medes, or Sacans. . . . Besides the triremes, there was an assemblage of thirty-oared and fifty-oared galleys, of cercuri [light boats of unusual length], and transports for conveying horses, amounting in all to three thousand."14

23. "Now when the numbering and marshaling of the host was ended, Xerxes conceived a wish to go himself throughout the forces, and with his own eyes behold everything. Accordingly he traversed the ranks seated in his chariot, and going from nation to nation, made manifold inquiries, while his scribes wrote down the answers; till at last he had passed from end of the whole land army, both the horsemen and likewise the foot. This done, he exchanged his chariot for a Sidonian galley, and seated beneath a golden awning, sailed along the prows of all his vessels (the vessels having now been hauled

down and launched into the sea), while he made inquiries again, as he had done when he reviewed the land forces, and

100

caused the answers to be recorded by his scribes. The captains took their ships to the distance of about four hundred feet from the shore, and there lay to, with their vessels in a single row, the prows facing the land, and with the fighting men upon the decks accounted as if for war, while the king sailed along in the open space between the ships and the shore, and so reviewed the fleet."¹⁵

1 [Page 89] Encyclopedia Britannica.

2 [Page 89] "Records of the Past," Old Series, Vol. ix, p. 82, note.

3 [Page 89] Esther 1:5-9.

4 [Page 90] Book vii, chaps. 20, 21, 19. All the succeeding quotations in this chapter are from herodotus, and will be marked only by reference to book and chapter.

5 [Page 90] "Athos is a great and famous mountain, inhabited by men, and stretching far out into the sea. Where the mountain ends toward the mainland, it forms a peninsula; and in this place there is a neck of land about twelve furlongs across, the whole extent whereof from the sea of the Acanthians to that over against Torone, is a level plain, broken only by a few low hills." -- Id., chap. 22.

6 [Page 90] Book vii, chap. 32.

7 [Page 91] Fifty-oared freight ships.

8 [Page 92] Book vii, chap. 33-37.

9 [Page 93] Id. chaps. 40, 41.

10 [Page 94] Id., chaps. 44-46.

11 [Page 94] The "Ten Thousand were all Persians and all picked men. . . They were called 'the Immortals,' for the following reason: If one of their body failed either by the stroke of death or of disease, forthwith his place was filled up by another man, so that their number was at no time either greater or less than ten thousand." -- Herodotus, book vii chap. 82.

12 [Page 95] Id., chaps. 54-56.

13 [Page 98] Book vii, chaps. 60-83.

14 [Page 99] Book vii, chaps. 89-97.

15 [Page 100] Id., chap. 100.

9. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- XERXES.

THERMOPYLAE.

XERXES finally took up his march toward Greece, meeting with neither check nor mischance until he came to Thermopylae. Indeed, the Thessalians "warmly espoused the side of the Medes; and afterward, in the course of the war, they were of the greatest service to Xerxes."

2. Thermopylae thermo, heat; pyloe, gates, -- "gates of the hot springs") is a pass from Thessaly into Greece, about seven feet wide, "only wide enough for a single carriage," between the high mountains and the sea; and is the only means of entering Greece by land from north or east. Here the Greeks determined to make their stand, and resist the progress of the host of Xerxes. At this point the army of Xerxes, including those brought out of Asia and those gathered in Europe, amounted to 2,641,610 fighting men. "Such then being the number of the fighting men, it is my belief that the attendants who followed the camp, together with the crews of the corn-barks, and of the other craft accompanying the army, made up an amount rather above than below that of the fighting men. However, I will not reckon them as either fewer or more, but take them at an equal number. We have therefore to add to the sum already reached an exactly equal amount. This will give 5,283,220 as the whole number of men brought by Xerxes, the son of Darius, as far as Sepias and Thermopylae." And "among all this multitude of men there was not one who, for beauty and stature, deserved more than Xerxes himself to wield so vast a power." -- Herodotus.¹

3. The fleet, having sailed to the coast of Magnesia, was overtaken by a mighty tempest which continued for three days, and

102

destroyed, at the lowest estimate, four hundred of the ships and a multitude of men. From Thessaly Xerxes with the army "passed on into Malis, along the shores of a bay, in which there is an ebb and flow of the tide daily. By the side of this bay lies a piece of flat land, in one part broad, but in another very narrow indeed, around which runs a range of lofty hills, impossible to climb, enclosing all Malis within them, and called the Trachinians Cliffs. The first city upon the bay, as you come from Achaea, is Anticyra, near which the river Spercheius, flowing down from the country of the Enianians, empties itself into the sea. About twenty furlongs from this stream there is a second river, called the Dyrras, which is said to have appeared first to help Hercules when he was burning. Again, at the distance of twenty furlongs, there is a stream called the Melas, near which, within about five furlongs, stands the city of Trachis.

4. "South of Trachis there is a cleft in the mountain range which shuts in the territory of Trachinia; and the river Asopus, issuing from this cleft, flows for awhile along the foot of

the hills. Further to the south, another river, called the Phenix, which has no great body of water, flows from the same hills, and falls into the Asopus. Here is the narrowest place of all, for in this part there is only a causeway wide enough for a single carriage. From the river Phenix to Thermopylae is a distance of fifteen furlongs; and in this space is situate the village called Anthela, which the river Asopus passes ere it reaches the sea. . . . King Xerxes pitched his camp in the region of Malis called Trachinia, while on their side the Greeks occupied the straits. These straits the Greeks in general call Thermopylae (the hot gates); but the natives and those who dwell in the neighborhood, call them Pylae (the Gates). Here then the two armies took their stand; the one master of all the region lying north of the Trachis, the other of the country extending southward of that place to the verge of the continent."2

5. There were about six thousand men, from twelve of the different States of Greece, at the pass of Thermopylae to defend it against the host of Persia. "The various nations had each captains

103

of their own under whom they served; but the one to whom all especially looked up, and who had command of the entire force, was the Lacedaemonian, Leonidas," king of Sparta. After his arrival at Thermopylae, and when all the arrangements of defense had been made, Leonidas learned for the first time that there was a trail over the mountains, at some distance from Thermopylae, along which it would be possible for a sufficient force to pass, and by being able to attack them in the rear, destroy all the force of their defense. He therefore detached a thousand men (of the Phocians) to take their station on the top of the mountain and defend the trail against any force that would surely be sent that way if the knowledge of it should come to Xerxes. This left only about five thousand men at the pass of Thermopylae itself, to hold the place against the millions of the army of Xerxes.

6. Xerxes waited four whole days before he made any advance, "expecting that the Greeks would run away." He, however, sent out "a mounted spy to observe the Greeks, and note how many they were, and what they were doing. He had heard, before he came out of Thessaly, that a few men were assembled at this place, and that at their head were certain Lacedaemonians, under Leonidas, a descendant of Hercules. The horseman rode up to the camp, and looked about him, but did not see the whole army; for such as were on the further side of the wall (which had been rebuilt and was now carefully guarded) it was not possible for him to behold; but he observed those on the outside, who were encamped in front of the rampart. It chanced that at this time the Lacedaemonians held the outer guard, and were seen by the spy, some of them engaged in gymnastic exercises, others combing their long hair. At this the spy greatly marveled, but he counted their number, and when he had taken accurate note of everything, he rode back quietly; for no one pursued after him, or paid any heed to his visit. So he returned, and told Xerxes all that he had seen.

7. "When, however, he found on the fifth day that they were not gone, thinking that their firm stand was mere impudence and recklessness, he grew wroth, and sent against them the Medes and Cissians, with orders to take them alive and bring them into his

104

presence. Then the Medes rushed forward and charged the Greeks, but fell in vast numbers; others, however, took the places of the slain, and would not be beaten off, though they suffered terrible losses. In this way it became clear to all, and especially to the king, that though he had plenty of combatants, he had but very few warriors. The struggle, however, continued during the whole day.

8. "Then the Medes, having met so rough a reception, withdrew from the fight; and their place was taken by the band of Persians under Hydarnes, whom the king called his 'Immortals:' they, it was thought, would soon finish the business. But when they joined battle with the Greeks, 't was with no better success than the Median detachment; things went much as before -- the two armies fighting in a narrow space, and the barbarians using shorter spears than the Greeks, and having no advantage from their numbers. The Lacedaemonians fought in a way worthy of note, and showed themselves far more skilful in fight than their adversaries, often turning their backs, and making as though they were all flying away, on which the barbarians would rush after them with much noise and shouting, when the Spartans at their approach would wheel round and face their pursuers, in this way destroying vast numbers of the enemy. Some Spartans likewise fell in these encounters, but only a very few. At last the Persians, finding that all their efforts to gain the pass availed nothing, and that whether they attacked by divisions or in any other way, it was to no purpose, withdrew to their own quarters. During these assaults, it is said that Xerxes, who was watching the battle, thrice leaped from the throne on which he sat, in terror for his army.

9. "Next day the combat was renewed, but with no better success on the part of the barbarians. The Greeks were so few that the barbarians hoped to find them disabled, by means of their wounds, from offering any further resistance, and so they once more attacked them. But the Greeks were drawn up in detachments according to their cities, and bore the brunt of the battle in turns, -- all except the Phocians, who had been stationed on the mountain to guard the pathway. So when the Persians found no difference between that day and the preceding, they again retired to their quarters.

105

10. "Now, as the king was in a great strait, and knew not how he should deal with the emergency, Ephialtes, the son of Eurydemus, a man of Malis, came to him and was admitted to a conference. Stirred by the hope of receiving a rich reward at the king's hands, he had come to tell him of the pathway which led across the mountain to Thermopylae; by which disclosure he brought destruction on the band of Greeks who had there withstood the barbarians. . . . Great was the joy of Xerxes on this occasion; and as he approved highly of the enterprise which Ephialtes undertook to accomplish, he

forthwith sent upon the errand Hydarnes, and the Persians under him. The troops left the camp about the time of the lighting of the lamps. The pathway along which they went at first was discovered by the Malians of these parts, who soon afterwards led the Thessalians by it to attack the Phocians, at the time when the Phocians fortified the pass with a wall, and so put themselves under covert from danger. And ever since, the path has always been put to an ill use by the Malians.

11. "The course which it takes is the following: Beginning at the Asopus, where that stream flows through the cleft in the hills, it runs along the ridge of the mountain (which is called, like the pathway over it, Anopaea), and ends at the city of Alpenus -- the first Locrian town as you come from Malis -- by the stone called Melampygos and the seats of the Cercopians. Here it is as narrow as at any other point. The Persians took this path, and crossing the Asopus, continued their march through the whole of the night, having the mountains of (Eta on their right hand, and on their left those of Trachis. At dawn of day they found themselves close to the summit. Now the hill was guarded, as I have already said, by a thousand Phocian men-at-arms, who were placed there to defend the pathway, and at the same time to secure their own country. They had been given the guard of the mountain path, while the other Greeks defended the pass below, because they had volunteered for the service, and had pledged themselves to Leonidas to maintain the post.

12. "The ascent of the Persians became known to the Phocians in the following manner: During all the time that they were making

106

their way up, the Greeks remained unconscious of it, inasmuch as the whole mountain was covered with groves of oak. But it happened that the air was very still, and the leaves which the Persians stirred with their feet made, as it was likely they would, a loud rustling, whereupon the Phocians jumped up and flew to seize their arms. In a moment the barbarians came in sight, and perceiving men arming themselves, were greatly amazed; for they had fallen in with an enemy when they expected no opposition. Hydarnes, alarmed at the sight, and fearing lest the Phocians might be Lacedaemonians, inquired of Ephialtes to what nation these troops belonged. Ephialtes told him the exact truth, whereupon he arrayed his Persians for battle. The Phocians, galled by the showers of arrows to which they were exposed, and imagining themselves the special object of the Persian attack, fled hastily to the crest of the mountain, and there made ready to meet death; but while their mistake continued, the Persians, with Ephialtes and Hydarnes, not thinking it worth their while to delay on account of Phocians, passed on and descended the mountain with all possible speed."

13. Before the night was ended, "deserters came in, and brought the news that the Persians were marching round by the hills. . . . Last of all, the scouts came running down from the heights, and brought in the same accounts, when the day was just beginning to break. Then the Greeks held a council to consider what they should do, and here opinions were divided: some were strong against quitting their post, while others contended to the contrary. So when the council had broken up, part of the troops departed and went their

ways homeward to their several States; part however resolved to remain, and to stand by Leonidas to the last."³

14. There were fourteen hundred who thus remained -- three hundred Spartans, seven hundred Thespians, and four hundred Thebans. The Spartans by their own laws were obliged to remain, even had they desired to go. There is some doubt as to whether the Thebans remained of their own accord, or were required by Leonidas to do so, "for it is certain that in the midst of the last battle they deserted their companions, and with hands upraised,

107

advanced toward the barbarians, exclaiming -- as was indeed most true -- that they for their part wished well to the Medes." But with the Thespians it was altogether an act of self-sacrifice freely chosen; for they could have departed without fear of disgrace.

15. "At sunrise Xerxes made libations, after which he waited until the time when the forum is wont to fill, and then began his advance. Ephialtes had instructed him thus, as the descent of the mountain is much quicker, and the distance much shorter, than the way round the hills, and the ascent. So the barbarians under Xerxes began to draw nigh; and the Greeks under Leonidas, as they now went forth determined to die, advanced much farther than on previous days, until they reached the more open portion of the pass. Hitherto they had held their station within the wall, and from this had gone forth to fight at the point where the pass was the narrowest. Now they joined battle beyond the defile, and carried slaughter among the barbarians, who fell in heaps. Behind them the captains of the squadrons, armed with whips, urged their men forward with continual blows. Many were thrust into the sea, and there perished; a still greater number were trampled to death by their own soldiers; no one heeded the dying. For the Greeks, reckless of their own safety and desperate, since they knew that, as the mountain had been crossed, their destruction was nigh at hand, exerted themselves with the most furious valor against the barbarians.

16. "By this time the spears of the greater number were all shivered, and with their swords they hewed down the ranks of the Persians; and here, as they strove, Leonidas fell fighting bravely. . . . And now there arose a fierce struggle between the Persians and the Lacedaemonians over the body of Leonidas, in which the Greeks four times drove back the enemy, and at last by their great bravery succeeded in bearing off the body. This combat was scarcely ended when the Persians with Ephialtes approached; and the Greeks, informed that they drew nigh, made a change in the manner of their fighting. Drawing back into the narrowest part of the pass, and retreating even behind the cross wall, they posted themselves upon a hillock, where they stood all drawn up together in one close body, except only the Thebans. . . . Here they defended

108

themselves to the last, such as still had swords using them, and the others resisting with their hands and teeth; till the barbarians, who in part had pulled down the wall and attacked them in front, in part had gone round and now encircled them upon every side, overwhelmed and buried the remnant left, beneath showers of missile weapons.

17. "The slain were buried where they fell; and in their honor, nor less in honor of those who died before Leonidas sent the allies away, an inscription was set up which said: --

"'Here did four thousand men from Pelops' land,
Against three hundred myriads bravely stand.'

"This was in honor of all. Another was for the Spartans alone: --

"'Go, stranger, and to Lacedaemon tell
"That here, obeying her behests, we fell.'

"This was for the Lacedaemonians. The seer had the following: --

"'The great Megistias' tomb you here may view,
Whom slew the Medes, fresh from Spercheius' fords.
Well the wise seer the coming death foreknew,
Yet scorned he to forsake his Spartan lords.'

"Thus fought the Greeks at Thermopylae."⁴

1[Page 101] Id., chaps. 186, 187.

2[Page 102] Id., chap. 198-201.

3[Page 106] Id., chaps. 208, 210-213, 215-219.

4[Page 108] Id., 223-225, 228, 234.

10. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- XERXES.

SALAMIS.

ON the very days of the fighting at Thermopylae, there were three engagements between the Greek and the Persian fleets, in which neither side gained a decided victory, though the loss of both ships and men was far greater on the side of the Persians.

2. When Xerxes had buried his slain, which numbered about twenty thousand, he again took up his march toward Athens. He passed through Doris and Phocis. The country of Doris was spared; but the land of Phocis "was entirely overrun, for the Thessalians led the Persian army through the whole of it; and wherever they went, the country was wasted with fire and sword, the cities and even the temples being wilfully set alight by the troops. The march of the army lay along the valley of the Cephissus; and here they ravaged far and wide, burning" twelve towns.

3. At the border of Boeotia "the army separated into two bodies, whereof one, which was the more numerous and the stronger of the two, marched, under Xerxes himself, toward Athens, entering Boeotia by the country of the Orchomenians. The Boeotians had one and all embraced the cause of the Medes; and their towns were in the possession of Macedonian garrisons." "The other division took guides, and proceeded toward the temple of Delphi, keeping Mount Parnassus on their right hand. They too laid waste such parts of Phocis as they passed through, burning the city of the Panopeans, together with those of the Daulians and of the AEolidae. This body had been detached from the rest of the army and made to march in this direction, for the purpose of plundering the Delphian temple and conveying to King Xerxes the riches which were there laid up."

110

4. "Meanwhile, the Grecian fleet, which had left Artemisium, proceeded to Salamis, at the request of the Athenians, and there cast anchor. The Athenians had begged them to take up this position, in order that they might convey their women and children out of Attica, and further might deliberate upon the course which it now behooved them to follow. . . . So while the rest of the fleet lay to off this island, the Athenians cast anchor along their own coast. Immediately upon their arrival, proclamation was made that every Athenian should save his children and household as he best could; whereupon some sent their families to Egina, some to Salamis, but the greater number to Troezen. This removal was made with all possible haste."

5. "And now, the remainder of the Grecian sea force, hearing that the fleet which had been at Artemisium, was come to Salamis, joined it at that island from Troezen, orders having been issued previously that the ships should muster at Pogon, the port of the Troezenians. The vessels collected were many more in number than those which had fought at Artemisium, and were furnished by more cities. The admiral was the same who

had commanded before, to wit, Eurybiades, the son of Eurycleides, who was a Spartan, but not of the family of the kings; the city, however, which sent by far the greatest number of ships, and the best sailors, was Athens."

6. "When the captains from these various nations were come together at Salamis, a council of war was summoned." In the midst of the council "there came an Athenian to the camp, who brought word that the barbarians had entered Attica, and were ravaging and burning everything. For the division of the army under Xerxes had just arrived at Athens from its march through Boeotia, where it had burnt Thespieae and Plataea, both which cities were forsaken by their inhabitants, who had fled to the Peloponnese, -- and now it was laying waste all the possessions of the Athenians. Thespieae and Plataea had been burnt by the Persians, because they knew from the Thebans that neither of those cities had espoused their side."

7. As the inhabitants of Athens had fled, the Persians "found the city forsaken; a few people only remained in the temple, either

111

keepers of the treasures, or men of the poorer sort. These persons having fortified the citadel [the Acropolis] with planks and boards, held out against the enemy." "The Persians encamped upon the hill over against the citadel which is called Mars hill by the Athenians, and began the siege of the place, attacking the Greeks with arrows whereto pieces of lighted tow were attached, which they shot at the barricade. And now those who were within the citadel found themselves in a most woeful case, for their wooden rampart betrayed them; still, however, they continued to resist. It was in vain that the Pisistratidae came to them and offered them terms of surrender; they stoutly refused all parley, and among their other modes of defense, rolled down huge masses of stone upon the barbarians as they were mounting up to the gates: so that Xerxes was for a long time very greatly perplexed, and could not contrive any way to take them.

8. "At last, however, in the midst of these many difficulties, the barbarians made discovery of an access. For verily the oracle had spoken truth; and it was fated that the whole mainland of Attica should fall beneath the sway of the Persians. Right in front of the citadel, and behind the gates and the common ascent, -- where no watch was kept, and no one would have thought it possible that any foot of man could climb, -- a few soldiers mounted from the sanctuary of Aglaurus, Cecrops's daughter, notwithstanding the steepness of the precipice. As soon as the Athenians saw them upon the summit, some threw themselves headlong from the wall, and so perished; while others fled for refuge to the inner part of the temple. The Persians rushed to the gates and opened them, after which they massacred the suppliants. When all were slain, they plundered the temple, and fired every part of the citadel.

9. "Xerxes, thus completely master of Athens, despatched a horseman to Susa, with a message to Arbanus, informing him of his success hitherto. The day after, he collected

together all the Athenian exiles who had come into Greece in his train, and bade them go up into the citadel, and there offer sacrifice after their own fashion."1

112

10. "Meanwhile, at Salamis, the Greeks no sooner heard what had befallen the Athenian citadel, than they fell into such alarm that some of the captains did not even wait for the council to come to a vote, but embarked hastily on board their vessels, and hoisted sail as though they would take to flight immediately. The rest, who stayed at the council board, came to a vote that the fleet should give battle at the Isthmus. Night now drew on, and the captains, dispersing from the meeting, proceeded on board their respective ships."

11. Before any had sailed away, however, Themistocles succeeded in having another council called, the result of which was that they "decided to remain and give battle at Salamis;" and all the commanders "at once made ready for the fight." And now the Persian fleet gathered together in the bay of Phalerum, the principal port of Athens. On account of additions by both land and sea, the forces of Xerxes "were not less numerous than they had been on their arrival at Sepias and Thermopylae." At Phalerum the sea forces were "visited by Xerxes, who had conceived a desire to go aboard and learn the wishes of the fleet."

12. "So he came and sat in a seat of honor; and the sovereigns of the nations, and the captains of the ships, were sent for to appear before him, and as they arrived, took their seats according to the rank assigned them by the king. In the first seat sat the king of Sidon; after him, the king of Tyre; then the rest in their order. When the whole had taken their places one after another, and were set down in orderly array, Xerxes, to try them, sent Mardonius and questioned each, whether a sea fight should be risked or no. Mardonius accordingly went round the entire assemblage, beginning with the Sidonian monarch, and asked this question, to which all gave the same answer, advising to engage the Greeks, except only Artemisia," queen of Caria. It was decided to risk a naval battle, and Xerxes "resolved that he would be an eyewitness of the combat."

13. "Orders were now given to stand out to sea; and the ships proceeded toward Salamis, and took up the stations to which they were directed, without let or hindrance from the enemy. The day,

113

however, was too far spent for them to begin the battle, since night already approached; so they prepared to engage upon the morrow. The Greeks, meanwhile, were in great distress and alarm, more especially those of the Peloponnese, who were troubled that they had been kept at Salamis to fight on behalf of the Athenian territory, and feared that, if they should suffer defeat, they would be pent up and besieged in an island, while their own country was left unprotected.

14. "The same night the land army of the barbarians began its march toward the Peloponnese, where, however, all that was possible had been done to prevent the enemy from forcing an entry by land. As soon as ever news reached the Peloponnese, of the death of Leonidas and his companions at Thermopylae, the inhabitants flocked together from the various cities, and encamped at the Isthmus, under the command of Cleombrotus, son of Anaxandridas, and brother of Leonidas. Here their first care was to block up the Scironian way; after which it was determined in council to build a wall across the Isthmus. As the number assembled amounted to many tens of thousands, and there was not one who did not give himself to the work, it was soon finished. Stones, bricks, timber, baskets filled full of sand, were used in the building; and not a moment was lost by those who gave their aid, for they worked without ceasing either by night or day.

15. "So the Greeks at the Isthmus toiled unceasingly as though in the greatest peril; since they never imagined that any great success would be gained by the fleet. The Greeks at Salamis, on the other hand, when they heard what the rest were about, felt greatly alarmed; but their fear was not so much for themselves as for the Peloponnese. At first they conversed together in low tones, each man with his fellow, secretly, and marveled at the folly shown by Eurybiades; but presently the smothered feeling broke out, and another assembly was held; whereat the old subjects provoked much talk from the speakers, one side maintaining that it was best to sail to the Peloponnese and risk battle for that, instead of abiding at Salamis and fighting for a land already taken by the enemy; while the other, which consisted of the Athenians, Eginetans, and

Megarians, was urgent to remain and have the battle fought where they were.

16. "Then Themistocles, when he saw that the Peloponnesians would carry the vote against him, went out secretly from the council, and instructing a certain man what he should say, sent him on board a merchant ship to the fleet of the Medes. The man's name was Sicinnus; he was one of Themistocles's household slaves, and acted as tutor to his sons; in after times, when the Thespians were admitting persons to citizenship, Themistocles made him a Thespian, and a rich man to boot. The ship brought Sicinnus to the Persian fleet, and there he delivered his message to the leaders in these words: 'The Athenian commander has sent me to you privily, without the knowledge of the other Greeks. He is a well-wisher to the king's cause, and would rather success should attend on you than on his countrymen; wherefore he bids me tell you that fear has seized the Greeks, and they are mediating a hasty flight. Now then it is open to you to achieve the best work that ever ye wrought, if only ye will hinder their escaping. They no longer agree among themselves, so that they will not now make any resistance; nay, 't is likely ye may see a fight already begun between such as favor and such as oppose your cause.' The messenger, when he had thus expressed himself, departed and was seen no more.

17. "Then the captains, believing all that the messenger had said, proceeded to land a large body of Persian troops on the islet of Psyttaleia, which lies between Salamis and the

mainland; after which, about the hour of midnight, they advanced their western wing toward Salamis, so as to enclose the Greeks. At the same time the force stationed about Ceos and Cynosura moved forward, and filled the whole strait as far as Munychia with their ships. This advance was made to prevent the Greeks from escaping by flight; and to block them up in Salamis, where it was thought that vengeance might be taken upon them for the battles fought near Artemisium. The Persian troops were landed on the islet of Psyttaleia, because, as soon as the battle began, the men and wrecks were likely to be drifted thither, as the isle lay in the very path of the coming fight; and they would thus be able to save their own men and destroy those

115

of the enemy. All these movements were made in silence, that the Greeks might have no knowledge of them; and they occupied the whole night, so that the men had no time to get their sleep.

18. "Meanwhile, among the captains at Salamis, the strife of words grew fierce. As yet they did not know that they were encompassed, but imagined that the barbarians remained in the same places where they had seen them the day before. In the midst of their contention, Aristides, the son of Lysimachus, who had crossed from Egina, arrived in Salamis. . . . Then Aristides entered the assembly, and spoke to the captains: he had come, he told them, from Egina, and had but barely escaped the blockading vessels, -- the Greek fleet was entirely enclosed by the ships of Xerxes, -- and he advised them to get themselves in readiness to resist the foe. Having said so much, he withdrew. And now another contest arose, for the greater part of the captains would not believe the tidings.

19. "But while they still doubted, a Tenian trireme, commanded by Panaetius, the son of Sosimenes, deserted from the Persians and joined the Greeks, bringing full intelligence. For this reason the Tenians were inscribed upon the tripod at Delphi among those who overthrew the barbarians. With this ship, which deserted to their side at Salamis, and the Lemnian vessel which came over before at Artemisium, the Greek fleet was brought to the full number of three hundred and eighty ships; otherwise it fell short by two of that amount.

20. "The Greeks now, not doubting what the Tenians told them, made ready for the coming fight. At the dawn of day, all the men-at-arms were assembled together, and speeches were made to them, of which the best was that of Themistocles, who throughout contrasted what was noble with what was base, and bade them, in all that came within the range of man's nature and constitution, always to make choice of the nobler part. Having thus wound up his discourse, he told them to go at once on board their ships, which they accordingly did; and about this time the trireme, that had been sent to Egina for the AEacidae, returned, whereupon the Greeks put to sea with all their fleet.

116

21. "The fleet had scarce left the land when they were attacked by the barbarians. At once most of the Greeks began to back water, and were about touching the shore, when Ameinias of Pallene, one of the Athenian captains, darted forth in front of the line, and charged a ship of the enemy. The two vessels became entangled, and could not separate, whereupon the rest of the fleet came up to help Ameinias, and engaged with the Persians. . . . Against the Athenians, who held the western extremity of the line toward Eleusis, were placed the Phenicians; against the Lacedaemonians, whose station was eastward toward the Piraeus, the Ionians. Of these last a few only followed the advice of Themistocles, to fight backwardly; the greater number did far otherwise. . . .

22. "Far the greater number of the Persian ships engaged in this battle were disabled, either by the Athenians or by the Eginetans. For as the Greeks fought in order and kept their line, while the barbarians were in confusion and had no plan in anything that they did, the issue of the battle could scarce be other than it was. Yet the Persians fought far more bravely here than at Euboea, and indeed surpassed themselves; each did his utmost through fear of Xerxes, for each thought that the king's eye was upon himself.

23. "What part the several nations, whether Greek or barbarian, took in the combat, I am not able to say for certain; Artemisia, however, I know, distinguished herself in such a way as raised her higher than she stood before in the esteem of the king. For after confusion had spread throughout the whole of the king's fleet, and her ship was closely pursued by an Athenian trireme, she, having no way to fly, since in front of her were a number of friendly vessels, and she was nearest of all the Persians to the enemy, resolved on a measure which in fact proved her safety. Pressed by the Athenian pursuer, she bore straight against one of the ships of her own party, a Calyndian, which had Damasithymus, the Calyndian king, himself on board. I can not say whether she had had any quarrel with the man while the fleet was at the Hellespont, or no, neither can I decide whether she of set purpose attacked his vessel, or whether it merely chanced that the Calyndian ship came in her way; but certain it is that she bore down upon his vessel and

117

sank it, and that thereby she had the good fortune to procure herself a double advantage. For the commander of the Athenian trireme, when he saw her bear down on one of the enemy's fleet, thought immediately that her vessel was a Greek, or else had deserted from the Persians, and was now fighting on the Greek side; he therefore gave up the chase, and turned away to attack others.

24. "Thus in the first place she saved her life by the action, and was enabled to get clear off from the battle; while further, it fell out that in the very act of doing the king an injury she raised herself to a greater height than ever in his esteem. For as Xerxes beheld the fight, he remarked (it is said) the destruction of the vessel, whereupon the bystanders observed to him, 'Seest thou, master, how well Artemisia fights, and how she has just sunk a ship of the enemy?' Then Xerxes asked if it were really Artemisia's doing; and they answered, 'Certainly; for they knew her ensign;' while all made sure that the sunken vessel belonged to the opposite side. Everything, it is said, conspired to prosper the

queen; it was especially fortunate for her that not one of those on board the Calyndian ship survived to become her accuser. Xerxes, they say, in reply to the remarks made to him, observed, 'My men have behaved like women, and my women like men!'

25. "There fell in this combat Ariabignes, one of the chief commanders of the fleet, who was son of Darius and brother of Xerxes, and with him perished a vast number of men of high repute, Persians, Medes, and allies. Of the Greeks there died only a few; for as they were able to swim, all those that were not slain outright by the enemy, escaped from the sinking vessels and swam across to Salamis. But on the side of the barbarians more perished by drowning than in any other way, since they did not know how to swim. The great destruction took place when the ships which had been first engaged began to fly; for they who were stationed in the rear, anxious to display their valor before the eyes of the king, made every effort to force their way to the front, and thus became entangled with such of their own vessels as were retreating.

26. "During the whole time of the battle, Xerxes sat at the base of the hill called AEgaleos, over against Salamis; and whenever he saw any of his own captains perform any worthy exploit, he inquired

118

concerning him; and the man's name was taken down by his scribes, together with the names of his father and his city. . . . When the rout of the barbarians began, and they sought to make their escape to Phalerum, the Eginetans, awaiting them in the channel, performed exploits worthy to be recorded. Through the whole of the confused struggle the Athenians employed themselves in destroying such ships as either made resistance or fled to shore, while the Eginetans dealt with those which endeavored to escape down the straits; so that the Persian vessels were no sooner clear of the Athenians than straightway they fell into the hands of the Eginetan squadron. Such of the barbarian vessels as escaped from the battle fled to Phalerum, and there sheltered themselves under the protection of the land army.

27. "Xerxes, when he saw the extent of his loss, began to be afraid lest the Greeks might be counseled by the Ionians, or without their advice might determine, to sail straight to the Hellespont and break down the bridges there, in which case he would be blocked up in Europe, and run great risk of perishing. He therefore made up his mind to fly; but as he wished to hide his purpose alike from the Greeks and from his own people, he set to work to carry a mound across the channel to Salamis, and at the same time began fastening a number of Phenician merchant ships together, to serve at once for a bridge and a wall. He likewise made many warlike preparations, as if he were about to engage the Greeks once more at sea. Now, when these things were seen, all grew fully persuaded that the king was bent on remaining, and intended to push the war in good earnest. Mardonius, however, was in no respect deceived; for long acquaintance enabled him to read all the king's thoughts. Meanwhile, Xerxes, though engaged in this way, sent off a messenger² to carry intelligence of his misfortune to Persia.

28. "At Susa, on the arrival of the first message, which said that Xerxes was master of Athens, such was the delight of the Persians who had remained behind, that they forthwith strewed all the streets with myrtle boughs, and burnt incense, and fell to feasting and merriment. In like manner, when the second message reached them, so sore was their dismay, that they all with one accord rent their garments, and cried aloud, and wept and wailed without stint. They laid the blame of the disaster on Mardonius; and their grief on the occasion was less on account of the damage done to their ships, than owing to the alarm which they felt about the safety of the king. Hence their trouble did not cease till Xerxes himself, by his arrival, put an end to their fears."³

29. The remains of the Persian fleet sailed away to the Hellespont. Xerxes being anxious to reach Asia as soon as possible, Mardonius requested that he might select three hundred thousand of the Persian army, and with this bring all Greece into subjection to the Persians. This arrangement was made; but as it was now late in the year, about September, 480 B. C., Mardonius concluded to winter in Thessaly, and make his campaign the following summer. Accordingly, the whole army took up its march from Athens, and arrived in Thessaly.

30. "After the army was come into Thessaly, Mardonius made choice of the troops that were to stay with him; and, first of all, he took the whole body called the 'Immortals,' except only their leader, Hydarnes, who refused to quit the person of the king. Next, he chose the Persians who wore breastplates, and the thousand picked horse; likewise the Medes, the Sacans, the Bactrians, and the Indians, foot and horse equally. These nations he took entire: from the rest of the allies he culled a few men, taking such as were either remarkable for their appearance, or else such as had performed, to his knowledge, some valiant deed. The Persians furnished him with the greatest number of troops, men who were adorned with chains and armlets. Next to them were the Medes, who in number equaled the Persians, but in valor fell short of them. The whole army, reckoning the horsemen with the rest, amounted to three hundred thousand men.

31. "Xerxes, after this, left Mardonius in Thessaly, and marched away himself, at his best speed, toward the Hellespont. In five and forty days he reached the place of passage, where he arrived with scarce a fraction, so to speak, of his former army. All along their line of march, in every country where they chanced to be, his soldiers seized and devoured whatever corn they could find belonging to the inhabitants; while, if no corn was to be found, they gathered the grass that grew in the fields, and stripped the trees, whether cultivated or wild, alike of their bark and of their leaves, and so fed themselves. They left nothing anywhere, so hard were they pressed by hunger. Plague, too, and dysentery attacked the troops while still upon their march, and greatly thinned their ranks. Many died; others fell sick and were left behind in the different cities that lay upon the route, the inhabitants being strictly charged by Xerxes to tend and feed them. Of these some remained in Thessaly, others in Siris of Paeonia, others again in Macedon. Here

Xerxes, on his march into Greece, had left the sacred car and steeds of Jove; which, upon his return, he was unable to recover; for the Paeonians had disposed of them to the Thracians, and, when Xerxes demanded them back, they said that the Thracian tribes which dwelt about the sources of the Strymon had stolen the mares as they pastured.

32. "The Persians, having journeyed through Thrace and reached the passage, entered their ships hastily and crossed the Hellespont to Abydos. The bridges were not found stretched across the strait; since a storm had broken and dispersed them. At Abydos the troops halted, and obtaining more abundant provision than they had yet got upon their march, they fed without stint; from which cause, added to the change in their water, great numbers of those who had hitherto escaped, perished. The remainder, together with Xerxes himself, came safe to Sardis."⁴

1 [Page 111] Book viii, chaps. 34, 35, 40-42, 49, 50, 52-54.

2 [Page 118] "Nothing mortal travels so fast as these Persian messengers. The entire plan is a Persian invention; and this is the method of it: Along the whole line of road there are men (they say) stationed with horses, in number equal to the number of days which the journey takes, allowing a man and horse to each day; and these men will not be hindered from accomplishing at their best speed the distance which they have to go, either by snow, or rain, or heat, or by the darkness of night. The first rider delivers his despatch to the second, and the second passes it to the third; and so it is borne from hand to hand along the whole line, like the light in the torch race, which the Greeks celebrate to Vulcan. The Persians give the riding post in this manner, the name of 'Angarum.'" -- Id., chap. 98.

3 [Page 119] Id., chaps. 67, 68, 70, 71, 74-76, 78, 79, 81-92, 95-99.

4 [Page 120] Id., chaps. 113, 115, 117.

11. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- XERXES.

PLATAEA.

Early in the spring of 479 B. C., Mardonius sent an embassy to Athens to offer friendship, and request them to enter into league with the Persians, which failed, of course. Then he "led his army with all speed against Athens; forcing the several nations through whose land he passed to furnish him with additional troops." The people of Athens again withdrew from the city, "Some to their ships, but the greater part to Salamis, and he gained possession of only a deserted town. It was ten months after taking of the city by the king that Mardonius came against it for the second time."

2. Again Mardonius sent an envoy to the Athenians who were at Salamis, with the same proposals as formerly. The envoy was spared, and was allowed to depart unharmed; but when one of the Athenian counselors, named Lycidas, spoke in favor of laying before the assembly of the people the proposals of Mardonius, both the council and bystanders "were full of wrath, and forthwith surrounded Lycidas, and stoned him to death." And when the Athenian women learned what had happened, "each exhorted her fellow, and one brought another to take part in the deed; and they all flocked of their own accord to the house of Lycidas, and stoned to death his wife and his children."

3. Mardonius, learning that the Greeks were assembling at the Isthmus, burnt Athens the second time, and withdrew into the territory of the Thebans (not far from the city of Thebes, Who were friendly to the Persians, and had even espoused their cause. There he fixed his camp. "His army at this time lay on the Asopus, and stretched from Erythrae, along by Hysiae, to the territory of the Plataeans."¹

122

4. The Greeks, advancing from the Isthmus, "learnt that the barbarians were encamped upon the Asopus, wherefore they themselves, after considering how they should act, disposed their forces opposite to the enemy upon the slopes of Mount Cithaeron. Mardonius, when he saw that the Greeks would not come down into the plain, sent all his cavalry, under Masistius (or Macistius, as the Greeks call him), to attack them where they were. Now Masistius was a man of much repute among the Persians, and rode a Nisaeon charger, with a golden bit, and otherwise magnificently caparisoned. So the horse advanced against the Greeks, and made attacks upon them in divisions, doing them great damage at each charge, and insulting them by calling them women." The result was, however, that Masistius was slain, and the Persians were defeated, leaving the dead body of their commander in the hands of the Greeks.

5. "After this the Greeks determined to quit the high ground and go nearer Plataea, as the land there seemed far more suitable for an encampment than the country about Erythrae, particularly because it was better supplied with water.... So they took their arms, and proceeded along the slopes of Cithaeron, past Hysiae, to the territory of the

Plataeans; and here they drew themselves up, nation by nation, close by the fountain Gargaphia, and the sacred precinct of the Hero Androcrates, partly along some hillocks of no great height, and partly upon the level of the plain." And here, on the Plataean Plain, was fought the last battle of the Persians in Greece, September, 479 B. C.

6. The Persian forces, with their Greek allies, numbered 350,000; the Greek army, 110,000. The two armies waited for ten days after taking position, before the battle was finally joined. "On the eleventh day from the time when the two hosts first took station, one over against the other, near Plataea," the Greeks decided that if the Persians did not attack them that day, they would move their camp to "a tract of ground which lies in front of Plataea, at the distance of ten furlongs from the Asopus and fount Gargaphia, where the army was encamped at that time."

7. They intended to make this movement in the night. A part of the army moved, according to this arrangement; but instead of

123

going to the appointed place, "they fled straight to Plataea, where they took post at the temple of Juno, which lies outside the city, at the distance of about twenty furlongs from Gargaphia, and here they pitched their camp in front of the sacred building." The leaders of the rest of the army quarreled with one another, and, "extended the dispute till morning began to dawn upon them." "Then Pausanias, who as yet had not moved, gave the signal for retreat." At day break the Persian horsemen rode up to reconnoiter "the Greek camp, when they discovered that the place where the Greeks had been posted hitherto was deserted. Hereupon they pushed forward without stopping, and as soon as they overtook the enemy, pressed heavily on them."

8. When this was reported to Mardonius, "he crossed the Asopus, and led the Persians forward at a run directly upon the track of the Greeks, whom he believed to be in actual flight. He could not see the Athenians; for as they had taken the way of the plain, they were hidden from his sight by the hills; he therefore led on his troops against the Lacedaemonians and the Tegeans only. When the commanders of the other divisions of the barbarians saw the Persians pursuing the Greeks so hastily, they all forthwith seized their standards, and hurried after at their best speed, in great disorder and disarray. On they went with loud shouts and in wild riot, thinking to swallow up the runaways."

9. Pausanias sent a horseman to the Athenians to call them to his aid; but they were so harassed by the attacks of the Persian forces that they could not respond. "Accordingly, the Lacedaemonians and the Tegeans -- whom nothing could induce to quit their side -- were left alone to resist the Persians. Including the light armed, the number of the former was 50,000; while that of the Tegeans was 3,000." This little band, not willing to stand any longer on the defensive, "advanced to the attack; while the Persians, on their side, left shooting, and prepared to meet them. And first the combat was at the [rampart of] wicker shields. Afterward, when these were swept down, a fierce contest took place by the side

of the temple of Ceres, which lasted long, and ended in a hand-to-hand struggle. The barbarians many times seized hold of the Greek

124

spears and brake them; for in boldness and warlike spirit the Persians were not a whit inferior to the Greeks; but they were without bucklers, untrained, and far below the enemy in respect of skill in arms. Sometimes singly, sometimes in bodies of ten, now fewer and now more in number, they dashed forward upon the Spartan ranks, and so perished.

10. "The fight went most against the Greeks, where Mardonius, mounted upon a white horse, and surrounded by the bravest of all the Persians, the thousand picked men, fought in person. So long as Mardonius was alive, this body resisted all attacks, and, while they defended their own lives, struck down no small number of Spartans; but after Mardonius fell, and the troops with him, which were the main strength of the army, perished, the remainder yielded to the Lacedaemonians, and took to flight. Their light clothing, and want of bucklers, were of the greatest hurt to them; for they had to contend against men heavily armed, while they themselves were without any such defense. The Persians, as soon as they were put to flight by the Lacedaemonians, ran hastily away, without preserving any order, and took refuge in their own camp, within the wooden defense which they had raised in the Theban territory.

11. "The Persians, and the multitude with them, who fled to the wooden fortress, were able to ascend into the towers before the Lacedaemonians camp up. Thus placed, they proceeded to strengthen the defenses as well as they could; and when the Lacedaemonians arrived, a sharp fight took place at the rampart. So long as the Athenians were away, the barbarians kept off their assailants, and had much the best of the combat, since the Lacedaemonians were unskilled in the attack of walled places; but on the arrival of the Athenians, a more violent assault was made, and the wall was for a long time attacked with fury. In the end the valor of the Athenians and their perseverance prevailed -- they gained the top of the wall, and, breaking a breach through it, enabled the Greeks to pour in.

12. "The first to enter here were the Tegeans, and they it was who plundered the tent of Mardonius; where among other booty they found the manger from which his horses ate, all made of solid brass, and well worth looking at. This manger was given by the Tegeans

125

to the temple of Minerva Alea, while the remainder of their book was brought into the common stock of the Greeks. As soon as the wall was broken down, the barbarians no longer kept together in any array, nor was there one among them who thought of making further resistance -- in good truth they were all half dead with fright, handled as so many thousands were into so narrow and confined a space. With such tameness did they submit to be slaughtered by the Greeks, that of the three hundred thousand men who composed

the army -- omitting the forty thousand by whom Artabazus was accompanied in his flight -- no more than three thousand outlived the battle. Of the Lacedaemonians from Sparta there perished at this combat ninety-one; of the Tegeans, sixteen; of the Athenians fifty-two."²

13. Thus, "the vengeance which was due to the Spartans for the slaughter of Leonidas, was paid them by Mardonius, then, too, del Pausanius, the son of Cleombrotus, and grandson of Anaxandrides (I omit to recount his other ancestors, since they are the same with Leonidas), win a victory exceeding in glory all those to which our knowledge extends." On the same day as the battle of Plataea, the Greek fleet annihilated the Persian fleet and army at Mycale, on the coast of Asia, near Miletus. And so ended the feat of Xerxes in "stirring up all against the realm of Grecia."

14. In his seventh year, 480-79 B. C., Xerxes reached once more his own capital of Susa, and having divorced Vashti at the time of the grand banquet before the expedition against Greece, he issued his decree for the gathering together of maidens from the different parts of the empire, from whom he might choose a wife. Among these was Esther, who was chosen to be queen. "So Esther was taken unto King Ahasuerus into his house royal in the tenth month, which is the month Tebeth, in the seventh year of his reign. And the king loved Esther above all the women, and she obtained grace and favor in his sight more than all the virgins; so that he set the royal crown upon her head, and made her queen instead of Vashti."³

126

15. In 470 Athens sent out a fleet of two hundred ships, under the command of Cimon, to invade the coasts of Asia. He was joined by a hundred ships of the Asiatic Greeks, and with this combined fleet "he took in all the maritime parts of Caria and Lydia, driving all the Persians out of all the cities they were possessed of in those parts; and then, hearing that they had a great fleet on the coasts of Pamphylia, and were also drawing down thither as great an army by land for some expedition, he hastened thither with two hundred and fifty of his best ships in quest of them; and finding their fleet, consisting of three hundred and fifty sail, at anchor in the mouth of the river Eurymedon, and their land army encamped on the shore near by, he first assaulted their fleet, which, being soon put to the rout, and having no other way to fly except up the river, was all taken, every ship of them, and twenty thousand men in them, the rest having either escaped to land or been slain in the fight. After this, while his forces were thus flushed with success, he put them ashore and fell upon the land army, and overthrew them also with a great slaughter; whereby he got two great victories in the same day, of which one was equal to that of Salamis, and the other to that of Plataea."

16. "The next year [469] Cimon sailed to the Hellespont; and falling on the Persians who had taken possession of the Thracian Chersonesus, drove them out thence, and subjected their country again to the Athenians ... After this he subdued the Thasians, . . . and then, landing his army on the opposite shore of Thrace, he seized all the gold mines on those coasts, and brought under him all that country as far as Macedon." -- Prideaux.⁴

17. "From this time no more of Xerxes's ships were seen in the AEgean Sea, nor any of his forces on the coast adjoining it, all the remainder of his reign," which, however, continued but four years longer. In 465, about the time of his twentieth year, Xerxes was murdered as the result of a conspiracy led by Artabanus, chief of the guard.

1 [Page 122] Book lx, chap. 15.

2 [Page 125] Book ix, chaps. 15, 19, 20, 25, 57, 59, 62, 63, 65, 70.

3 [Page 125] Esther 2:16, 17.

4 [Page 126] "Connexion," under years 470-469.

12. EMPIRE OF PERSIA AND MEDIA -- ARTAXERXES TO DARIUS CODOMANUS.

ARTAXERXES, surnamed Longimanus (the long-armed¹), the son of Xerxes, out of much trouble, plot, counterplot, and murder, succeeded Xerxes in the throne of Persia, B. C. 464.

2. In B. C. 460 Egypt revolted, and Athens, to take further vengeance on Persia, joined the Egyptians. But, though the Persians were defeated and their army almost destroyed in the first battle, a greater army was sent into Egypt, and the allied forces were defeated in a great battle, and the whole fleet of the Athenians fell into the hands of the Persians. Egypt was again completely subjected to the Persian power, B. C. 455.

3. In 449 the Athenians again sent out a fleet of two hundred ships, under the command of Cimon. The fleet sailed to Cyprus, and first laid siege to Citium, on that island. There Cimon died; and for want of provisions, the Athenians were forced to raise the siege, and seek some place where their efforts would bring quicker returns. Having departed from Citium, as the fleet was "sailing past Salamis [in Cyprus], it found there a Cilician and Phenician fleet, consisting of three hundred vessels, which it immediately attacked and defeated, notwithstanding the disparity of number. Besides the ships which were sunk, a hundred triremes were taken and the sailors then landed and gained a victory over a Persian army upon the shore." -- Rawlinson.²

4. "Artaxerxes, upon this, fearing lest he should lose Cyprus altogether, and thinking that, if Athens became mistress of this important island, she would always be fomenting insurrection in

Egypt, made overtures for peace to the generals who were now in command. His propositions were favorably received. Peace was made on the following terms: Athens agreed to relinquish Cyprus, and recall her squadron from Egypt; while the king consented to grant freedom to all the Greek cities on the Asiatic continent, and not to menace them either by land or water. The sea was divided between the two powers. Persian ships of war were not to sail to the west of Phaselis in the Levant, or of the Cyanean Islands in the Euxine; and Greek war-ships, we may assume, were not to show themselves east of those limits. On these conditions there was to be peace and amity between the Greeks and the Persians, and neither nation was to undertake any expeditions against the territories of the other. Thus terminated the first period of hostility between Greece and Persia, a period of exactly half a century, commencing B. C. 499 and ending B. C. 449, in the seventeenth year of Artaxerxes."³ The peace at this time concluded was called the "Peace of Callias."

5. In his seventh year, 457 B.C., Artaxerxes issued to Ezra the decree found in Ezra 7, for the finishing of the temple and the complete establishment of the government of the Jews in Palestine.

6. Nehemiah was cup-bearer to this Artaxerxes; and in the twentieth year of the king, Nehemiah was made very sorry by the report that the Jews "in Palestine were in great affliction and reproach," and that the wall of Jerusalem was yet in ruins. As he was offering wine to the king, Artaxerxes noticed his sadness, and asked, "Why is thy countenance sad, seeing thou art not sick? this is nothing else but sorrow of heart." Nehemiah answered, "Let the king live forever: why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchers, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire? Then the king said, . . . For what dost thou make request?" and, says Nehemiah, "I prayed to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king, If it please the king, and if thy servant have found favor in his sight, that thou wouldst send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchers, that I may build it. And the king said unto me, (the queen also

129

sitting by him,) For how long shall thy journey be? and when wilt thou return? So it pleased the king to send me; and I set him a time.

7. "Moreover I said unto the king, If it please the king, let letters be given me to the governors beyond the river, that they may convey me over till I come into Judah; and a letter unto Asaph the keeper of the king's forest, that he may give me timber to make beams for the gates of the palace which appertained to the house, and for the wall of the city, and for the house that I shall enter into. And the king granted me, according to the good hand of my God upon me."⁴

8. Nehemiah immediately reorganized the government, and gathered all the people together, and distributed them clear around the city, building the wall all at once, a certain portion of the people building a certain section.

9. As in former times, the Samaritans were "grieved exceedingly that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel." As soon as they saw that the work was to begin in earnest, "Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, and Geshem the Arabian," laughed them to scorn, and despised them, and said, "What is this thing that ye do? will ye rebel against the king?" But when they learned that the wall was actually being built, they were "wroth, and took great indignation, and mocked the Jews;" and Sanballat "spake before his brethren and the army of Samaria, and said, What do these feeble Jews? will they fortify themselves? will they sacrifice? will they make an end in a day? will they revive the stones out of the heaps of the rubbish which are burned?" And "Tobiah the Ammonite was by him, and he said, Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall."

10. But the Jews proceeded steadily with their building, and "when Sanballat, and Tobiah, and the Arabians, and the Ammonites, and the Ashdodites, heard that the walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the breaches began to be stopped, then they were very wroth, and conspired all of them together to come and to fight.

130

against Jerusalem, and to hinder it." They intended to do it so secretly that the Jews should not know of it until the attack was begun in the very midst of them. But Nehemiah learned of it in time to set all the people on the defensive, which, when the Samaritans discovered, they postponed their attack.

11. Then all the Jews set persistently to work again to build the wall; and, says Nehemiah, "From that time forth,... the half of my servants wrought in the work, and the other half of them held both the spears, the shields, and the bows, and the habergeons; and the rulers were behind all the house of Judah. They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon. For the builders, every one had his sword girded by his side, and so builded. And he that sounded the trumpet was by me.

12. "And I said unto the nobles, and to the rulers, and to the rest of the people, The work is great and large, and we are separated upon the wall, one far from another. In what place therefore ye hear the sound of the trumpet, resort ye thither unto us: our God shall fight for us. So we labored in the work: and half of them held the spears from the rising of the morning till the stars appeared. Likewise at the same time said I unto the people, Let every one with his servant lodge within Jerusalem, that in the night they may be a guard to us, and labor on the day. So neither I, nor my brethren, nor my servants, nor the men of the guard which followed me, none of us put off our clothes, saving that every one put them off for washing."⁵

13. "So the wall was finished in the twenty and fifth day of the month Elul, in fifty and two days. And it came to pass, that when all our enemies heard thereof, and all the heathen that were about us saw these things, they were much cast down in their own eyes: for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God. Moreover in those days the nobles of Judah sent many letters unto Tobiah, and the letters of Tobiah came unto them. For there were many in Judah sworn unto him, because he was the son-in-law of Shechaniah

131

the son of Arah; and his son Johanan had taken the daughter of Meshullam the son of Berechiah. Also they reported his good deeds before me, and uttered my words to him. And Tobiah sent letters to put me in fear."⁶

14. Nehemiah remained twelve years at Jerusalem, restoring the city, the government, and the religious organization of the Jews. He then returned to the king of Persia. He

remained, however, only a short time at the court of the king, when he again "obtained . . . leave of the king," and went up once more to Jerusalem. Having arrived at Jerusalem, he found that in his absence Eliashib the high priest had actually installed Tobiah in one of the chambers in the court of the temple, and Tobiah was dwelling there as though it were in his own house. Nehemiah, without any parley, "cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber," and commanded that that and the other chambers be cleansed, and placed in them the vessels and furniture of the temple that belonged there.

15. Also during Nehemiah's absence the evil of the mixed marriages of the Jews with the heathen had been deepened. As we have seen already, both Tobiah and his son had married daughters of prominent Jews. But now one of the grandsons of Eliashib the high priest had married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite; also there were found "Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab: and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin. Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives?"

16. "And one of the sons of Joaida, the son of Eliashib the

132

high priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business; and for the wood offering, at times appointed, and for the first-fruits. Remember me, O my God, for good."⁷

17. Artaxerxes lived and reigned eight years longer, and died in 425.

18. Xerxes II, the son of Artaxerxes Longimanus, immediately succeeded his father in the throne, but was allowed to reign but forty-five days, being murdered by his half-brother, Sogdianus.

19. Sogdianus seized the throne, by the murder of Xerxes II, and was able to hold it but six months and fifteen days, when he himself was murdered by his half-brother, Ochus.

20. Darius II is the name which Ochus gave himself, on ascending the throne. To this the Greeks added the surname Nothus; so that in the history he stands as Darius Nothus. He reigned nineteen years; but the whole period was hardly anything else than a

continuous series of revolts in the provinces; and intrigues of treacherous men, murderous women, and eunuchs at the court.

21. One notable thing, however, occurred in the reign of Darius Nothus: That grandson of Eliashib the high priest who was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite, and whom Nehemiah chased from Jerusalem, was named Manasseh. Sanballat, Tobiah, Tobiah's sons, and this Manasseh, all finding themselves excluded from Jerusalem and the worship there, determined to have a temple and a worship of their own. Sanballat accordingly went to Darius Nothus and obtained "from him a grant to build on Mount Gerizim, near Samaria, a temple like that at Jerusalem, and to make Manasseh his son-on-law high priest of it."

22. "Sanballat having built this temple, and made Manasseh high priest of it, Samaria thenceforth became the common refuge and asylum of the refractory Jews; so that, if any among them were found guilty of violating the law, as in eating forbidden meats, the

133

breach of the Sabbath, or the like, and were called to an account for it, they fled to the Samaritans, and there found reception; by which means it came to pass that, after some time, the greatest part of that people were made up of apostate Jews and their descendants.... The mixing of so many Jews among them soon made a change in their religion. For whereas they had hitherto worshiped the God of Israel only in conjunction with their other gods, -- that is, the gods of those nations of the East from whence they came, -- after a temple was built among them, in which the daily service was constantly performed in the same manner as at Jerusalem, and the book of the law of Moses was brought to Samaria, and there publicly read to them, they soon left off worshiping their false gods, and conformed themselves wholly to the worship of the true God, according to the rule which was in that book prescribed to them.

23. "However, the Jews, looking on them as apostates, hated them above all the nations of the earth, so as to avoid all manner of converse and communication with them. This hatred first began from the opposition which the Samaritans made against them, on their return from the Babylonish captivity, both in their rebuilding of the temple, and their repairing of the walls of Jerusalem, of which an account hath been above given; and it was afterward much increased by this apostasy of Manasseh and those who joined with him in it, and by their erecting hereon an alter and a temple in opposition to theirs at Jerusalem. And all others who, at any time after, fled from Jerusalem for the violating of the law, always finding reception among them, this continually further added to the rancor which the Jews had entertained against them, till at length it grew to that height that the Jews published a curse and an anathema against them, the bitterest that ever was denounced against any people. For thereby they forbade all manner of communication with them, declared all the fruits and products of their land, and everything else of theirs which was either eaten or drunk among them, to be as swine's flesh; and prohibited all of their nation ever to taste thereof; and also excluded all of that people from ever being received as proselytes to their religion." -- Prideaux.⁸

24. This is why the woman of Samaria was so surprised when Jesus asked her to give him a drink of water; and she replied: "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." It also illustrates the force of that expression of the Jews to the Saviour, "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil;" as in their estimation to be a Samaritan and to have a devil were to the same purpose.

25. Darius Nothus reigned nineteen years, and died B. C. 405, leaving the crown to his eldest son, Arsaces, by his wife Parysatis.

26. Artaxerxes was the name which Arsaces gave himself on becoming king, "to whom the Greeks, for his extraordinary memory, gave the name Mnemon, i. e., the rememberer." However, "Darius and Parysatis had two sons, Artaxerxes the elder, and Cyrus the younger." -- Xenophon.⁹ To Artaxerxes, as we have seen, the crown was given by Darius himself. At the same time Darius bestowed upon Cyrus the governorship of the whole of Asia Minor, the wealthiest of all the provinces of the empire. Yet Cyrus was so insanely jealous of this honor bestowed upon Artaxerxes, that he plotted to murder him at the time of his coronation. The plot was discovered. Cyrus was arrested and was ordered to be executed; but his mother interceded so earnestly for him as to obtain a pardon, and he was allowed to return to the position of governor of Asia Minor.

27. In his place as governor of his province, however, Cyrus still clung to his determination to destroy Artaxerxes and be king himself. Under pretense of planning an invasion of Thrace, he employed Clearchus, a Lacedaemonian captain, to raise an army of Greeks for his service. Shortly afterward, by the intrigue of Cyrus, several cities under the government of Tissaphernes revolted to Cyrus. This caused some minor contention between Cyrus and Tissaphernes, which gave to Cyrus the much-desired opportunity of gathering a powerful army with which really to attack Artaxerxes, but under pretense of defending himself against Tissaphernes. He

even sent to Artaxerxes himself piteous pleas for troops to aid him in protecting himself against Tissaphernes. Through all this, Artaxerxes was completely deceived. Cyrus had also emissaries busily at work among the governors and people throughout the empire, sowing seeds of discontent against Artaxerxes, and constantly turning their attention to Cyrus.

28. At last, in B. C. 401, Cyrus, with 113,000 troops and a powerful fleet, considered himself in position openly to take up his march toward the capital, to unseat Artaxerxes. A part of this army of Cyrus -- indeed the flower of it -- was the "Ten Thousand" immortalized by their famous retreat, and by having Xenophon to record it.

29. Artaxerxes, hearing of the coming of Cyrus, made the greatest preparations possible, and succeeded in gathering an army of about 1,200,000 men. The armies met at Cunaxa, about seventy-five miles from Babylon. The Ten Thousand took the lead in the battle, and at their first onset routed the main part of the army of Artaxerxes, which fled precipitately. Artaxerxes, however, in command of his right wing, held his division of his army together, and began to wheel his troops to attack the forces of Cyrus in the flank. Cyrus seeing this, led his mounted body-guard of six hundred directly against him, and the immediate command of Artaxerxes was also put to flight.

30. The battle was won, and Cyrus was proclaimed king by his troops; which he might easily have continued, if he could have been satisfied with anything less than the death of Artaxerxes. But catching sight of Artaxerxes, he was transported with rage, and crying out, "I see him!" urged forward his horse to meet Artaxerxes, in single combat. The result was that Cyrus was killed, and all his body-guard rushed in and died with him.

31. The main body of the troops of Cyrus firmly believed that they had the victory complete; because they had put to rout the left wing of the army of Artaxerxes; but the right wing of Artaxerxes returning and joining the king, were sure that they had the victory, because Cyrus was dead. The Greeks that had followed the fleeing Persians returned to secure their camp; and Artaxerxes, as soon as

136

Cyrus was killed, sent out messengers and rallied all his forces. The two armies were again soon drawn up to renew the battle. Again, at the first onset of the Greeks, the Persian army broke and fled. The Greeks did not yet know that Cyrus was dead; and night coming on, they gathered again to their camp, and were much surprised to find Cyrus nowhere; but thinking that perhaps he was pursuing the fleeing Persians, they rested easy through the night.

32. The next day, however, the Greeks learned that Cyrus was dead. They immediately sent deputies to one of his principal generals, and asked him to allow himself to be proclaimed king of Persia; but he refused. Artaxerxes sent messengers, demanding that the Greeks should surrender. They strenuously refused. After about five days, a parley was obtained, with Tissaphernes as the "go-between." The Greeks explained (and this was the first occasion that they had had to explain) that Cyrus had not let them know, neither when he left Asia Minor, nor while on the march, that he was leading them against Artaxerxes; and they had no idea of any such thing until the time came for battle, and then when they saw Cyrus surrounded with dangers, they considered it would be infamous to abandon him. They declared that as Cyrus was now dead, they were released from all engagement to him; and as they had no desire to disturb Artaxerxes in his possession of the crown of Persia, they asked that he left them return to their own country.

33. Artaxerxes granted their request, on condition that they should swear that they would not commit any violence or disorder to the people of the country as they passed, but take simply what was necessary to sustain them as they marched. This agreement was sealed by both parties' giving their hands. Yet, after several days' marching, under the escort of Tissaphernes with a considerable army, all the generals and principal officers of the Greeks were inveigled into a pretended council, and were massacred. The following night, by the advice of Xenophon, a council of the Greeks was held, and new officers were appointed in the place of those who had been murdered. Before break of day the whole army was assembled, the determination was formed, and final arrangements were made, to march in a body back to their own country. And there, early in

137

the morning, eighteen hundred miles from home, in the heart of a treacherous enemy's country, began the memorable "Retreat of the Ten Thousand," to which no account, outside of the immortal record made by Xenophon himself, can ever do justice.

34. After Artaxerxes had got rid of the Greeks, he was obliged to conduct a war of six years to deliver the island of Cyprus from Evagoras, who had obtained possession of the city of Salamis, and extended his conquest from city to city, and was in a fair way to become possessor of the whole island. This war came to an end, a treaty of peace was made, allowing Evagoras to continue king of the city of Salamis only, B. C. 385.

35. The next year, Artaxerxes conducted an expedition against the Cadusians, who "inhabited part of the mountains situate between the Euxine and Caspian seas, in the north of Media." -- Rollin.10

36. Some time before this, Egypt had again revolted; and, more than anything else, it was the support which Egypt gave to Evagoras in the island of Cyprus that made it so difficult for the Persians to beat him there. In 377 Artaxerxes determined to bring Egypt again into subjection. He spent three years in gathering together his forces. He secured the alliance of the Greeks, with the exception of the Thebans. The place of general rendezvous was Acco (since called Ptolemias), in Palestine. "In a review there, the army was found to consist of two thousand hundred Persians, under the command of Pharnabazus, and twenty thousand Greeks under Iphicrates. The naval forces were in proportion to those of the land; their fleet consisted of three hundred galleys, besides two hundred vessels of thirty oars, and a prodigious number of barks to transport the necessary provisions for the fleet and army."11

37. The forces reached Egypt in good order, and had much the advantage; but the Egyptians conducted their defense so skilfully as to prevent any decisive battle until the regular inundation of the Nile, when, all of Egypt being under water, the Persians were obliged to abandon the expedition and retire from the country.

38. About the year 361 B. C. there was a revolt almost general

of the provinces of Persia; but as there was no unity of purpose, nor any mutual support, among the revolted governors, any great mischief was prevented by the anxiety of each one to secure the favor of the imperial forces, to protect him from the encroachments of others. "Thus this formidable revolt, which had brought the Persian Empire to the very brink of ruin, dissolved of itself."12

39. The last days of the reign of Artaxerxes "abounded with cabals." The whole court was divided into factions in favor of one or other of his sons, who pretended to the succession. He had one hundred and fifty by his concubines, who were in number 360; and three by his lawful wife, Atasso; viz., Darius, Ariaspes, and Ochus. To put a stop to these intrigues, he declared Darius, the eldest, his successor. And to remove all possibility of disputing that prince's right after the death of Artaxerxes, he permitted Darius to assume from thenceforth the title of king, and to wear the royal tiara."13 However, this did not satisfy Darius, and he formed a conspiracy to murder his father, that he himself might reign alone. The conspiracy was detected, and Darius and his accomplices were put to death. After this all the cabals were renewed, in the midst of which Artaxerxes Mnemon died, B. C. 361, after a reign of forty-three years.

40. Ochus succeeded to the throne upon the death of his father, Artaxerxes Mnemon. "Ochus was the most cruel and wicked of all the princes of his race, as his actions soon evinced. In a very short time the palace and the whole empire were filled with his murders." -- Rollin.14

41. Ochus determined upon the reduction of Egypt; but just as he was starting on his expedition, he was met with the news that Phenicia had revolted and formed an alliance with Egypt. This obliged him to turn his attention to Phenicia. But the Phenicians defeated all the troops which were sent against them. Upon this encouragement, Cyprus threw off the Persian yoke, and joined Phenicia and Egypt. Ochus succeeded in so pacifying the Greeks as to secure himself against any further troops joining the revolted provinces.

He was even able to secure for his army a body of ten thousand Greeks. Then, gathering all his forces together at the border of Phenicia, he took personal command of the whole army, consisting of three hundred thousand infantry and thirty thousand cavalry. Sidon was betrayed into his hands, and he burned it, after which all Phenicia submitted. Upon this, Cyprus desired to make terms, and Ochus, rather than to be longer delayed from invading Egypt, granted peace. Then, all obstacles being out of the way, he took up his long-desired march directly to Egypt.

42. Nectanebus was king of Egypt; and with an army of one hundred and forty thousand he made great preparations for the defense of his country. One battle, however, in which the Persians were victorious, decided the fate of Egypt. "Nectanebus, having

lost all hope of being able to defend himself, escaped with his treasures and most valuable effects into Ethiopia, from whence he never returned. He was the last king of Egypt of the Egyptian race, since whom it has always continued under a foreign yoke, according to the prediction of Ezekiel." -- Rollin.¹⁵

43. "Ochus, having entirely conquered Egypt in this manner, dismantled the cities, pillaged the temples, and returned in triumph to Babylon, laden with spoils, and especially with gold and silver, of which he carried away immense sums. He left the government of it to Pherendates, a Persian of the first quality." In 350 B. C., "Ochus, after the conquest of Egypt, and the reduction of the revolted provinces of his empire, abandoned himself to pleasure and luxurious ease during the rest of his life, and left the care of affairs entirely to his ministers. The two principal of them were the eunuch Bagoas and Mentor the Rhodian, who divided all power between them;" and "after having reigned twenty-three years, Ochus died of poison given him by Bagoas."¹⁶ B. C. 338.

44. Arses, the youngest of the sons of Ochus, was placed upon the throne by Bagoas, who slew all the rest of the king's sons. He chose Arses, the youngest, to occupy the throne, merely that he might have one to bear the name of king, while he himself should

140

exercise the power. This condition of things continued for two years, when Bagoas, perceiving that Arses contemplated bearing the Power, as well as the name, of a king, murdered him, B.C. 336.

45. Darius was next placed on the throne by Bagoas. His original name was Codomanus, but on ascending the throne he took the name of Darius, and is therefore known in history as Darius Codomanus. Bagoas, soon discovering that Darius was likely to assert himself as king instead of being a pliable tool, attempted to poison him; but Darius, having discovered the plot, contrived to bring Bagoas into a position where he was obliged either to drink the deadly poison, or betray himself by refusing; and Bagoas, knowing that the result would be the same in either case, swallowed the poison.

46. Darius Codomanus was the last king of Persia; for the time was at hand when "the prince of Grecia" should "come." And as that "prince" was already on the throne in Grecia, we must now turn our attention thither.

1 [Page 127] His arms were so long that "on his standing upright he could touch his knees" with his hands. -- Prideaux.

2 [Page 127] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Monarchy, chap. Vii, par. 141.

3 [Page 128] Id.

4 [Page 129] Neb 2:2-8.

5 [Page 130] Neb. 4: 16-23.

6 [Page 131] Neb 6 : 15-19.

7 [Page 132] Neb. 13 : 23-31.

8 [Page 133] "Connexion," pars. 4, 6 under 409 B. C.; also Josephus's "Antiquities," book xi, chp.Viii. par. 2.

9 [Page 134] "Anabasis," first sentence.

10 [Page 137] "Ancient History," book ix, chap, iii, sec. vii, par. 1.

11 [Page 137] Id., book xi. chap. i, sec. ix. par. 5.

12 [Page 138] Id., sec, x, par. 16.

13 [Page 138] Id., sec. xi, par.1.

14 [Page 139] "Ancient History," book xiii, sec, i, par. 2.

15 [Page 140] Id., sec. iv, par.22; Eze. 30:13.

16 [Page 140] Id., book xii, sec. iv. pars. 22; sec. v. pars. 1,2.

13. EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- REIGN OF PHILIP.

To Nebuchadnezzar the Lord said that after him there should arise another kingdom "inferior" to his, which was Medo-Persia, "and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth."¹

2. In Dan. 10:20 the angel said, "And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come." Therefore we know that Grecia was the power that should succeed that of Media and Persia -- that Grecia was the "third kingdom of brass" which should "bear rule over all the earth."

3. Philip II succeeded to the kingdom of Macedon B. C. 360, at the age of twenty-three or twenty-four. "Macedonia is a part of Greece." -- Strabo.² "At first Hellas denoted nothing but the spot in Thessaly where the tribe of Hellenes dwelt. In later times, after Philip of Macedon obtained a seat at the Amphictyonic Council,³ it meant the whole peninsula south of the Balkan Mountains (Haemus), including Macedonia and Thrace."⁴

142

4. "Macedon was a hereditary kingdom, situated in ancient Thrace, and bounded on the south by the mountains of Thessaly; on the east by Battia and Pieria; on the west by the Lyncestae; and on the north by Mygdonia and Pelagonia. But after Philip had conquered part of Thrace and Illyrium, this kingdom extended from the Adriatic Sea to the river Strymon. Edessa was first the capital of it, but afterward resigned that honor to Pella, famous for giving birth to Philip and Alexander. The kings of Macedon pretended to descend from Hercules by Caranus, and consequently to be Greeks by extraction. Philip was the son of Amyntas II, who is reckoned the sixteenth king of Macedon from Caranus." -- Rollin.⁵

5. Apart from Macedonia, at the accession of Philip, Greece consisted of nineteen distinct States; and was "at the moment completely disorganized." These nineteen States were, Epirus and Thessaly, which composed North Greece; Acarnania, Aetolia, Locris, Doris, Phocis, Megaris, Baeotia, and Attica, which composed Central Greece; and the Corinthia, Sicyonia, Achaia, Elis, Messenia, Lagonia, Argolis, and Arcadia, which composed the Peloponnesus, or Southern Greece; the island of Euboea, which lay along the eastern coast, formed the nineteenth State, -- but taken all together, the whole territory was only a little larger than is the State of West Virginia, having an area of 25,811 square miles, while West Virginia has 23,000.

6. Imagine a territory so small as that, with a coast line as great as that of Greece, divided into nineteen independent States, two of which comprise fully half of the whole area, each one of the nineteen being jealous of all the others, besides being itself disturbed by factions jealous of each other, with all public spirit gone -- imagine such a condition of affairs as this, and you have a picture of Greece at the time that Philip became king of Macedon.

7. Ever since the time of Xerxes, Greece had been anxiously longing to reach the heart of Persia and wreak her vengeance there, as Persia had done in Greece in the burning of Athens. But it is evident that before Greece could do anything at all herself, or before

143

anything could be done by any one with her, she must be united. She must be united upon her own choice, and so be free; or else be united against her choice, and be in subjection. To form a united Greece under his own hand, was the task which Philip set for himself. Therefore, as soon as he had settled the affairs of his own kingdom, he deliberately set about what he knew to be a mighty task -- the bringing of all the States of Greece into subjection to himself. And this with the definite object of "getting himself appointed, in the assembly of the Greeks, their generalissimo against the Persians." -- Rollin.⁶

8. Greece, of course, was not willing to have it so. She did not desire to have even her dearest wish accomplished in any way that Philip designed. Therefore, everything that he attempted was strenuously opposed by at least a considerable portion of the States of Greece. Demosthenes was at this time just rising to power as an orator; and as such he was the most steady, most determined, and most powerful antagonist to Philip that was found in all Greece. Philip was now twenty-four years old, and Demosthenes was twenty-six. And the task which fell to Demosthenes (for Athens was the head of Greece), to keep the Greeks awake and alive to steady opposition to Philip, was hardly less difficult than was that of Philip to bring all Greece into subjection to himself.

9. For "we must not form a judgment of the character of the Athenians, in the age of which we are now speaking, from that of their ancestors in the time of the battles of Marathon and Salamis, from whose virtues they had extremely degenerated. They were no longer the same men, and had no longer the same maxims nor the same manners. They no longer discovered the small zeal for the public good, the same application to the affairs of State, the same courage in enduring the fatigues of war by sea and land, the same care in managing the revenues, the same willingness to receive salutary advice, the same discernment in the choice of generals of the armies, nor of the magistrates to whom they entrusted the administration of the State." There "had succeeded a fondness for repose, and an indolence with regard to public affairs, an aversion for military

144

labors, which they now left entirely to mercenary troops, and a profusion of the public treasures in games and shows, a love for the flattery which their orators lavished upon them, and an unhappy facility in conferring public offices by intrigue and cabal -- all the usual forerunners of the approaching ruin of States. Such was the situation of Athens at the time when the king of Macedon began to turn his arms against Greece."⁷

10. In his very first Philippic,⁸ Demosthenes said to the people of Athens: "See to what a height the arrogance of that man rises, who will not suffer you to choose either action or

repose; but employs menaces, and, as fame says, speaks in the most insolent terms; and not contented with his first conquests, which are incapable of satiating his lust for dominion, engages every day in some new enterprise. Possibly you wait till necessity reduces you to act. Can there be a greater incentive to free born men than shame and infamy? Will you then forever walk in the public squares with this question in your mouths, 'What news is there?'⁹ Can there be greater news than that a Macedonian has vanquished the Athenians, and made himself the supreme arbiter of Greece? 'Philip is dead,' says one; 'No,' replies another, 'he is only sick.'¹⁰ But whether he be sick or dead, is nothing to the purpose, O Athenians! for the moment after heaven had delivered you from him, should you still behave as you now do, you would raise up another Philip against yourselves; since the man in question owes his grandeur infinitely more to your indolence, than to his own strength."¹¹

11. And now Philip on his part, "as a politician and conqueror, revolves how he may best extend his frontiers, reduce his neighbors, and weaken those whom he is not able to conquer at present; how he may introduce himself into the affairs of Greece, take part in her intestine feuds, make himself its arbiter, join with one side to destroy the other, in order to obtain the empire over all. In the execution of this great design, he spares neither artifices, open force, presents,

145

nor promises. He employs for this purpose negotiations, treaties, and alliances, and each of them singly in such a manner as he judges most conducive to the success of his design, expediency solely determining him in the choice of measures.

12. "We shall always see him acting under this character, in all the steps he takes thenceforth, till he assumes his last character, which is, preparing to attack the great king of Persia, and endeavoring to become the avenger of Greece, by subverting an empire which before had attempted to subject it, and which had always continued its irreconcilable enemy, either by open invasions or secret intrigues." -- Rollin.¹²

13. In 335 B. C. the Sacred War broke out among the states of Greece, and lasted ten years, which gave Philip his desired opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of Greece. The Sacred War was caused by the Phocians, who dwelt near Delphi, through the plowing up of certain grounds that had been consecrated to Apollo. When this was done, it was reported to the states general of Greece as sacrilege. The Phocians were summoned before the Amphictyonic Council, and after an examination of the whole affair, they were declared guilty of sacrilege, and sentenced to pay a heavy fine. They refused to submit, and took up arms. The council met again and declared war on the Phocians, and then the trouble began. Nearly all Greece took part in the quarrel, some of the States taking sides in favor of the god, others joining the Phocians.

14. "In this general movement of the Greeks . . . Philip thought it most consistent with his interest to remain neuter. . . . He was also well pleased to see both parties weaken and consume each other, as he should thereby be enabled to fall upon them afterward with

greater ease and advantage."13 However, in 353 B. C., Philip interfered so far as to join Thessaly to his kingdom, and the Thessalian cavalry to his standard, and start to invade Phocis; but the Athenians seized Thermopylae, and he was obliged to return to Macedonia for a season. At last the Thebans grew tired of the Sacred War, and sought the alliance of Philip. This

146

was just what Philip was waiting for, and he therefore, "declared at once in their favor." 15. "There was nothing Philip had more at heart than to possess himself of Thermopylae, as it opened to him a passage into Greece; to appropriate to himself all the honor of the Sacred War, as if he had been the principal in that affair; and to preside in the Pythian games. He was desirous of aiding the Thebans, and by their means to possess himself of Phocis; but then, in order to put this double design into execution, it was necessary for him to keep it secret from the Athenians, who had actually declared war against Thebes, and who for many years had been in alliance with the Phocians. His business, therefore, was to place other objects in their view; and on this occasion the politics of Philip succeeded to a wonder."14

16. Just at this juncture, the Athenians also grew tired of the war, and sent two commissioners to Philip to sound him in regard to his helping to bring about a peace. He of course answered very favorably. Thereupon Athens sent ten ambassadors, of whom Demosthenes was one, to inquire fully about all points in regard to the important question. The ten returned with a very favorable report indeed. Then these ten ambassadors were immediately sent back to Philip "with full powers to conclude a peace and ratify it by oaths." After considerable delay on the part of the ambassadors, and more on the part of the Philip, with his troops advancing all the time, peace was ratified, but Philip refused to include the Phocians. when the embassy returned to Athens a controversy arose there whether Philip was to be trusted or not, and while they were contending over that question, Philip decided it by taking possession of Thermopylae, "which opened to him the gates, and put into his hands the keys, of Greece." He at once invaded Phocis. The Phocians sued for peace, and yielded themselves to Philip's mercy. And so ended the Sacred War, with Philip in possession of the key of Greece.

17. Philip immediately assembled the Amphictyonic Council to pass judgment on the Phocians. The council decreed that all the cities of Phocis should be destroyed; that they should have no towns

147

of more than sixty houses each; that such towns should be a certain distance apart; that none should enjoy any possessions except upon the payment of an annual tribute; and that the Phocian seat in the council was forfeited. Then Philip demanded that the council give him the vacant seat, which, as a matter of course, was done, and so Philip of Macedon became a member of the general council of the States of Greece. Next the obsequious council gave him, in conjunction with the Boeotians and Thessalians, the superintendence

of the Pythian games. Thus he had obtained all his wish, after which he returned to Macedon, but still holding possession of Thermopylae.

18. The next seven years Philip spent in wars in Illyria, Thrace, and Scythia, and in an unsuccessful siege of Byzantium. In 338 B. C., another trouble, similar to that which caused the Sacred War, arose among the Locrians. The question came before the Amphictyonic Council. Philip had bribed the orators of the council, and they persuaded the deputies that it were much better to elect Philip generalissimo of all Greece, than to assess their respective States for the means with which to hire soldiers to fight the Locrians.

19. Accordingly, "by a public decree, `ambassadors were sent to Philip of Macedon, who, in the name of Apollo and the Amphictyons, implore his assistance, beseech him not to neglect the cause of that god which the impious Amphisians make their sport; and notify him, that for this purpose all the Greeks, associated in the council of the Amphictyons, elect him for their general, with full power to act as he shall think proper.' This was the honor to which Philip had long aspired, the aim of all his views, and the end of all the engines he had set at work till that time. He therefore did not lose a moment, but immediately assembled his forces . . . and possessed himself of Elatea, the greatest city in Phocis."¹⁵

20. Athens at last awoke to the reality of danger, and took prompt measures for defense. She sought also to secure the alliance of Thebes against Philip. Ambassadors, of whom Demosthenes was chief, were sent to that city for this purpose. Philip also was very desirous of securing the alliance of Thebes, and therefore sent ambassadors, of whom Pithon, his finest orator, was chief.

148

These two embassies met at Thebes. It was in truth an oratorical contest between Demosthenes and Pithon as to which side should have the alliance of Thebes. Demosthenes, however, completely overwhelmed his antagonist, and like an avalanche carried the Thebans to the desired alliance with Athens against Philip.

21. Philip was somewhat disconcerted by this union of the two strongest States of Greece; and immediately "sent ambassadors to the Athenians to request them not to levy an armed force, but to live in harmony with him." Of course this overture failed; for the Athenians were now thoroughly convinced that, of all people they could not trust Philip. The army of Philip was composed of thirty thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry; the army of the allies was nearly as large.

22. The two armies met at Chaeronea, in Boeotia. Of the allies the Thebans formed the right wing, and the Athenians the left. Philip commanded his own right wing against the Athenians, and his left wing, opposed to the Thebans, he gave "to his son Alexander, who was then but sixteen or seventeen years old, having posted his ablest officers near him." "Alexander discovered in this battle all the capacity which could be expected from a

veteran general, together with all the intrepidity of a young warrior. It was he who brake, after a long and vigorous resistance, the sacred battalion of the Thebans, which was the flower of their army. The rest of the troops, who were round Alexander, being encouraged by his example, entirely routed them." -- Rollin.¹⁶ On the right, after a bitter struggle, Philip succeeded in routing also the Athenians. Demosthenes was among them, and he "threw down his arms and fled with the rest." As he was fleeing, his robe happened to catch on a bramble. He was so badly frightened that he mistook it for one of the enemy, and in terror shouted, "Spare my life !" ¹⁷

23. By the victory of Chaeronea, all Greece finally lay at the feet of Philip. "Macedon at that time, with no more than thirty thousand soldiers, gained a point which Persia, with millions of men, had attempted unsuccessfully at Plataea, at Salamis, and at Marathon." -- Rollin.¹⁸

149

24. However, "Philip used his victory moderately; for he wished to leave Greece quiet behind him when he crossed into Asia to assail the great king" ¹⁹ of Persia. "In the first years of his reign he had repulsed, divided, and disarmed his enemies. In the succeeding ones, he had subjected, by artifice or force, the most powerful States of Greece, and had made himself its arbiter; but now he prepares to revenge the injuries which Greece had received from the barbarians, and meditates no less a design than the destruction of their [the Persian] empire. The greatest advantage he gained by his last victory (and this was the object he long had in view, and never lost sight of) was to get himself appointed, in the assembly of the Greeks, their generalissimo against the Persians." -- Rollin. ²⁰

25. Having attained all the other objects of his ambition, as originally designed, Philip now advanced to the accomplishment of this final one. Accordingly he "next proceeded to convene a congress of Grecian cities at Corinth. He here announced himself as resolved on an expedition against the Persian king, for the purpose of liberating the Asiatic Greeks and avenging the invasion of Greece by Xerxes. The general vote of the congress nominated him leader of the united Greeks for this purpose, and decreed a Grecian force to join him, to be formed of contingents furnished by the various cities. . . . It was in 337 B. C. that this Persian expedition was concerted and resolved. During that year preparations were made of sufficient magnitude to exhaust the finances of Philip, who was at the same time engaged in military operations, and fought a severe battle against the Illyrian king Pleurias. In the spring of 336 B. C., a portion of the Macedonian army under Parmenio and Attalus was sent across to Asia to commence military operations, Philip himself intending speedily to follow." -- Grote.²¹

26. But it was not for Philip to carry the war against Persia. He could unite Greece under one head; he could shape the forces so that they could be wielded by one mighty arm; and then his

150

work was done. It was reserved for a mightier than he to hurl the rugged forces of Macedon and Greece against the multitudes of the Persian king. In B. C. 336, Philip was assassinated at the marriage feast of his daughter. Thus he died at the age of forty-seven years, after a reign of twenty-four years. Ochus, king of Persia, died the same year -- poisoned by the eunuch Bagoas.

1 [Page 141] Dan. 2:39, last part.

2 [Page 141] "Fragments," book vii, chap. i, par. 1; sec. iii, par. 1.

3 [Page 141] The Amphictyonic Council "was a Hellenic institution, ancient and venerable, but rarely invested with practical efficiency. Though political by occasion, it was religious in its main purpose, associated with the worship of Apollo at Delphi and of Demeter at Thermopylae. Its assemblies were held twice annually -- in spring at Delphi, in autumn at Thermopylae, while every fourth year it presided at the celebration of the great Pythian festival near Delphi, or appointed persons to preside in its name. It consisted of deputies called Hieromnemones and Pylagorae, sent by the twelve ancient nations or factions of the Hellenic name, who were recognized as its constituent body. Thessalians, Boeotians, Dorians, Ionians Perrhaebians, Magnetes, Cetaeans, or Aenianes, Achaeans, Malians, Phocians, Dolopes. These were the twelve nations, sole partners in the Amphictyonic sacred rites and meetings, each nation, small and great alike, having two votes in the decision and no more; and each city, small and great alike, contributing equally to make up the two votes of that nation to which it belonged. Thus Sparta counted only as one of the various communities forming the Dorian; Athens, in like manner in the Ionian, not superior in rank of Erythrae or Priene." -- Grote's "History of Greece," chap. lxxxvii, par. 2.

4 [Page 141] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Greece, par. 1.

5 [Page 142] Ancient History," Philip, sec. 1. 1, 3.

6 [Page 143] Id., sec. vii, par. 1.

7 [Page 144] Id., sec. iii, par. 2

8 [Page 144] The Philippics of Demosthenes are his speeches against Philip. Hence the term "Philippie."

9 [Page 144] Acts 17:21

10 [Page 144] Philip had lately wounded at the siege of Methone.

- 11 [Page 144] Rollin's translation, "Ancient History," Philip. sec. iii, par 4
- 12 [Page 145] "Ancient History," Philip, sec. i, pars. 21, 22.
- 13 [Page 145] Id., sec. ii, par. 7.
- 14 [Page 146] Id., sec. iv, par. 2.
- 15 [Page 147] Id., sec. vi, pars, 5, 6.
- 16 [Page 148] Id., sec. iv, par. 18,
- 17 [Page 148] Id., par. 19.
- 18 [Page 148] Id., sec. vii, par. 1.
- 19 [Page 149] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Macedonian Empire, par. 3.
- 20 [Page 149] "Ancient History," Philip, sec. vii, par. 1.
- 21 [Page 149] "History of Greece," chap. xc, par. 11 from end.

15. EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- ALEXANDER.

IN EUROPE.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT, the son of Philip, at twenty years of age succeeded Philip as king of Macedon and head of Greece, B. C. 336. Darius Codomanus succeeded Ochus in the throne of Persia the same year. Thus the last king of Persia and his conqueror-that was to be, began to reign in the same year.

2. Alexander inherited all the ambition of both his father Philip and his mother Olympias; while the ambition of either of these was a sufficient portion for any human being. Indeed, it was more than sufficient for human beings; for each of them aspired to divinity.

3. Olympias was the "daughter of Neoptolemus, prince of the Molossi, and descended from the ancient Molossian kings, who boasted of a heroic Eakid genealogy." Philip first met her "at the religious mysteries in the island of Samothrace, where both were initiated at the same time. In violence of temper, in jealous, cruel, and vindictive disposition, she forms almost a parallel to the Persian queens Amestris and Parysatis. The Epirotic women, as well as the Thracian, were much given to the Bacchanalian religious rites, celebrated with fierce ecstasy amid the mountain solitudes, in honor of Dionysus. To this species of religious excitement, Olympias was peculiarly susceptible. She is said to have been fond of tame snakes playing around her, and to have indulged in ceremonies of magic and incantation. Her temper and character became, after no long time, repulsive and even alarming to Philip." Grote.¹ Philip finally divorced her, and "successively married several wives," the last of whom was a young lady whose name was Cleopatra.

152

4. Philip was in the very act of celebrating his own divinity when he was slain by Pausanias. For at that moment he was making a grand and majestic entry into the great and crowded theater, having been preceded only shortly before by a procession of the twelve great gods, and "immediately after them the statue of Philip himself as a thirteenth god." "The hour for his leaving the palace having arrived, he went forth in a white robe, and advanced with a majestic air, in the midst of acclamations, toward the theater, where an infinite multitude of Macedonians as well as foreigners waited his coming with impatience." -- Rollin.² "As he approached the door . . . he felt so exalted with the impression of his own dignity, and so confident in the admiring sympathy of the surrounding multitude, that he advanced both unarmed and unprotected, directing his guards to hold back. At this moment Pausanias, standing near with a Gallic sword concealed under his garment, rushed upon him, thrust the weapon through his body, and killed him." -- Grote.³ Besides this, Philip was given both to drunkenness and licentiousness, in addition to his utter perfidy in politics.⁴

5. From such parentage as this on both sides, it is easy to understand the violent temper, the indulgence in strong drink, and the aspiration to be a god, that marks the whole public career of Alexander the Great.

6. From the age of thirteen "for at least three years," Alexander was "under the instruction of Aristotle, whom Philip expressly invited for the purpose." Thus he who is called the greatest conqueror in the world of arms was taught by him who has been called "the greatest conqueror in the world of thought."

7. When, at the sudden death of Philip, the crown was placed "on the head of Alexander the Great, no one knew what to expect

153

from the young prince thus suddenly exalted at the age of twenty years. . . . It remained to be proved whether the youthful son of Philip was capable of putting down opposition and upholding the powerful organization created by his father.

8. "But Alexander, present and proclaimed at once by his friends, showed himself, both in word and deed, perfectly competent to the emergency. He mustered, caressed, and conciliated the divisions of the Macedonian army and the chief officers. His addresses were judicious and energetic, engaging that the dignity of the kingdom should be maintained unimpaired, and that even the Asiatic projects already proclaimed should be prosecuted with as much vigor as if Philip still lived.

9. "By unequivocal manifestations of energy and address, and by despatching rivals or dangerous malcontents, Alexander thus speedily fortified his position on the throne at home. But from the foreign dependents of Macedon -- Greeks, Thracians, and Illyrians -- the like acknowledgment was not so easily obtained. Most of them were disposed to throw off the yoke; yet none dared to take the initiative of moving, and the suddenness of Philip's death found them altogether unprepared for combination. By that event the Greeks were discharged from all engagement, since the vote of the confederacy had elected him personally as emperor. They were now at full liberty, in so far as there was any liberty at all in the proceeding, to elect any one else, or to abstain from re-electing at all, and even to let the confederacy expire.

10. "Now it was only under constraint and intimidation, as was well known both in Greece and Macedonia, that they had conferred this dignity on Philip, who had earned it by splendid exploits, and had proved himself the ablest captain and politician of the age. They were by no means inclined to transfer it to a youth like Alexander, until he had shown himself capable of bringing the like coercion to bear, and extorting the same submission. The wish to break loose from Macedonia, widely spread throughout the Grecian cities, found open expression from Demosthenes and others in the assembly at Athens." Demosthenes "depreciated the abilities of Alexander, calling him Margites, the name of a silly character in

one of the Homeric poems, and intimating that he would be too much distracted with embarrassments and ceremonial duties at home, to have leisure for a foreign march." -- Grote.⁵ But "the Greeks of Thebes and Athens little knew what sort of man had taken the place of Philip. . . . They had to reckon with one who could swoop on his prey with the swiftness of an eagle."⁶

11. "Apprised of these impulses prevalent throughout the Grecian world, Alexander felt the necessity of checking them by a demonstration immediate, as well as intimidating. The energy and rapidity of his proceedings speedily overawed all those who had speculated on his youth, or had adopted the epithets applied to him by Demosthenes. Having surmounted, in a shorter time than was supposed possible, the difficulties of his newly acquired position at home, he marched into Greece at the head of a formidable army, seemingly about two months after the death of Philip. He was favorably received by the Thessalians, who passed a vote constituting Alexander head of Greece in place of Philip; which vote was speedily confirmed by the Amphictyonic assembly, convoked at Thermopylae.

12. "Alexander next advanced to Thebes, and from thence over the isthmus of Corinth into Peloponnesus. . . . His great force, probably not inferior to that which had conquered at Chaeronea, spread terror everywhere, silencing all except his partizans. Nowhere was the alarm greater than at Athens. The Athenians, recollecting both the speeches of their orators and the votes of their assembly . . . trembled lest the march of Alexander should be directed against their city, and accordingly made preparation for a siege. . . . At the same time, the assembly adopted . . . a resolution of apology and full submission to Alexander; they not only recognized him as chief of Greece, but conferred upon him divine honors, in terms even more emphatic than those bestowed on Philip. The mover, with other legates, carried the resolution to Alexander, whom they found at Thebes, and who accepted the submission.

13. "After displaying his force in various portions of Peloponnesus, Alexander returned to Corinth, where he convened deputies

from the Grecian cities generally. . . . Alexander asked from the assembled deputies the same appointment which the victorious Philip had required and obtained two years before -- the hegemony, or headship, of the Greeks collectively for the purpose of prosecuting war against Persia. To the request of a prince at the head of an irresistible army, one answer only was admissible. He was nominated imperator, with full powers by land and sea.

14. "The convention sanctioned by Alexander was probably the same as that settled by and with his father Philip. Its grand and significant feature was that it recognized Hellas as a confederacy under the Macedonian prince as imperator, president, or executive head

and arm. It crowned him with a legal sanction as keeper of the peace within Greece, and conqueror abroad in the name of Greece." -- Grote.⁷

15. Alexander "summoned, at Corinth, the assembly of the several States and free cities of Greece, to obtain from them the same supreme command against the Persians as had been granted to his father a little before his death. No diet ever debated on a more important subject. It was the Western world deliberating on the ruin of the East, and the methods for executing a revenge that had been suspended more than an age. The assembly held at this time will give rise to events, the relation of which will appear astonishing and almost incredible; and to revolutions which will change the appearance of things nearly throughout the world.

16. "To form such a design required a prince bold, enterprising, and experienced in war; . . . but above all, a monarch who had supreme authority over all the States of Greece, none of which singly was powerful enough to make so arduous an attempt; and which required, in order to their acting in concert, to be subject to one chief, who might give motion to the several parts of that great body by making them all concur to the same end. Such a prince was Alexander. It was not difficult for him to rekindle in the minds of the people their ancient hatred of the Persians, their perpetual and irreconcilable enemies, whose destruction they had more than once sworn, and whom they had determined to extirpate, in case an

156

opportunity should ever present itself for that purpose. . . . The deliberations of the assembly were therefore very short, and that prince was unanimously⁸ appointed generalissimo against Persia." -- Rollin.⁹

17. While Alexander left "Macedonian officers in the exercise of their new imperial authority throughout Greece and the islands," he himself "returned home to push the preparations for his Persian campaign. He did not, however, think it prudent to transport his main force into Asia until he had made his personal ascendancy felt by the Macedonian dependencies westward, northward, and north-eastward of Pella -- Illyrians, Paeonians, and Thracians. Under these general names were comprised a number of distinct tribes, or nations, warlike, and for the most part predatory. Having remained unconquered until the victories of Philip, they were not kept in subjection even by him without difficulty; nor were they at all likely to obey his youthful successor until they had seen some sensible evidence of his personal energy." -- Grote.¹⁰

18. But they were soon effectually treated to a "sensible evidence of his personal energy" -- in about one month he had swept the country from the borders of Macedonia through the midst of Thracia and Moesia to, and across, the Danube at about the twenty-sixth degree of longitude, there to attack the Getae. "The Getae, intimidated not less by this successful passage than by the excellent array of Alexander's army, hardly stayed to sustain a charge of cavalry; but hastened to abandon their poorly fortified town, and retire farther away from the river. Entering the town without resistance, he destroyed it, carried

away such movables as he found, and then returned to the river without delay. Before he quitted the northern bank, he offered sacrifice to Zeus the Preserver, to Heracles, and to the god Ister (Danube) himself, whom he thanked for having shown himself not impassable. On the very same day, he recrossed the river to his camp; after an empty demonstration of force intended to prove that he could do what neither his father nor any Grecian

157

army had ever yet done, and what every one deemed impossible -- crossing the greatest of all known rivers without a bridge and in the face of an enemy." -- Grote.¹¹

19. From there, in about four months he had marched up the Danube about a hundred and fifty miles; then southeastward to the southern point of Lake Lychnidus (the present Ochrida Lake), in the southern part of Illyria (the present Albania), conquering all as he went; and in less than three weeks after arriving at Lake Lychnidus, he stood with his army in Boeotia, to the south of Thebes, ready to chastise that city for her rebellion during his absence.

20. As Alexander had sent home neither messengers nor reports during the whole time of his expedition up the Danube, rumor was busy in saying that he was dead. "Among these reports, both multiplied and confident, one was certified by a liar who pretended to have just arrived from Thrace, to have been an eye-witness of the fact, and to have been himself wounded in the action against the Triballi, where Alexander had perished." -- Grote.¹² This was only too gladly received at Athens and Thebes. Encouraged, and even assisted, by Demosthenes and other prominent citizens of Athens, though not by the city as such, Thebes threw off the Macedonian yoke, proclaimed herself free, and summoned the Macedonian garrison to surrender. As the garrison occupied the citadel, which was strongly fortified and well provisioned, they refused to surrender.

21. The Thebans blockaded the citadel, and sent messengers to the neighboring States to come to their assistance. Demosthenes, both on his own part and as the paid agent of Persia, was busy as orator and envoy in behalf of the Theban revolt. However, the other States and cities were unwilling to take any decided steps until they should more certainly know that Alexander was really dead. The Thebans pushed steadily closer and their blockade of the Macedonian garrison, and would shortly have forced a surrender, when they were startled by the fearful news that Alexander was within less than two days' march of Thebes itself.

22. "In this incident we may note two features which characterized

158

Alexander to the end of his life -- matchless celerity of movement, and no less remarkable favor of fortune. . . . He was already within Thermopylae before any Greeks were aware that he was in march, or even that he was alive. The question about

occupying Thermopylae by a Grecian force was thus set aside. . . . His arrival, in itself a most formidable event, told with double force on the Greeks from its extreme suddenness. . . . As it happened, his unexpected appearance in the heart of Greece precluded all combination, and checked all idea of resistance." -- Grote.¹³ As soon as he was safely within Thermopylae on his hurried march, Alexander exclaimed, "Demosthenes called me in his orations a little child, when I was in Illyria and among the Triballi; he called me a young man when I was in Thessaly; I must show him before the walls of Athens that I am a man grown." -- Rollin.¹⁴

23. The Thebans were summoned to surrender. They refused. He asked them to deliver up to him the two ringleaders, and offered a general pardon to all who would come over to him. They refused everything, and taunted him by demanding in return the surrender of his two chief officers, and inviting all his army to come over and join them. Through a fierce battle the city was taken by storm, thousands of the people were slaughtered, the whole place was plundered, thirty thousand captives were sold into slavery, and the city of "Thebes was effaced from the earth."

24. Alexander then immediately sent envoys to Athens with a threatening and denunciatory letter "formally demanding the surrender of eight or ten leading citizens of Athens," of whom Demosthenes was one. An embassy was sent in return to plead with Alexander not to enforce his dreadful demand. He refused even to hear their plea. A second embassy was sent, to whose pleadings he yielded all, except that he demanded the banishment of the two chief military leaders, who accordingly went to Persia and entered the army of Darius.

25. Alexander then, without visiting Athens, or even entering Attica, marched direct to Corinth, where he received deputations

159

from various Grecian cities. He there also presided at a meeting of the assembled deputies of the Grecian States, at which he levied the quota of troops that each State should supply in the intended expedition, the following spring, against Persia. This having been settled, "Alexander left Greece for Pella in the autumn of 335 B. C., and never saw it again."¹⁵

1 [Page 151] "History of Greece." chap. lxxxvi, last par.

2 [Page 152] "Ancient History," Philip, sec. vii, par. 5.

3 [Page 152] "History of Greece," chap xc, par. 7 from end

4 [Page 152] "The contemporary historian Theopompus, a warm admirer of Philip's genius, stigmatizes not only the perfidy of his public dealings, but also the drunkenness, gambling, and excesses of all kinds in which he indulged, encouraging the like in those around him. His Macedonian and Grecian body-guard, eight hundred in number, was a troop in which no decent man could live; distinguished indeed for military bravery and aptitude, but sated with plunder, and stained with such shameless treachery, sanguine rapacity, and unbridled lust, as befitted only Centaurs and Laestrygons." -- Grote's "History of Greece." chap. xc, last paragraph but one.

5 [Page 154] Id., chap. xci, par. 14.

6 [Page 154] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Alexander the Great par. 3; Dan. 7: 6: 8: 5,21.

7 [Page 155] "History of Greece," chap. xci. pars. 10-14, 16-18.

8 [Page 156] According to Grote, it was not exactly unanimous. He says the Lacedaemonians did not acquiesce in the vote. -- Chap. xci, par. 17.

9 [Page 156] "Ancient History," Alexander, sec. ii. pars. 15, 16.

10 [Page 156] "History of Greece," chap. xci, par. 26.

11 [Page 157] Id., chap. xci, par. 29.

12 [Page 157] Id., chap. xci, par. 35.

13 [Page 158] Id., chap. xci, pars. 40, 41; Dan. 7: 6.

14 [Page 158] "Ancient History." Alexander, sec. i, par. 5.

15 [Page 159] "History of Greece," chap. xci, last paragraph but one.

CHAPTER XV.

EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- ALEXANDER.

GRANICUS, ISSUS, AND ARBELA.

THE winter of 335 B. C. was employed by Alexander "in completing his preparations; so that early in the spring of 334 B. C., his army, destined for the conquest of Asia, was mustered between Pella and Amphipolis, while his fleet was at hand to lend support."

2. "The army intended for Asia, having been assembled at Pella, was conducted by Alexander himself first to Amphipolis, where it crossed the Strymon; next along the road near the coast to the river Nestus and to the towns of Abdera and Maroneia; then through Thrace across the rivers Hebrus and Melas; lastly, through the Thracian Chersonese to Sestos. Here it was met by his fleet, consisting of a hundred and sixty triremes, with a number of trading vessels besides; made up in large proportions from contingents furnished by Athens and Grecian cities. The passage of the whole army -- infantry, cavalry, and machines -- on ships, across the strait from Sestos in Europe to Abydos in Asia, was superintended by Parmenio, and accomplished without either difficulty or resistance.

3. "The army when reviewed on the Asiatic shore after its crossing, presented a total of thirty thousand infantry and four thousand five hundred cavalry. . . . Besides these troops, there must have been an effective train of projectile machines and engines, for battles and sieges, which we shall soon find in operation. As to money, the military chest of Alexander, exhausted in part by profuse donatives to Macedonian officers," contained only seventy talents, -- \$78, 085, -- no more than enough to maintain his army for thirty days; besides this he had, in bringing together and fitting out his army, incurred a debt of about \$1,450,150, -- Grote.¹

161

4. Thus in the spring of 334 B. C., on the soil of the Persian Empire, stood Alexander the Great, "as the chief of united Greece," and "the conqueror abroad in the name of Greece," extending the Greek power over all the nation of the East, and carrying to them Greek art, the Greek language, and Greek civilization. And so, according to the word of the Lord, spoken two hundred years before, "the prince of Grecia" HAD "come."²

5. About seventy-five or eighty miles from the place where Alexander landed in Asia Minor, the river Granicus pours into the Sea of Marmora. There, early in his fourth day's march, May 22, B. C. 334,³ he found the Persian army drawn up in battle array, on the eastern bank of the river. "On approaching the river he made his preparations for immediate attack." Alexander's forces having arrived at the brink of the river, the two armies stood for some time "watching each other in anxious silence." Then Alexander gave the word of command, and with wild war-shouts, and sound of trumpets, his troops rushed into the river and across, and in a little while had gained the opposite bank. The Persian army was annihilated. Of the Persian troops about twenty thousand were killed, and about two thousand were taken prisoners; while of Alexander's soldiers there were only one hundred and fifteen killed, and about one thousand one hundred and fifty wounded. "No victory could be more decisive or terror-striking than that of Alexander" at the Granicus. "There remained no force in the field to oppose him. . . . Such exploits,

impressive even when we read of them now, must at the moment when they occurred have acted most powerfully upon the imagination of contemporaries." -- Grote.⁴

6. "The battle of Granicus threw open to Alexander the whole of Asia Minor. . . . Accordingly, the Macedonian operations for the next twelve months, or nearly the whole space that intervened between the battles of the Granicus and of Issus, consisted of little more than a series of marches and sieges." -- Rawlinson.⁵

162

7. From the Granicus Alexander sent Parmenio into Phrygia to attack the capital of that province. Parmenio found the place evacuated by the garrison, and it surrendered without a blow. "The whole satrapy of Phrygia thus fell into Alexander's power." -- Grote.⁶

8. Alexander himself, with the main part of his army, marched direct to Sardis, "the bulwark of the barbarian empire on the side next the sea," about one hundred and forty miles southeast of the place where the battle of the Granicus was fought. That city, though so strong both by nature and by military skill as to be "accounted impregnable," sent out a deputation of citizens to meet Alexander eight miles from the place, and surrender to him the city. "The town, citadel, garrison, and treasure were delivered up to him without a blow." Without any delay at Sardis he marched direct to Ephesus, about sixty miles to the southwest, which likewise offered no resistance. From Ephesus he went straight to Miletus, twenty-eight miles to the southeast, which attempted resistance, but after a brief assault by battering-rams was taken by storm at the first onset.

9. From Miletus he marched forty-miles southeastward to Halicarnassus in Caria, a strongly fortified city, and the capital of Caria. "The siege was long, and attended with such surprising difficulties as would have discouraged any warrior but an Alexander; yet the view of danger served only to animate his troops, and their patience was at last successful." -- Rollin.⁷ "The ensuing winter months he employed in the conquest of Lycia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia. All the southern coast of Asia Minor is mountainous, the range of Mount Taurus descending nearly to the sea, so as to leave little or no intervening breadth of plain. In spite of great strength of situation, such was the terror of Alexander's arms, that all the Lycian towns -- Hyparna, Telmissus, Pinara, Xanthus, Patara, and thirty others -- submitted to him without a blow."

10. As he was marching to Perga in Pamphylia "the ordinary mountain road by which he sent most of his army was so difficult

163

as to require some leveling by Thracian light troops sent in advance for the purpose. But the king himself, with a select detachment, took a road more difficult still, called Climax, under the mountains by the brink of the sea. When the wind blew from the south, this road was covered by such a depth of water as to be impracticable. For some time before he had reached the spot, the wind had blown strong from the south; but as he came near,

the special providence of the gods (so he and his friends conceived it) brought on a change to the north, so that the sea receded and left an available passage, though his soldiers had the water up to their waists." -- Grote.⁸

11. From Perga Alexander continued without material hindrance his conquering course northward to Gordium the capital of Greater Phrygia, where he arrived about the latter part of February, 333, and remained resting his army, till the middle of the following May. After the siege of Halicarnassus, and before entering Lycia, Alexander had allowed all the newly married men in his army to go home to Macedonia to spend the winter, upon their promise to return to him in the spring. Promptly in the spring these came to him at Gordium, bringing with them re-enforcements to the number of 3,650 men.

12. Leaving Gordium, the army first marched northward toward Paphlagonia. At the border of their country he was met by an embassy of Paphlagonians, who yielded the country to Alexander, only asking him not to march his army into it. Alexander accepted their submission and complied with their request, appointing a governor over the country. He then turned and entered Cappadocia, and speedily subdued the whole of that country, "even to a considerable extent beyond the Halys," and appointed a governor there also -- as in fact he did in every country that he conquered. Several countries of Asia Minor besides Paphlagonia voluntarily submitted to him, among which was Pontus.

13. Having established his authority over all this region, and leaving the whole of Asia Minor secure behind him, Alexander next led his army southward toward Tarsus in Cilicia. To go from Cappadocia to Cilicia the Taurus Mountains had to be crossed, and the

164

only way was through the pass known as the Cilician Gates. This pass was so "narrow, winding, and rugged," that Xenophon, who, with the younger Cyrus, had traversed it, declares it "absolutely impracticable for an army, if opposed by an occupying force." "The narrowest part, while hardly sufficient to contain four armed men abreast, was shut in by precipitous rocks on each side. . . . On the first approach of Alexander, the few Persian soldiers occupying the pass fled without striking a blow, being seemingly unprepared for any enemy more formidable than mountain robbers. Alexander thus became master of this almost insuperable barrier without the loss of a man. On the ensuing day he marched his whole army over it into Cilicia, and arriving in a few hours at Tarsus, found the town already evacuated." -- Grote.⁹

14. The utter neglect of even any precaution regarding this pass, is but an illustration of the general persistent blindness of Darius in all his military conduct. It amounted practically to sheer military imbecility; and can hardly be explained upon any natural hypothesis. However, the Scripture explains it: When the angel of God was sketching this period to Daniel, he said that when he had told the prophet what he was commanded to tell him, he would return to the court of Persia; and then he said, "When I am gone forth, lo! the prince of Grecia shall come." The angel had remained with the kingdom of Persia,

and at that corrupt court, as long as he could possibly endure it. When intemperance and iniquity of all sorts so abounded there that it could no longer be endured by the holy messenger, he went forth. And when he had gone forth, and Persia and her king were abandoned to themselves and their pernicious ways, and the prince of Grecia had come, there was no wisdom, nor knowledge, nor power, to resist him. What was wisdom seemed to the Persians foolishness; and what was foolishness seemed to them the only wisdom.

15. By a severe fit of illness, Alexander was detained at Tarsus much longer than he expected, or wished, to remain. He had no sooner regained strength, however, than he was again on the march, this time toward Syria. The road from Cilicia into Syria led

165

through a pass called the Gates of Cilicia and Syria, which was only less narrow and easy to be defended than were the Gates of Cilicia. Here, however, as there, the Persian guard fled with very little, if any, resistance. While he was on this march, Alexander first received definite news of the whereabouts of Darius, and found that he was encamped with a vast army on the plain in Syria, a little east of the southern point of Mount Amanus, at a place called Sochi.

16. In the year that had passed since the battle of the Granicus, Darius had succeeded in gathering together a vast host, numbering at the very lowest estimate 311,200, and at the highest 600,000, the weight of authority favors placing the real number at about 500,000. Accompanied by his mother, his wife, his concubines, his children, and all the personal attendants of every description that pertain to the palace and the harem, Darius in person led his army out of Babylon just about the time that Alexander, with his little band of less than forty thousand left Gordium. In the camp all the luxury of the palace was maintained by the king and his Persian grandees. "The baggage was enormous; of gold and silver alone we are told that there was enough to furnish load for six hundred mules and three hundred camels. A temporary bridge being thrown over the Euphrates, five days were required to enable the whole army to cross. . . . At the head of such an overwhelming host, Darius was eager to bring on at once a general battle." -- Grote.¹⁰

17. At the extreme northeastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea lay the city of Issus. As Alexander passed through this city, he left there the sick ones of his army, and hastened onward to find the camp of Darius. He marched two days' journey southward from Issus along the seacoast, intending there to pass eastward through the Gates of Syria to the camp of Darius at Sochi. Meantime, however, Darius had marched out of Syria into Cilicia to seek the army of Alexander. While Alexander was marching southward west of the mountains, to go by the southern pass into Syria, Darius was marching northward east of the mountains, to go by the northern pass into Cilicia.

166

18. Darius crossed the mountains and came to Issus. There he learned that Alexander had left that place only two days before to find him. The Persians cruelly put to death all the sick whom Alexander had left at Issus, except a few of the more able-bodied who were able, or were allowed, to escape. These refugees hurried onward to overtake Alexander and to inform him that Darius was behind him. Alexander had been delayed by a violent storm, and so had not passed into Syria, and was therefore easily overtaken by the refugees. Though Darius had done the very thing that Alexander could have most desired, yet, under the circumstances, it was a thing so altogether blind and unmilitary that Alexander could not believe the report of the refugees until he had sent some of his officers in a galley up the coast to see. Darius had marched from Issus toward Alexander, and was now encamped with his whole host at the river Pinarus about eighteen miles from Alexander's camp. The officers in the galley soon came in sight of the Persian host, and returned with all possible speed to their chief with the glad news. It was now evening, yet the camp was all astir, only eager to be led against the Persian host. Supper was eaten, and the march was begun. At midnight he had secured the Gates of Syria and Cilicia, and now being complete master of the situation against any attack that Darius might make, he rested his army till daylight, when he again took up his march. The time was November, 333 B. C.

19. Between the base of the mountains and the sea on the borders of the Gulf of Issus, was a tract of flat land, nowhere more than a mile and a half wide. In this narrow space, on the north bank of the river Pinarus, Darius wedged two hundred thousand men. Of course this made his ranks so deep that the rest of his army had no room to act, and so they remained, to the number of about two hundred and fifty thousand, useless and unformed in the rear.

20. On the south side of the river Pinarus, Alexander formed his forces, so in this position the Pinarus flowed between the two armies as did the Granicus at the battle that was fought there. The battle began by the advance of Alexander. Leaving three hundred of his cavalry to hold in check twenty thousand Persians that threatened his right flank, he moved onward his whole line at a slow pace

167

till it came within bow-shot of the Persian front, and then gave the command to charge. Alexander with the right of his line charged Darius's left, which "instantly broke and fled." Alexander's left was not so successful, however, -- their part of the bank of the river was steep, and defended by stakes, and besides this, the Persian right showed a stubborn resistance; nor was it until Alexander had returned from the rout of Darius's left, and attacked in flank the remaining forces, that his own left gained any headway; then, however, that part of the Persian line was driven back, and the rout became general.

21. Then the vast multitude confined in so narrow a space, horses, and chariots, and men, rushing headlong hither and thither in their frantic efforts to escape, only made the slaughter more dreadful. One hundred and ten thousand of the Persian army were slain, and forty thousand were made prisoners. Among the prisoners was Darius's whole

family. He himself managed to gather up four thousand of the flying troops; and made no tarrying until he put the Euphrates between himself and Alexander. Besides these, eight thousand hired Greeks held together in one body, and made their way to Tripolis on the coast of Phenicia, where they found the vessels that had brought them over; these they seized and escaped to Cyprus, and then to Egypt. And that was all that was left of the immense host that Darius brought to the battle of Issus.

22. No attempt was made to rally or reform the flying fugitives, and so the second time a Persian army was annihilated by Alexander; this time with a loss to himself of only four hundred and fifty killed, and five hundred and four wounded. "No victory recorded in history was ever more complete in itself, or more far-stretching in its consequences, than that of Issus. Not only was the Persian force destroyed or dispersed, but the efforts of Darius for recovery were paralyzed by the capture of his family. Portions of the dissipated army of Issus may be traced, reappearing in different places for operations of detail; but we shall find no further resistance to Alexander, during almost two years, except from the brave freemen of two fortified cities. Everywhere an overwhelming sentiment of admiration and terror was spread abroad, toward the force, skill,

168

or good fortune of Alexander, by whichever name it might be called." -- Grote.¹¹

23. As the battle of Granicus gave to Alexander all Asia Minor, so the battle of Issus laid at his feet Egypt and all Asia west of the Euphrates.

24. Without delay Alexander took up his march toward Phenicia, detaching a considerable force under Parmenio to go and take possession of Damascus, where Darius had deposited the greater part of his treasure under the charge of the ministers and principal grandees of his empire. The city was surrendered without any attack, with all the treasure, the ministers, and the favorites of the court of Darius. "The prisoners were so numerous that most of the great Persian families had to deplore the loss of some relative, male or female." -- Grote.¹²

25. All the cities of Syria and Phenicia were surrendered to Alexander without a battle, except Tyre, which he was obliged to besiege seven months through terrible hardships. While he was marching through Phenicia, Alexander was overtaken by envoys from Darius with a letter asking that his family might be released and allowed to return to him. Alexander replied: --

"By the grace of the gods I have been victorious, first over your satraps, next over yourself. I have taken care of all who submit to me, and made them satisfied with their lot. Come yourself to me also, as to the master of all Asia. Come without fear of suffering harm. Ask me, and you shall receive back your mother and wife, and anything else which you please. When next you write to me, however, address me not as an equal, but as lord of Asia and of all that belongs to you; otherwise I shall deal with you as with a wrong-

doer. If you intend to contest the kingdom with me, stand and fight for it, and do not run away. I shall march forward against you, wherever you may be."13

26. Since the siege and destruction of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, that city had been rebuilt on an island about a half mile from the mainland, and had recovered much of its former power and glory. The city was surrounded at the water's edge by a strong wall which "on the side fronting the mainland, reached a height of not less than

169

one hundred and fifty feet, with corresponding solidity and base." -- Grote.14 The water between the mainland and the city, though shallow close to shore, at the bank of the island attained a depth of eighteen feet. Alexander determined to build a mole from the mainland to the island, of sufficient width to support siege-towers, battering-rams, and a besieging force. When this mole had been built almost up to the wall of the city, the Tyrians made a sally with a great force of ships, on a very stormy day, and succeeded in destroying a great part of it. Nothing daunted, however, Alexander set to work to rebuild it broader and stronger throughout. The ruins of the old city, that had been left by Nebuchadnezzar, was the source of supply for material to build the mole; and the necessity of building the mole practically twice caused the place of old Tyre to be scraped bare of every particle of soil and rubbish that was obtainable. And thus was fulfilled the word of the Lord by Ezekiel when he first spoke of Nebuchadnezzar's going against Tyre: "They shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water." "I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock." "Thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord."15

27. By gathering together a strong fleet from the cities of the Phenician coast, from Cyprus, Lycia, and even from Rhodes, and blockading the harbors of Tyre, Alexander was enabled to carry to completion his new mole. When this had been done, the city was soon taken, though only by desperate fighting. The victory was celebrated by a grand procession of his whole force, land and naval, led by Alexander himself, to the temple of the Tyrian Hercules, where he offered sacrifice.

28. While the siege of Tyre was being carried on, Darius sent to Alexander a proposal, offering him ten thousand talents in money; all the territory west of the Euphrates; his daughter to be Alexander's wife; Darius to recognize the Macedonian power as the ally of Persia; Alexander on his part only to release the mother and wife of Darius and conclude a peace. Upon this offer Parmenio remarked, "If I

170

were Alexander, I should accept such terms, instead of plunging into further peril." Alexander replied, "So should I, if I were Parmenio; but since I am Alexander, I must return a different answer." Then to Darius he sent the following reply: --

"I want neither your money nor your cession. All your money and territory are already mine, and you are tendering to me a part in place of the whole. If I choose to marry your daughter, I will marry her, whether you give her to me or not. Come hither to me, if you wish to obtain from me any act of friendship."¹⁶

29. From Tyre Alexander marched to Jerusalem with the determination to destroy it as he had destroyed Tyre, because the Jews had not rendered him the support against Tyre that he demanded. This the Jews considered that they could not do for him, holding that as they were subjects of Darius, it would be an act of rebellion to support Alexander so long as Darius was alive. And this the more especially as all that they now were they owed under God to the Persian kings. All this they stated to Alexander in declining to send to him the desired assistance. Nevertheless Alexander would make no allowance for any such plea; he would visit vengeance upon their city also.

30. The Jews, learning of the coming of Alexander in wrath, were greatly troubled to know what to do. The high priest proclaimed a fast, and "ordained that the people should make supplications, and should join with him in offering sacrifices to God, whom he sought to protect that nation, and to deliver them from the perils that were coming upon them. Whereupon God warned him in a dream which came upon him after he had offered sacrifice, that he should take courage, and adorn the city, and open the gates; that the rest should appear in white garments; but that he and the priests should meet the king in the habits proper to their order, without the dread of any ill consequences, which the providence of God would prevent. Upon which, when he rose from his sleep, he greatly rejoiced, and declared to all the warning he had received from God. According to which dream he acted entirely, and so waited for the coming of the king.

171

31. "And when he understood that he was not far from the city, he went out in procession with the priests and the multitude of citizens. The procession was venerable, and the manner of it different from that of other nations. It reached to a place called Sapha, which name, translated into Greek, signifies a prospect; for you have thence a prospect both of Jerusalem and of the temple. And when the Phenicians and the Chaldeans that followed him (Alexander) thought they should have liberty to plunder the city, and torment the high priest to death, which the king's displeasure fairly promised them, the very reverse of it happened. For Alexander, when he saw the multitude at a distance, in white garments, while the priests stood clothed with fine linen, and the high priest in purple and scarlet clothing, with his miter on his head, having the golden plate whereon the name of God was engraved, he approached by himself and adored that name, and first saluted the high priest. The Jews also did altogether with one voice salute Alexander and encompassed him about.

32. "Whereupon the kings of Syria and the rest were surprised at what Alexander had done, and supposed him disordered in his mind. However, Parmenio alone went up to him and asked him how it came to pass that when all others adored him, he should adore the high priest of the Jews. To whom he replied: 'I did not adore him, but that God who

hath honored him with his high-priesthood. For I saw this very person in a dream, in this very habit, when I was at Dios in Macedonia, who, when I was considering with myself how I might obtain the dominion of Asia, exhorted me to make no delay, but boldly to pass over the sea thither, for that he would conduct my army and would give me the dominion over the Persians; whence it is that having seen no other in that habit, and now seeing this person in it, and remembering that vision, and the exhortation which I had in my dream, I believe that I bring this army under the Divine conduct, and shall therewith conquer Darius, and destroy the Power of the Persians, and that all things will succeed according to what is in my mind.'

33. "And when he had said this to Parmenio, and had given the high priest his right hand, the priests ran along by him, and

172

he came into the city. And when he went up into the temple, he offered sacrifice to God according to the high priest's direction, and magnificently treated both the high priest and the priests. And when the book of Daniel was showed him, wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians, he supposed that himself was the person intended. And as he was then glad, he dismissed the multitude for the present, but the next day he called them to him and bade them ask what favors they pleased of him. Whereupon the high priest desired that they might enjoy the laws of their forefathers, and might pay no tribute on the seventh year. He granted all they desired. And when they entreated him that he would permit the Jews in Babylon and Media to enjoy their own laws also, he willingly promised to do hereafter what they desired. And when he said to the multitude that if any of them would enlist themselves in his army on this condition, that they should continue under the laws of their forefathers, and live according to them, he was willing to take them with him, many were ready to accompany him in his wars." -- Josephus.¹⁷

34. From Jerusalem Alexander took up his march toward Egypt. Coming to Gaza on his way, and that city refusing to surrender, he decided to besiege it. This city was so strong that "the Macedonian engineers themselves pronounced it to be impregnable. But Alexander could not endure the thought of tacitly confessing his inability to take Gaza. The more difficult the enterprise, the greater was the charm for him, and the greater would be the astonishment produced all around when he should be seen to have triumphed." -- Grote.¹⁸ Gaza was built on a lofty artificial mound in a sandy plain, and was surrounded by a strong wall one hundred and fifty feet high. Alexander first built a mound on only one side of the city, and set up there his battering-rams and siege-towers, and began to batter the wall. The besieged made such a fierce sally that they were successful in defeating the besiegers and destroying their engines. Alexander then sent to Tyre and had all his siege-engines that had been employed there, brought by sea to Gaza.

173

While this was being done, he set to work to build a wall around the whole city of Gaza, so as next to make his attack on all sides at once. "This Herculean work, the description of which we read with astonishment, was two hundred and fifty feet high all round, and two stadia (1,240 feet) broad." -- Grote.¹⁹ After this mighty work was finished, the place was soon taken; though the whole was accomplished in a few months, apparently only three or four.

35. "The two sieges of Tyre and Gaza, which occupied both together nine months, were the hardest fighting that Alexander had ever encountered, or in fact ever did encounter throughout his life. After such toils, the march to Egypt, which he now commenced (October, 332 B. C.), was an affair of holiday and triumph." -- Grote.²⁰ All his time in Egypt also, after he reached the country, was only a holiday and a triumph; for instead of being obliged to conquer the country, "crowds of Egyptians assembled to welcome him." He spent about five months in Egypt, in which time the two most notable things that he did were: first, the founding of a city which he named after himself, Alexandria, and which soon became, and has ever since remained, the greatest city in Egypt; and second, the dangerous march to the temple and oracle of Jupiter-Ammon in the midst of the Libyan desert, where he succeeded in having himself declared by the priest to be the son of the god Jupiter.

36. Early in the spring of 331 B. C., Alexander left Egypt and took up his march once more to find Darius; though he had no expectation of finding him anywhere but in the heart of Asia. Thither therefore he somewhat slowly, though steadily, made his way, so that about the middle of September he was at the ford of the Tigris thirty-five miles above the site of Nineveh. "On reaching the ford of the Tigris, he found it absolutely undefended. Not a single enemy being in sight, he forded the river as soon as possible, with all his infantry, cavalry, and baggage. The difficulties and perils of crossing were extreme, from the depth of the water (above their breasts), the rapidity of the current, and the slippery footing. A resolute and vigilant enemy might have rendered the

174

passage almost impossible. But the good fortune of Alexander was not less conspicuous in what his enemies left undone than in what they actually did." -- Grote.²¹

37. Nearly twenty-three months had passed since the battle of Issus, and Darius had succeeded in gathering together at Arbela an army of more than a million of men. "The forces that he had collected for the final struggle comprised -- besides Persians, Babylonians, Medes, and Susianians from the center of the empire -- Syrians from the banks of the Orontes, Armenians from the neighborhood of Ararat, Cappadocians and Albanians from the regions bordering on the Euxine, Cadusians from the Caspian, Bactrians from the Upper Oxus, Sogdians from the Jaxartes, Arachosians from Cabul, Arians from Herat, Indians from Punjab, and even Sacae from the country about Kashgar and Yarkand, on the borders of the Great Desert of Gobi. Twenty-five nations followed the standard of the great king, and swelled his vast army, which amounted (according to the best authorities) to above a million of men. Every available resource that the empire

possessed was brought into play. Besides the three arms of cavalry, infantry, and chariots, elephants were, for perhaps the first time in the history of military science, marshaled in the battle-field, to which they added an unwonted element of grotesqueness and savagery." -- Rawlinson.²²

38. After crossing the Tigris as we have seen, Alexander gave his army a rest of two days. He then marched for four days down the Tigris. The fourth day he met a body of Persian cavalry, which he scattered, taking some prisoners, from whom he learned that Darius with his whole army was only a few miles away. At this he halted and gave his army a rest of four days. While it was yet dark, the morning of the fifth day he advanced with the intention of attacking Darius at break of day. However, when he reached the plain immediately in the Persian front, he saw that some of the ground was freshly broken, and fearing that pitfalls had been prepared for his army, he delayed the attack, and spent the day in carefully surveying the field.

175

39. "The spot predetermined for a pitched battle was the neighborhood of Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about thirty miles west of Arbela, toward the Tigris, and about as much southeast of Mosul, a spacious and level plain, with nothing more than a few undulating slopes, and without any trees. It was by nature well adapted for drawing up a numerous army, especially for the free maneuvers of cavalry, and the rush of scythed chariots; moreover the Persian officers had been careful beforehand to level artificially such of the slopes as they thought inconvenient. In the ground, there seemed everything to favor the operation both of the vast total and the special forces of Darius, who fancied that his defeat at Issus had been occasioned altogether by his having adventured himself in the narrow defiles of Cilicia, and that on open and level ground his superior numbers must be triumphant. For those who looked only to numbers, the host assembled . . . might well inspire confidence, for it is said to have consisted of one million infantry, forty thousand cavalry, two hundred scythed chariots, and fifteen elephants." -- Grote.²³

40. The next morning, Alexander marshaled his army, consisting of forty thousand infantry and seven thousand cavalry. As at Issus, Alexander led the right and Parmenio the left. In fact the whole conflict was hardly more than a repetition of the battle of Issus. Alexander defeated the Persian left, and got near enough to hurl a spear at Darius, which killed his charioteer. At this the cry was raised that Darius had fallen; the Persian ranks at once grew unsteady, and presently began to break and fly. Darius, seeing this, and being in imminent danger from Alexander, yielded to the general alarm, and fled, and with him, fleeing in every direction, went the whole of the left and center of his army. The Persian right, however, stoutly withstood Parmenio until Alexander had routed the rest of the army and was recalled to attack these in flank; then, seeing that all hope of success was gone, they, too, quitted the field. Then the terror began. The Persians hurrying to cross the river Zab were pursued by the conquerors, who slew the unresisting fugitives till they were weary of slaughter.

176

41. "The prodigious army of Darius was all either killed, taken, or dispersed, at the battle of Arbela. . . . The miscellaneous contingents of this once mighty empire, such at least among them as survived, dispersed to their respective homes, and could never be again mustered in mass. The defeat of Arbela was in fact the death-blow of the Persian Empire. It converted Alexander into the great king, and Darius into nothing better than a fugitive pretender." "The decisive character of the victory was manifested at once by the surrender of the two great capitals of the Persian Empire -- Babylon and Susa." -- Grote.²⁴

42. "A few days after the battle, Alexander entered Babylon, 'the oldest seat of earthly empire's then in existence, as its acknowledged lord and master. There were yet some campaigns of his brief and bright career to be accomplished. Central Asia was yet to witness the march of his phalanx. He was yet to effect that conquest of Afghanistan in which England since has failed. His generalship, as well as his valor, was yet to be signalized on the banks of the Hydaspes and the field of Chillianwallah, and he was yet to precede the queen of England in annexing the Punjab to the dominions of a European sovereign. But the crisis of his career was reached; the great object of his mission was accomplished; and the ancient Persian Empire, which once menaced all the nations of the earth with subjection, was irreparably crushed when Alexander had won his crowning victory of Arbela." -- Creasy.²⁵

43. "At Arbela the crown of Cyrus passed to the Macedonian. . . . The he goat with the notable horn between his eyes had come from the west to the ram which had two horns, and had run unto him with the fury of his power. He had come close to him, and, moved with choler, had smitten the ram and broken his two horns; there was no power in the ram to stand before him; but he had cast him down to the ground and stamped upon him, and there was none to deliver the ram out of his hand." -- Rawlinson.²⁶

1 [Page 160] "History of Greece," chap. xcii, pars. 1. 24, 27, 28.

2 [Page 161] Dan. 10:20.

3 [Page 161] Haydn's "Dictionary of Dates."

4 [Page 161] "History of Greece," chap, xcii, pars. 39-50; "Rollin's "Ancient History," Alexander, sec. iii, pars. 10-15.

5 [Page 161] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii, par. 195.

6 [Page 162] History of Greece," chap, xcii, par. 51.

7 [Page 162] "Ancient History," Alexander, sec. iv, par. 4.

- 8 [Page 163] "History of Greece," chap, xcii, pars. 64-65.
- 9 [Page 164] Id., chap. xciii, pars. 13, 14.
- 10 [Page 165] Id., chap. xciii, pars. 18, 19.
- 11 [Page 168] "History of Greece," chap, xciii, par. 33.
- 12 [Page 168] Id., par. 35.
- 13 [Page 168] Grote's "History of Greece," chap. xciii, par. 43.
- 14 [Page 169] "History of Greece," chap. xciii, par. 43.
- 15 [Page 169] Eze. 26:4, 12, 14.
- 16 [Page 170] Grote's "History of Greece," chap. xciii, par. 52.
- 17 [Page 172] "Antiquities of the Jews," book xi, chap. viii, pars. 4, 5.
- 18 [Page 172] "History of Greece," chap. xciii, par. 54.
- 19 [Page 173] Id., par. 55.
- 20 [Page 173] Id., par. 59.
- 21 [Page 174] "History of Greece," chap. xciii, par. 66.
- 22 [Page 174] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii. par. 207 (11th from end).
- 23 [Page 175] "History of Greece," chap. xciii, pars. 72, 73.
- 24 [Page 176] Id., chap. xciii, pars. 88, 91.
- 25 [Page 176] "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World," Arbela, last paragraph.
- 26 [Page 176] "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Monarchy, chap. vii, last paragraph.

16. EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- ALEXANDER.

FROM BABYLON TO BABYLON AGAIN.

WHEN Alexander himself marched to Babylon, he sent a detachment to take possession of Susa. Though the treasure acquired at Babylon was great, that at Susa was greater, amounting to about fifty-six million dollars. Alexander rested his troops thirty-four days "amidst the luxurious indulgences of Babylon," when he too set out for Susa, where he arrived in twenty days of easy marching. From Susa he made his way with but little resistance into Persia proper, and took possession of the two capitals -- Persepolis and Pasargadae. At Persepolis he found treasure amounting to about one hundred and thirty-five million dollars, at Pasargadae about seven million dollars. Persepolis he gave up to plunder, massacre, and fire, in revenge for the sacking and burning of Athens by the Persians under Xerxes. From Persepolis he went to Ecbatana, the capital of Media, to capture Darius if possible. When he arrived there, he found that Darius had been gone only five days. Alexander deposited all his treasure in Ecbatana under a strong guard, and followed Darius for eleven days to the city of Rhages, a short distance south of the Caspian Sea, yet without overtaking him.

2. Not long after this, Darius was made a prisoner by Bessus, his chief commander, which when Alexander learned, he again hastened forward in the hope of rescuing him from his betrayers. As Alexander was about to overtake them, the traitors tried to persuade Darius to mount a horse and flee with them. He refused, and they struck him with a shower of darts, and left him to die while they made good their escape. Some of Alexander's troops found Darius a few minutes before he died; but Alexander himself did not arrive till a few minutes after his death. Alexander wept

178

over his corpse, spread his military cloak over it, had it embalmed and sent to the mother of Darius, and had it buried with all the honors usually paid to Persian monarchs in their burial.

3. Alexander next assembled all his forces at Hecatompylos in Parthia, where he gave them a large donative from the booty taken in the camp of Darius, and a period of fifteen days for rest and recreation from the long period of forced marches through which they had just passed. At the end of this time he led his forces northward into Hyrcania, which formed the southeastern coast of the Caspian Sea. Here he first made an expedition to the eastward between the mountains and the sea, against the tribes of the Mardi. He then conducted his army to the northeastward through the eastern portion of Hyrcania, then to the southeastward through Parthia and a short distance over the border of Bactria, then turned to the southward and marched out of Bactria into and through Aria, southward and eastward through Drangiana, eastward and northeastward through Arachosia and Paropamisadae, northward through Bactria and Sogdiana to the river Jaxartes, which he crossed, and conquered and dispersed all the Scythians whom he could find.

4. From the river Jaxartes the army marched back through Sogdiana and Bactria to the main stream of the Cabul River; then eastward and southeastward through India as far' as to the river Hyphasis. Alexander desired to go farther; but his army refused with such persistence and determination that he was obliged to desist. He then returned about half the distance between the Hyphasis and the Indus to the river Hydaspes, where he constructed and collected a fleet of two thousand boats, and, with both fleet and army, followed down that stream to its confluence with the Indus, then down the Indus to its mouth. From the mouth of the Indus he sent Nearchus with the fleet to make his way along the coast, through the straits of Bab-el-mandeb, and up the Persian Gulf to the mouth of the Euphrates, while he himself led the army through Gedrosia and Carmania to Persepolis in Persia, from which place they had all started six years before.

5. In those six years that devoted little army had followed that indomitable leader over mountains and through deserts, through

179

freezing snows and scorching sands, across mighty rivers and drought-stricken deserts; they had fought every sort of people, from the Scythians to the Indians, and had never suffered defeat. During all this time and throughout that whole region, whether in camp or on the march, they had carried rapine and slaughter, carousal and outrage everywhere.

6. In all these years Alexander's camp was his only capital. As he proceeded in his victorious course, his vanity grew and his conviction of his own divinity became more confirmed. The effects of his continual drinking became also more marked. In his camp, "there was always great state -- pages, household officers, chamberlains, and all the ceremony of a royal residence. There were secretaries keeping a careful journal of every day's events; there was a staff office, with its adjutants and orderlies. There was a state dinner, to which the king sat down with fifty or sixty guests; and as in the play, when he pledged the gods in libations and draughts of wine, the bray of trumpets proclaimed to the whole army that the king drank.

7. "The excesses, too, of their revels were notorious, as they had been even in Philip's time; the king would tell his adventures and boast of his prowess in the chase and in war; they would spend the night in drinking, according to the Macedonian and Thracian habits, and not as suited the hotter climate of the south. So the toils of the day and excesses of the night were such as must have exhausted many a sound constitution, and made many a young man grow old before his time." -- Mahaffy.¹ In one of these drunken carousals Alexander with his own hand killed Clitus, who with his own hand had saved Alexander's life in the thickest of the fight at the battle of the Granicus. Thus he had become dangerous to his best friends as well as to his enemies. "His halts were formidable to his friends and companions; his marches, to the unconquered natives whom he chose to treat as enemies." -- Grote.²

8. About the month of February, 324 B. C., Alexander with his army marched out of Persia and came again to Susa in Elam. To

180

him here also came Nearchus with the fleet, having reached the head of the Persian Gulf in safety. Thus at Susa in the spring of 324 B. C., Alexander had all his force about him. He remained at Susa several months. In Bactria, in 327 B. C., Alexander had married Roxana, the daughter of the greatest chief of the country, who had captivated him by her great beauty. But now at Susa he took two more wives -- Statira, the daughter of Darius; and Parysatis, the daughter of Ochus, who had reigned over Persia before Darius. At the same time he required eighty of his chief officers and friends to take each a Persian wife from among the noblest families.

9. As the great heat of midsummer approached, Alexander went with his army to Ecbatana, the capital of Media, "the ordinary summer residence of the Persian kings." "During his stay at Ecbatana, he celebrated magnificent sacrifices and festivities, with gymnastic and musical exhibitions, which were further enlivened, according to the Macedonian habits, by banquets and excessive wine-drinking." -- Grote.³

10. At Ecbatana at this time, Hephaestion died of a fever. Alexander's "sorrow for this loss was unbounded, manifesting itself in excesses suitable to the general violence of his impulses, whether of affection or antipathy. . . . He cast himself on the ground near the dead body, and remained there wailing for several hours; he refused all care, and even food, for two days; he cut his hair close, and commanded that all the horses and mules in the camp should have their manes cut close also; he not only suspended the festivities, but interdicted all music and every sign of joy in the camp; he directed that the battlements of the walls belonging to the neighboring cities should be struck off; he hung or crucified the physician Glaucias, who had prescribed for Hephaestion; he ordered that a vast funeral pile should be erected at Babylon at a cost given to us of ten thousand talents (L 2,300,000 -- \$11,201,000) to celebrate the obsequies; he sent messengers to the oracle of Ammon to inquire whether it was permitted to worship Hephaestion as a god." - - Grote.⁴

181

11. "Alexander stayed at Ecbatana until winter was at hand, seeking distraction from his grief in exaggerated splendor of festivals and ostentation of life. His temper became so much more irascible and furious that no one approached him without fear, and he was propitiated by the most extravagant flatteries. At length he roused himself and found his true consolation in gratifying the primary passions of his nature -- fighting and man-hunting." -- Grote. "He conquered the Cosseans, and put all that were come to the years of puberty to the sword. This he called a sacrifice to the manes of Hephaestion." -- Plutarch.⁵ Forty days were spent in hunting and slaughtering the Cosseans "amidst a region of lofty, trackless, inaccessible mountains."

12. Not long after this, but late in the winter of 323 B. C., "Alexander commenced his progress to Babylon; but by slow marches, further retarded by various foreign embassies which met him on the road." -- Grote.⁶

13. "Being arrived within a league and a half [four and a half miles] of Babylon, the Chaldeans, who pretended to know futurity by the stars, deputed to him some of their old men to warn him that he would be in danger of his life in case he entered that city, and were very urgent that he should pass by it. . . . The Greek philosophers being told the foundation of his fear and scruples, waited upon him, . . . and made him have so great a contempt for divination in general, and for that of the Chaldeans in particular, that he immediately marched toward Babylon with his whole army. He knew that there were arrived in that city ambassadors from all parts of the world, who waited for his coming; the whole earth echoing so much with the terror of his name that the several nations came with inexpressible ardor, to pay homage to Alexander, as to him who was to be their sovereign So that he set forward with all possible diligence toward that great city, there to hold, as it were, the states-general of the world. After making a most magnificent entry, he gave audience to all the ambassadors, with the grandeur and dignity suitable to a great monarch, and at the same time with

182

the affability and politeness of a prince who is desirous of winning the affections of all." - Rollin.⁷

14. "So widely had the terror of his name and achievements been spread, that several of these envoys came from the most distant regions. There were some from the various tribes of Libya [west of Egypt], from Carthage [west of Libya], from Sicily and Sardinia, from the Illyrians and Thracians, from the Lucanians, Bruttians, and Tuscans, in Italy -- nay (even some affirmed), from the Romans, as yet a people of moderate power. But there were other names yet more surprising -- Ethiopians from the extreme south, beyond Egypt; Scythians from the north, beyond the Danube; Iberians [from Spain] and Gauls from the far west, beyond the Mediterranean Sea. Legates also arrived from various Grecian cities, partly to tender congratulations and compliments upon his matchless successes, partly to remonstrate against his sweeping mandate for the general restoration of the Grecian exiles. It was remarked that these Grecian legates approached him with wreaths on their heads, tendering golden wreaths to him, as if they were coming into the presence of a god. The proofs which Alexander received even from distant tribes, with names and costumes unknown to him, of fear for his enmity and anxiety for his favor, were such as had never been shown to any historical person, and such as entirely to explain his superhuman arrogance." -- Grote.⁸

15. "His march to Babylon steeped him still more in the intoxication of success. As he advanced on his road, he was met by ambassadors not only from Illyrians and Thracians, from Sicily and Sardinia, from Libya and Carthage, but from the Lucanians and Etruscans, and as some said, from Rome itself. The lord of all the earth could scarcely look for wider acknowledgment or more devout submission."⁹

16. "In the tenth year after he had crossed the Hellespont, Alexander, having won his vast dominion, entered Babylon; and resting from his career in that oldest seat of earthly empire, he steadily surveyed

183

the mass of various nations which owned his sovereignty, and revolved in his mind the great work of breathing into this huge but inert body the living spirit of Greek civilization. In the bloom of youthful manhood, at the age of thirty-two, he paused from the fiery speed of his earlier course: and for the first time gave the nations an opportunity of offering their homage before his throne. They came from all the extremities of the earth, to propitiate his anger, to celebrate his greatness, or to solicit his protection. African tribes came to congratulate and bring presents to him as the sovereign of Asia. Not only would the people bordering on Egypt upon the west look with respect on the founder of Alexandria and the son of Jupiter Ammon, but those who dwelt on the east of the Nile, and on the shores of the Arabian Gulf, would hasten to pay court to the great king whose fleets had navigated the Erythrean Sea, and whose power was likely to affect so largely their traffic with India.

17. "Already the bravest of the barbarians of Europe were eager to offer him their aid; and the Celts and Iberians, who had become acquainted with Grecian service when they fought under Dionysius and Agesilaus, sent embassies to the great conqueror of Babylon, allured alike by the fame of his boundless treasures and his unrivaled valor. It was no wonder that the Carthaginians, who had dreaded, a century earlier, the far inferior power of the Athenians, and on whose minds Timoleon's recent victories had left a deep impression of the military genius of Greece, despatched their ambassadors to secure, if possible, the friendship of Alexander. . . . The Lucanians and Bruttians are especially mentioned as having sent embassies to Alexander at Babylon 'The Tyrrhenians also,' said Aristobulus and Ptolemaeus, 'sent an embassy to the king to congratulate him upon his conquests.' The ports of the western coasts of Italy swarmed at this time with piratical vessels, which constantly annoyed the Greek traders in those seas. These piracies had been reported to Alexander, and he sent remonstrances to the Romans on the subject. . . . There is every reason to believe that among the Tyrrhenian ambassadors mentioned by Alexander's historians there were included ambassadors from Rome.

18. "History may allow us to think that Alexander and a

184

Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work and to found a wider and still more enduring empire. They met, too, in Babylon, almost beneath the shadow of Bel, perhaps the earliest monument ever raised by human pride and power, in a city stricken, as it were, by the word of God's heaviest judgment, as the symbol of greatness apart from, and opposed to, goodness. . . . During

the period of Alexander's conquests, no other events of importance happened in any part of the civilized world, as if a career so brilliant had claimed the undivided attention of mankind." -- Arnold.¹⁰

19. Here are two scenes: --

SCENE FIRST: In the year 603 B. C., Nebuchadnezzar, king of the mighty kingdom, and builder of the wonderful city, of Babylon, sits in his pleasant palace. Before him, and speaking earnestly, stands a young Jew. To the intently listening king, the young man is interpreting a remarkable dream that the great king had dreamed: he says that God is thus making known to the king what should come to pass afterward; and that one among these things would be the rise of a "third kingdom." and that this third kingdom should "bear rule over all the earth."

SCENE SECOND: Two hundred and seventy years afterward, in that same great city of Babylon, perhaps in the same palace where Nebuchadnezzar had sat, there sits Alexander the Great, king of the third kingdom from Nebuchadnezzar. As there he sits upon his throne, before him stand ambassadors "from all the extremities of the earth," who are come "to propitiate his anger, to celebrate his greatness, or to solicit his protection."

20. Now look on this picture, then on that; and no man can say that the scene represented in the second is not the perfect consummation of that which was spoken in the first. "I believe that there was in his time no nation of men, no city, nay, no single individual, with whom Alexander's name had not become a familiar word. I therefore hold that such a man, who was like no ordinary mortal, was not born into the world without some special providence." --

185

Arrian.¹¹ The dream was certain, the interpretation was sure, and the fulfilment absolute.

21. Another symbol of this third, or Grecian, empire, is a leopard having four wings. The symbol of the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar was a lion with eagle's wings, signifying that in the rapidity of his conquests he would "fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." The four wings upon the leopard could signify nothing less. And so it was with Alexander; for "from Macedonia to the Ganges, very near to which Alexander marched, is computed at least eleven hundred leagues. Add to this the various turnings in Alexander's marches, first from the extremity of Cilicia where the battle of Issus was fought to the temple of Jupiter Ammon in Libya, and his returning from thence to Tyre, a journey of three hundred leagues at least, and as much space at least for the windings of his route in different places, we shall find that Alexander, in less than eight years, marched his army upward of seventeen hundred leagues, without including his return to Babylon." -- Rollin.¹² "In the seventh summer after his passage of the Hellespont, Alexander erected the Macedonian trophies on the banks of the Hyphasis." -- Gibbon.¹³

22. Another symbol of this same power is a "he goat" which "came from the west on the face of the whole earth." For the perfect accuracy of this symbol to the fact, recall the career of Alexander as the history has traced it, and look on the accompanying map.

23. In the month of June, 323 B. C., he celebrated the funeral of Hephaestion at Babylon, at which "victims enough were offered to furnish a feast for the army, who also received ample distributions of wine," because "to drink to intoxication at a funeral was required as a token of respectful sympathy toward the deceased." "Alexander presided in person at the feast, and abandoned himself to conviviality like the rest. Already full of wine, he was persuaded by his friend Medius to sup with him, and to pass the whole night in yet further drinking, with the boisterous indulgence called by the Greeks Comus, or Revelry.

186

24. "Having slept off his intoxication during the next day, he in the evening again supped with Medius, and spent a second night in the like unmeasured indulgence," "till at last he found a fever coming upon him. It did not, however, seize him as he was drinking the cup of Hercules, nor did he find a sudden pain in his back as if it had been pierced with a spear. These are circumstances invented by writers who thought the catastrophe of so noble a tragedy should be something affecting and extraordinary. Aristobulus tells us that in the rage of his fever and the violence of his thirst, he took a draught of wine which threw him into a frenzy, and that he died the thirtieth of the month Daesius (June).

25. "But in his journals the account of his sickness is as follows: --

"On the eighteenth of the month Daesius, finding the fever upon him, he lay in his bath-room.

"The next day, after he had bathed, he removed into his own chamber, and played many hours with Medius at dice. In the evening he bathed again, and after having sacrificed to the gods, he ate his supper. In the night the fever returned.

"The twentieth he also bathed, and after the customary sacrifice, sat in the bath-room, and diverted himself with hearing Nearchus tell the story of his voyage, and all that was most observable with respect to the ocean.

"The twenty-first was spent in the same manner. The fever increased, and he had a very bad night.

"The twenty-second, the fever was violent. He ordered his bed to be removed and placed by the great bath. There he talked to his generals about the vacancies in his army, and desired they might be filled up with experienced officers.

"The twenty-fourth, he was much worse. He chose, however, to be carried to assist at the sacrifice. He likewise gave orders that the principal officers of the army should wait within the court, and the others keep watch all night without.

"The twenty-fifth, he was removed to his palace, on the other side of the river, where he slept a little; but the fever did not abate, and when his generals entered the room, he was speechless.

"He continued so the following day. The Macedonians, by this time thinking he was dead, came to the gates with great clamor, and threatened the great officers in such a manner that they were forced to admit them, and suffer them all to pass unarmed by the bedside.

"The twenty-seventh, Pithon and Seleucus were sent to the temple of Serapis to inquire whether they should carry Alexander thither, and the deity ordered that they should not remove him.

"The twenty-eighth, in the evening, he died.

187

26. "These particulars are taken almost word for word from his diary." -- Plutarch.¹⁴

27. "One of his last words spoken is said to have been, on being asked to whom he bequeathed his kingdom, 'To the strongest;' one of his last acts was to take the signet-ring from his finger and hand it to Perdiccas." -- Grote.¹⁵

28. Thus died Alexander, at the age of thirty-two years and eight months, after a reign of twelve years and eight months. Though so young in years, his swift and constant campaigning, from almost the day of his accession, in all countries between Corinth and the river Hyphasis, and in all climates, from the fierce winters of Cappadocia and the mountains of the Hindu-Kush to the burning sands of Central Asia and the sultry heat of India, with several severe wounds and much hard drinking, had carried him far beyond the freshness of youth that should otherwise have yet attached to his thirty-two years. He was a man of Providence; and what a pity he did not profit by his opportunities as did Nebuchadnezzar!

1[Page 179] "Alexander's Empire," chap. iv, par. 12.

2[Page 179] "History of Greece," chap. xciv, par. 56.

3[Page 180] Id., chap. xciv, par. 77.

4[Page 180] Id., chap. xciv, par. 77.

- 5[Page 181] "Alexander the Great," par. 11 from end.
- 6[Page 181] "History of Greece," chap. xciv, par. 79.
- 7[Page 182] "Ancient History," Alexander, sec. xviii, par.1.
- 8[Page 182] "History of Greece," chap. xciv, par. 79 (23 from end of chapter).
- 9[Page 182] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Alexander the Great, par. 14.
- 10[Page 184] "History of Rome," chap. xxx, pars.1-3.
- 11[Page 185] Quoted by Creasy in "Fifteen Decisive Battles," Arbela, par. 4.
- 12[Page 185] "Ancient History," Alexander, sec. ii, end.
- 13[Page 185] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. II par. 4
- 14[Page 187] "Lives," Alexander, last paragraph but one.
- 15 [Page 187] "History of Greece," chap. xciv, par. 86.

17. EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- ALEXANDER'S SUCCESSORS.1

THE EMPIRE DIVIDED.

NO immediate heir was left by Alexander. Roxana was his legitimate queen; but as yet she had no child. There was indeed a son, named Hercules, by his mistress Barsine; but he, being not a legitimate heir to the kingdom, could not be seriously considered. There was also an imbecile half-brother to Alexander, named Aridaeus. As Alexander had given to Perdiccas his signet-ring, this gave to that general the precedence in the government and the official charge of affairs.

2. In a council of the army, the cavalry and the horse-guards under the leadership of Perdiccas favored a government by a small council of the chief officers until the birth of the expected heir by Roxana. The infantry, on the other hand, at once set up the imbecile Aridaeus as king. There came near being a desperate battle of the two branches of the army to decide the question thus raised. A compromise was effected by which Aridaeus was acknowledged by all as king until the expected heir should attain the age at which he might assume the kingly authority. As Aridaeus was himself incapable, it was essential that there should be a regent, and to this office Perdiccas was chosen. Within two or three months from this time, Roxana gave birth to a son, who was named Alexander, of course for his father. The infant was proclaimed king jointly with Aridaeus, with Perdiccas now guardian of the infant as well as regent of the empire. All this made Perdiccas practically king.

189

3. The death of Alexander left thirty-six able generals, most of whom were with the army at Babylon, while others were stationed as governors at pivotal points in the empire. The first act of the new government was an effort to secure the stability of the empire by appointing these generals to be governors of the various provinces, or districts, -- the ablest generals to the most important provinces, of course, -- each one with full military power in his province, or district.

4. This distribution to the ones with whom this history must deal, was as follows: --

Lysimachus to Thrace.	Antigonus and his son Demetrius
Cassander to Caria.	to Lycia, Pamphylia,
Leonatus to Lesser Phrygia.	and Greater Phrygia.
Eumenes to Cappadocia and	Ptolemy to Egypt.
Paphlagonia.	Menander to Lydia.
Atropates to Media.	Laomedon to Syria and Phenicia.
Peucestes to Persia.	Antipater and Craterus to Macedon.
Arcesilas to Mesopotamia.	Greece, and Epirus.

Philip to Bactria and Sogdiana. Neoptolemus to Armenia.
Phrataphernes to Parthia and Perdiccas to Media Magna.
Hyrkania. Archon to Babylonia.

Seleucus was made Master-General of the cavalry.

Pithon, Clitus, Aridaeus, and Polysperchon were four to whom no province was given at first, but who come in later.

5. Each of these provincial governors was ready to grasp all that he possibly could of the empire; and each of the leading generals was ready to grasp for himself the whole of the empire. The infant king was held by all merely as a puppet before themselves and the world as a means of advantage. In the nature of things war was inevitable. It began very shortly, and continued so generally and so persistently that it is literally true that war became, and was considered, a vocation, as much as any every-day occupation, and was carried on more as a test of strength and military skill than as involving any matter of either principle or passion. It is essential to an intelligent understanding of the history, that the ambitions and the fortunes of these generals and their charges shall be followed; though it will have to be done as briefly as possible, consistent with retaining the thread of the universal story.

190

6. It must be remembered that Macedonia was the original of Alexander's empire; and that when he started from Greece to Persia he was absenting himself from his real kingdom and capital. This required that a regent should occupy his place in Macedonia, and rule this kingdom in his absence. Antipater was appointed by Alexander as this regent. Upon the distribution of provinces after the death of Alexander, Greece was added to Macedonia as the portion of Antipater.

7. And now, as the curtain rises on the long drama, the first scene is that in which Antipater goes into Greece to take possession as governor. Athens, however, formed a confederation of Greek cities and resisted him, under the leadership of an Athenian -- Leosthenes. Antipater was defeated in battle, and was shut up in Lamia in Thessaly. Leonatus crossed over from Lesser Phrygia to assist Antipater; but was defeated and slain before he could join his forces to those of Antipater. Upon this Antipater surrendered to Leosthenes; but was let go, and at once assumed command of the troops left without a leader by the death of Leonatus. Craterus, who had been appointed to the province of Epirus, now marching from Cilicia to Epirus, joined forces with Antipater in Thessaly. The united army numbered forty-eight thousand men, and defeated the Greek allies, who all surrendered. Antipater then went at once to Athens, which also surrendered. Demosthenes fled, but was pursued and overtaken, and rather than surrender to Antipater with the danger of being tortured, he took poison, and in a few minutes was dead (October, 322 B. C.). About this time also, Craterus married Antipater's daughter Phila.

8. Eumenes was to have been helped by Leonatus and Antigonus to the possession of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia; but Leonatus being killed in Thessaly, and Antigonus not caring to fulfil the agreement, Eumenes went with his five hundred men to Perdiccas in

Media Magna. Perdiccas conducted him to Cappadocia, defeated and captured the king of that country, and established Eumenes in the government of the two countries assigned him.

9. Perdiccas then went to Pisidia and Cilicia, and determined to divorce his wife, who was a daughter of Antipater, and take for his

191

wife Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great. Cleopatra was at Sardis, and Perdiccas sent Eumenes to her with his proposition. Antigonus, learning of this scheme, and seeing what an advantage Perdiccas was aiming at in securing Alexander's sister for his wife, when he was already guardian of the infant king and regent of the empire, went over to Greece and told the story to Antipater and Craterus, whom he induced to march at once to the Hellespont. He sent word also to Ptolemy, whom he also enlisted on his side.

10. Perdiccas, learning of this plot against him, sent Eumenes back to Cappadocia with orders to watch Neoptolemus of Armenia. He next sent his troops into Cappadocia. He then held a council of war as to whether he should first march against Antipater and Craterus in Macedonia, or against Ptolemy in Egypt. It was decided that Perdiccas himself should go to Egypt against Ptolemy, while Eumenes should watch Neoptolemus on the one side, and Antipater and Craterus on the other. That Eumenes might the better do all this there was now added to his dominion Caria, Lycia, and Lesser Phrygia, he being made generalissimo of all the troops, and governor of all the governors, in all these countries.

11. Eumenes at once collected an army to meet Antipater and Craterus, who had crossed the Hellespont. They tried by every means to induce Eumenes to desert Perdiccas and join them, but without avail. They did succeed in persuading Alcetas, brother to Perdiccas, to remain neutral, and Neoptolemus really to declare for them. Eumenes defeated Neoptolemus; but Neoptolemus himself, with three hundred of his cavalry, escaped to Antipater and Craterus. Antipater started to Egypt to help Ptolemy against Perdiccas, and sent Neoptolemus and Craterus against Eumenes in Cappadocia. A battle was fought in which both Neoptolemus and Craterus were slain -- Neoptolemus by Eumenes himself, after a long and desperate hand-to-hand struggle (321 B. C.).

12. Perdiccas went to Egypt by way of Damascus and Palestine. Ptolemy had been a personal friend, and one of the most trusted officers, of Alexander, and on his own part was popular with the army. Consequently, when Perdiccas reached Egypt, many of his troops hesitated much to fight against the personal friend of the

192

mighty chief whose memory they adored. Perdiccas, in forcing them to cross the Nile, caused the drowning of about two thousand of them, the half of whom were eaten by the crocodiles. This so angered his already sullen army that they broke out into open mutiny,

assassinated him, and went over bodily to Ptolemy, B. C. 321. Thus already in the brief space of about two years the guardian and regent and three of the chief governors came to their death -- Perdiccas, Leonatus, Neoptolemus, and Craterus.

13. Ptolemy induced his associates, with himself to issue a public decree devoting to destruction Eumenes and fifty other principal men as "enemies of the Macedonian State." Pithon and Aridaeus were appointed guardians of the infant king and regents of the imbecile king Aridaeus. They led the army back to Syria, and delivered it, with the regency and guardianship, to Antipater; also, the decree and the authority to war against Eumenes.

14. Antipater as regent now made a new distribution of some of the provinces. To Seleucus was given the province of Babylonia. To Pithon was given Media; but he was not able to take it: Atropates was too powerful for him, and was able to keep Media all his days. And so that region acquired the name of Media Atropatene, which it held even till modern times. Antipater himself returned to Macedonia, taking with him the puppet-kings, and left his son Cassander, general of cavalry, to watch Antigonus.

15. In the war that was made on Eumenes, that general was defeated through the treachery of one of his generals, whom, for it, he caught and hanged on the spot. Eumenes, after retreating from place to place, at last shut himself up with five hundred men in the castle of Nora, between Cappadocia and Lycaonia, where he withstood siege for a whole year. Then Antigonus tried to buy him over, but could not; but by changing the words of a proposed treaty, the siege was raised for a short time, and Eumenes escaped (320 B. C.).

16. When Antipater had returned to Macedonia, and while Antigonus was engaged against Eumenes, Ptolemy marched out of Egypt and overran Phenicia, and Syria; and on his

return carried captive to Egypt about one hundred thousand Jews. In 319 B. C., Antipater was seized of a sickness, of which he died. Before he died, he appointed Polysperchon regent and guardian of the infant and of the imbecile king. The death of Antipater left Antigonus the most powerful commander in the empire. Antigonus knew this, and began to assume kingly authority by removing two governors -- Aridaeus of Phrygia, and Clitus of Lydia. Upon this, Polysperchon as regent, in the name of the two puppet kings, sent to Eumenes a commission as captain-general of Asia Minor, and ordered all available troops to support him against Antigonus. Eumenes first attempted to recover Syria and Phenicia; but was defeated by the loss of his fleet. Learning this, Antigonus started to attack him wherever he might be found. Eumenes avoided a battle by crossing the Euphrates and marching into Mesopotamia, where he wintered. In the spring, 318 B. C., he went on toward Babylonia. Seleucus opposed him at first, but soon let him pass on to Susa, where he was joined by Peucestes and the other governors in that region. Antigonus, with his

army, followed Eumenes to the east; and after a long campaign Eumenes was defeated by treachery, and was delivered to Antigonus, who put him to death.

17. Cassander was the son of Antipater, and was greatly disappointed and supremely jealous when he found that Polysperchon, instead of himself, was made regent, although he was associated with Polysperchon in the regency. From that moment he set himself diligently to work to secure the kingdom of Macedonia and Greece for himself by any means, fair or foul. He took Athens and, indeed, secured the support of most of the Greek cities. He appointed as governor of Athens, 317 B. C., the Athenian, Demetrius Phalereus, who ruled the city ten years, and so pleased the people that they set up three hundred and sixty statutes to his honor. As soon as Polysperchon learned that Cassander held Athens, he besieged him there, but was obliged to raise the siege and retire from the place.

18. About this time -- 317 B. C. -- old Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, caused to be murdered the imbecile king

194

Aridaeus and his wife, and also Cassander's brother Nicanor, and about a hundred of his friends. She then retired to Pydna with her family; but Cassander followed her to that place, besieged her there, captured her, and put her to death. He then married Thessalonice, sister to Alexander the Great, and shut up Roxana and the young Alexander in the castle of Amphipolis. He next marched into Boeotia against Polysperchon. He gave orders also for the rebuilding of Thebes and the return of the Theban exiles; and in a few years Thebes became greater and richer than ever before. Eight years had now passed since the death of Alexander, and there were seven of the principal men dead, and the queen-mother Olympias besides.

19. After the death of Eumenes, Antigonus considered himself master of all Asia, and began to destroy all governors who possessed any considerable ability, of whom Pithon was one. He attempted to destroy Seleucus with the others; but Seleucus escaped and went to Ptolemy, and showed him what Antigonus was designing, and also sent information to Lysimachus and Cassander to the same effect. The result was that a league was formed, 314 B. C., of these four -- Seleucus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Cassander -- against Antigonus.

20. Antigonus had sent to Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Cassander, solicitations of peace; but the answers that he received convinced him at once that war was the only thing that he could expect. He therefore marched immediately from the east to Cilicia, raised new levies, regulated the affairs of Asia Minor, and then invaded Syria and Phenicia to take them from Ptolemy. He was able to take Joppa and Gaza with but little difficulty; but he was obliged to besiege Tyre for fifteen months. While this siege was being conducted, Cassander began to gain considerable advantage in Asia Minor. Antigonus, therefore, left his son Demetrius, aged twenty-two, to carry on the siege of Tyre, 313 B. C., while he

himself, with as many troops as could be spared, should try to hold Asia Minor against Cassander.

21. Antigonus met Cassander, and pressed him so closely that Cassander came to an agreement with him; but broke it as soon as

195

he was out of danger, and sent to Ptolemy and Seleucus for help, and renewed the war. This gave Ptolemy a chance to go up with a fleet and possess himself of Cyprus, make a descent on Cilicia and northern Syria, and return victorious to Egypt. He then marched out with an army and defeated Demetrius at Gaza, and recovered Palestine, Phenicia, and the Hollow Syria. Shortly afterward, however, Demetrius defeated Ptolemy's general; and immediately Antigonus joined him, and together they recovered all the Hollow Syria, Phenicia, and Palestine. As Ptolemy was being driven out, he broke down the defenses of Acco, Samaria, Joppa, and Gaza, and carried off another large company of Jews and planted them in Alexandria (312 B. C.).

22. After the victory of Ptolemy at Gaza, Seleucus took one thousand three hundred troops and went to Babylon. At Carrhae he was joined by a considerable body of Macedonian troops; and when he reached Babylon, the people opened their gates and received him with joy, because of the severity with which Antigonus had treated them when he was there. Seleucus next defeated Nicanor, governor of Media, whose troops then all joined Seleucus, making for him a strong army. Antigonus immediately sent Demetrius to recover Babylon from Seleucus. When Demetrius reached Babylon, Seleucus was in Media, and his governor retreated into the marshes, leaving Demetrius to take possession without a battle. However, Antigonus was obliged to recall Demetrius to his assistance, who, before he left Babylon, gave up the city to be plundered by his troops, which so enraged the Babylonians that as soon as Demetrius was well away they gladly welcomed back Seleucus, who never again lost possession of Babylon and the east. This was in 312 B. C.; and with this date began the Era of the Seleucidae, that is, of Seleucus and his successors.

23. When Demetrius reached Asia Minor from Babylon, and joined his father there, Ptolemy was besieging Halicarnassus; but by the re-enforcements which Demetrius brought he was obliged immediately to raise the siege. The confederate princes -- Ptolemy, Cassander, Lysimachus, and Seleucus -- then agreed to allow Antigonus to claim as his dominion all Asia Minor, until the

196

young Alexander should be old enough to reign. This agreement was all disconcerted, however, by Cassander's murdering both Alexander and Roxana (310 B. C.). Upon this Polysperchon brought from Pergamus, Hercules, the son of Alexander by his mistress Barsine, and proposed to the Macedonians that they make him king; but Cassander succeeded in inducing Polysperchon to murder Hercules instead of making him king (309

B. C.). Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, was dwelling at Sardis, and seeing what had overtaken these other relations of Alexander, she began to fear for her own life, and therefore started from Sardis to seek safety under the protection of Ptolemy. As soon as her flight was discovered, however, she was pursued, overtaken, brought back, and murdered (308 B. C.). Thus and now had perished the whole house of Alexander, excepting only Cassander's wife -- Thessalonice.

24. In the year 306 B. C., Demetrius defeated Cassander's forces, invaded Greece, took Athens, and declared it free -- a democracy as of old. Demetrius Phalereus, the governor, was allowed to depart to Thebes and afterward to Egypt, to Ptolemy. The inconstant Athenians, out of gratitude for their "freedom," conferred upon both Demetrius and Antigonus the title of king, with much other flattering foolishness, and broke down the three hundred and sixty statutes which they had so recently erected in honor of Demetrius Phalereus. Demetrius, with a powerful fleet, made a descent upon Cyprus, which was held by Ptolemy, defeating Ptolemy's forces that defended it. Ptolemy sent out a fleet from Egypt, which was also defeated by Demetrius. Then Ptolemy himself went out with large re-enforcements to his fleet, and he likewise was defeated by Demetrius. When Antigonus learned of this great success of Demetrius, he sent to him the kingly crown. Upon hearing of this, the Egyptians proclaimed Ptolemy king. Lysimachus and Seleucus learning what had been done, each assumed for himself the title of king. Cassander did not on his own part assume the title; but the others, in all their dealings with him, gave it to him and addressed him as king. This he tacitly accepted, and with the others stood as a king. This occurred in the year 305 B. C.

197

25. During this period of the victorious career of Demetrius in Greece, about Cyprus, and on the sea, Seleucus carried his power, and fixed his authority, over all Central Asia from Babylon to the river Indus.

26. Antigonus now -- 305 B. C. -- determined to invade Egypt with one hundred thousand men, by land, while Demetrius should go against it with a fleet. But Ptolemy made such good defense that Antigonus could do nothing, and after beating about for a time, was compelled to return to Syria to keep his troops from all going over to Ptolemy. As his part of the expedition so signally failed, so also did that of Demetrius come to naught.

27. Demetrius, thus finding himself out of employment, selected the island and city of Rhodes (304 B. C.) as the place for the exercise of his abilities. In a long and terrible siege the Rhodians were aided by Lysimachus with four hundred thousand bushels of barley, and the same of wheat; by Cassander with one hundred thousand bushels of barley; and by Ptolemy with three hundred thousand measures of wheat and large quantities of vegetables, and fifteen hundred men. When the siege had continued a year, Antigonus sent letters urging Demetrius to make peace with the Rhodians by any means. Just then the Etolians also besought Demetrius to give peace to the Rhodians. Peace was concluded, the Rhodians agreeing to help Antigonus against anybody but Ptolemy.

Demetrius made the Rhodians a present of all the machines of war that he had used against their city. These the Rhodians sold for three hundred thousand crowns, to which they added an equal amount from their own funds, and with the whole sum erected the Colossus of Rhodes, -- a colossal image of Apollo standing astride the entrance to their harbor, -- one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. Also out of gratitude to Ptolemy the Rhodians made him a god, and called him Soter, that is, savior.

28. Cassander was now again besieging Athens (303 B. C.). The Athenians applied to Demetrius for succor. He came, compelled Cassander to raise the siege, and drove him out of Attica, and, indeed, entirely out of Greece, overwhelmingly defeating him at Thermopylae. The Greeks then made Demetrius generalissimo of

198

all the forces of Greece, as they had done to Philip and Alexander. They desired to bestow upon him the further "honor" of initiating him into their mysteries. But there was a difficulty: it was now the month of May, whereas the lesser mysteries were celebrated only in March, and the greater mysteries only in October; and the lesser were only preparatory to the greater, and the greater could not be entered except through the lesser. All difficulty, however, was overcome by their decreeing that the month of May should be both March and October -- the first half of the month being March to accommodate the lesser mysteries, and the latter half being October to accommodate the greater mysteries; and all to accommodate Demetrius by putting him through the lesser directly into the greater. They also gave to Demetrius nearly three hundred thousand dollars in money, which he in turn handed over to his courtizans with which to supply themselves with washes, perfumery, and paints.

29. Cassander and Lysimachus now sent ambassadors to Seleucus and Ptolemy to show to them that Antigonus, now that his son Demetrius was become so great, would certainly be content with nothing less than the whole empire; and that therefore it was high time to bring him down. They reported that already, in the language of the court flatterers of Demetrius, Ptolemy was but "a captain of a ship," Seleucus "a commander of elephants," and Lysimachus "a treasurer." The result was that a strict confederacy was formed of these four -- Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander. This was in the year 302 B. C.

30. The plan of operations of these four in their confederacy was that Cassander should remain in Europe to hold it against Demetrius; while Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy should concentrate their forces in Asia Minor and crush Antigonus. Lysimachus took all the troops that could be spared, and crossed the Hellespont into Asia. He led a fine army, and soon reduced Phrygia, Lydia, and Lycaonia.

31. Antigonus was in Upper Syria at a capital which he had built and called Antigonia. He immediately drew his forces together, marched into Cilicia to his treasury there, took what funds he needed, and went on to meet Lysimachus, who continually beat

off till Seleucus and Ptolemy should arrive. Antigonus sent for Demetrius, who came immediately and landed at Ephesus with an army. Ptolemy was obliged to conquer his way through Palestine, Phenicia, and Syria, and was delayed by the sieges of Tyre and Sidon. While at the siege of Sidon he received a false report that Antigonus had defeated the other two allies; upon which he picked up everything and went straight back to Egypt.

32. By this time a year had passed. Yet shortly, 301 B. C. Seleucus had joined forces with Lysimachus, and the long sought battle was fought at Ipsus in Phrygia. Antigonus was defeated and slain, at the age of eighty-one; Demetrius escaped to Ephesus with nine thousand men, again joined his fleet, and ruled the sea.

33. Then 301 B. C., twenty-two years after the Alexander the Great, when all his house, whether relatives or posterity, had perished, the empire conquered by "the prince of Grecia" was divided among themselves, by Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander, "toward the four winds of heaven," as follows: --

IN THE			
NORTH			SOUTH
LYSIMACHUS -- Thrace, Bithynia, and some smaller provinces of		PTOLEMY -- Egypt, Libya Arabia, and some and Palestine. Asia Minor.	
EAST			WEST
SELEUCUS -- Syria and all the country try to the river Indus.		CASSANDER -- Macedon and Greece.	

34. And thus was fulfilled to the letter the word of the prophecy of Daniel: "The rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power."² And "a mighty king [of Grecia] shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those."³

1[Page 188] This account of the empire of Grecia after the death of Alexander the Great, has been wrought from such an intricately woven mass of material, that particular references to authority would be so indefinite in fact as to be almost meaningless. This period is undoubtedly the most complicated one in all ancient history. However, an intelligible and fully trustworthy story, with definite, positive, and true results, has been

obtained, and is here presented. Rollin's Ancient History," books xvi-Xviii, is the basis of it.

2[Page 199] Dan. 8:21, 22.

3[Page 199] Dan. 11:3, 4.

18. EMPIRE OF GRECIA -- ALEXANDER'S SUCCESSORS.

THE KING OF THE NORTH AND THE KING OF THE SOUTH.

THOUGH the dominion of the world had been amicably divided among the four great commanders, -- Seleucus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Cassander, -- neither the spirit nor the practise of war was in any wise diminished. They all warred as long as they lived; and when they were dead, their war spirit as well as their dominions was inherited by those who succeeded them.

2. Seleucus built for his capital, Antioch on the Orontes in Syria, about twenty miles from the sea. It soon became of so great note as to acquire the title "Queen of the East," and will necessarily be often mentioned in the course of the coming history. He broke down Antigonina, which had been the capital of Antigonus, farther up the river Orontes, and removed all the inhabitants to his new city of Antioch.

3. Lysimachus, to strengthen himself, made a close alliance with Ptolemy, and cemented it by marrying Ptolemy's daughter Arsinoe. This offended Seleucus, who, therefore, forthwith formed an alliance with Demetrius, and married his daughter Stratonice the niece of Cassander (299 B. C.). When Demetrius went to Antioch to take his daughter to Seleucus, he made a descent upon Cilicia and took possession of the whole province. After the battle of Ipsus, Demetrius had sailed with his fleet to Ephesus, and shortly afterward to Greece; but Athens refused to receive him. He then made a descent on the dominion of Lysimachus, and obtained sufficient booty to enable him to pay each of his troops a handsome sum, and so to re-encourage them. Next, he also formed a treaty with Ptolemy, and received in marriage Ptolemy's daughter Ptolemais, and received with her the gift of the island of Cyprus, and the cities of Tyre and Sidon. Having

201

already made the conquest of Cilicia, this great gift which Ptolemy now made to him elevated him once more to the position of a power in the world.

4. Cassander died in 298 B. C., and was succeeded by his son Philip, who himself soon died, leaving two brothers, Antipater and Alexander, to contend for the kingdom. Antipater, the elder, murdered his mother because she favored his brother for the crown. Alexander called to his aid Pyrrhus king of Epirus, and Demetrius, who had again been deprived of all his eastern possessions, and was in Greece besieging its cities. Pyrrhus established Alexander in the kingship, reconciled Antipater, and returned to his own dominion before Demetrius arrived in Macedonia (294 B. C.). When Demetrius did arrive, Alexander informed him that his services were not now needed. However, Demetrius lingered, and before long compassed the death of Alexander. Then, as the Macedonians would not have Antipater to be king, because he had so foully murdered his

mother, Demetrius persuaded them to accept himself as their king. Antipater fled into Thrace, where, soon afterward, he died, and Demetrius reigned seven years as king of Macedonia, 294-287 B. C.

5. In those seven years Demetrius built up an army of one hundred thousand men, and a fleet of five hundred galleys. At this, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Seleucus became alarmed, and set about to check his further progress. They secured the alliance of Pyrrhus, whose dominions bordered Macedonia on the west, and who, of course, could not consider himself safe in the presence of Demetrius in possession of such an army as that. Lysimachus invaded Macedonia from the east, and Pyrrhus from the west. The troops of Demetrius all deserted him and joined Pyrrhus. Demetrius made his escape in disguise; and Lysimachus and Pyrrhus divided between them the dominion of Macedonia (287 B. C.). However, Lysimachus soon succeeded in sowing such distrust among the soldiers who had lately gone over from Demetrius to Pyrrhus, that they now went over from Pyrrhus to Lysimachus. This so weakened Pyrrhus that, rather than to contend against the power of Lysimachus, he with his own Epirotes and original allies retired to his own country of

202

Epirus. This left the whole of Macedonia to Lysimachus, who formally took possession of it and added it to his dominions.

6. Demetrius succeeded in raising another army of ten thousand men and a fleet to carry them, and made a descent on Asia Minor. He landed at Miletus, marched inland to Sardis and captured it; but was compelled by Agathocles the son of Lysimachus to abandon it. Demetrius then started for the east; but Agathocles pressed him so closely that he was obliged to take refuge in Tarsus, whence he sent a message to Seleucus begging for help. Instead of helping him, Seleucus opposed him; and when he tried to force his way into Syria, Seleucus captured him (286 B. C.) and kept him a prisoner, though not in close confinement, till his death, three years afterward, at the age of fifty-four years.

7. Ptolemy had now (285 B. C.) reigned twenty years in Egypt with the title of king, -- nearly thirty-nine years from the death of Alexander the Great, -- and was eighty years old. To make his kingdom secure to the successor of his own choosing, he this year crowned his son Ptolemy Philadelphus king, and abdicated in his favor all the dominion. The coronation was celebrated with one of the most magnificent spectacles ever seen in the world. Ptolemy founded a library at Alexandria, which was much enlarged by Philadelphus, and which finally became the greatest in the ancient world, and one of the greatest that have been in all the world. That Demetrius Phalereus who ruled Athens for Cassander, and in whose honor the Athenians set up the three hundred and sixty statues which they afterward broke down, was the first librarian of this famous library. Ptolemy died two years after the coronation of Philadelphus (283 B. C.).

8. Lysimachus and Seleucus were now all who remained of the mighty men left by Alexander at his death; and, true to the prevailing instinct, these two now made war on

each other. Lysimachus and his son Agathocles had married sisters, the daughters to Ptolemy. Each of these sisters carried on an intrigue against the other in favor of her own children. Finally the wife of Lysimachus persuaded him to kill Agathocles; whereupon the widow of Agathocles, her children, her brother Ceraunus, and a son of

203

Lysimachus, all took refuge at the court of Seleucus. Several of the officers of Lysimachus went over to Seleucus at the same time. These refugees and deserters easily persuaded Seleucus to make war on Lysimachus.

9. Seleucus immediately invaded Asia Minor, took Sardis, and, with it, all the treasure of Lysimachus. The two great commanders with their armies met at Cyropedion in Phrygia, 281 B. C. Lysimachus was defeated and slain, at the age of seventy-four, and "Seleucus, without the smallest opposition, seized all his dominions." And then, Seleucus, at the age of seventy-seven years, exceedingly proud that he was the sole survivor of all the thirty-six great generals of the greater Alexander, bestowed upon himself the title "Conqueror of Conquerors."

10. The division of the Alexandrian Empire which had been the portion of Lysimachus, was now added to the already wide-extended domain of Seleucus. And though the dominion of the Ptolemies -- "the king of the south" -- was strong, yet that of Seleucus -- "the king of the north" -- was strong above him," and his dominion was a "great dominion."¹ For though the realm of the Ptolemies -- "the king of the south" -- embraced Egypt and Ethiopia, Libya, Arabia, Palestine, Phenicia, Lycia, Caria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Cyprus, yet that of the Seleucidae -- "the king of the north" -- was of far wider extent, for it embraced Macedonia, Thrace, Bithynia, all Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Media, Susiana, Persia, and all of central Asia to the river Indus. These two divisions -- the north and the south -- include all of the Alexandrian Empire except only the States of Greece proper, and between these lay the center of action, -- the small remaining portion of the west playing to these two only an incidental part, until, through it, there rose from the west the mighty power that overwhelmed all.

11. Seleucus was not allowed long to enjoy his pleasing dignity of sole survivor of such a mighty company of warriors, and his chosen title of "Conqueror of Conquerors." Seven months after his triumph over the death of Lysimachus, he passed over to Macedonia,

204

intending to spend the remainder of his days in his native country, which he had not seen since that day, fifty-seven years before, when with Alexander he had marched away to the conquest of the world; and there he was basely assassinated (280 B. C.) by that Ceraunus, the son of Ptolemy, whom he had befriended and protected. He was succeeded by his son Antiochus.

12. Ceraunus immediately seized the possessions that had formerly belonged to Lysimachus; and the more firmly to fix his hold, he proposed to marry the widow of Lysimachus, though she was his own sister. He made such grand representations, and professed such great love and such tender solicitude for her in her hard lot, that she finally abandoned her suspicions, and consented. But as soon as he had succeeded in this, he murdered her two sons and cast herself out of his sight, in banishment to the island of Samothracia. But vengeance overtook him within about a year; a great host of Gauls, having made their way through the countries along the Danube, overran Thrace and entered Macedonia. Ceraunus met them in battle. His army was utterly defeated, and he himself, covered with wounds, was captured and beheaded (279 B.C.). Shortly afterward Sosthenes, a citizen of Macedonia, rallied his countrymen and delivered his country from the Gaulish scourge.

13. The Gauls then made their way eastward and overran all the Thracian peninsula. They next separated, one part crossing the Bosphorus, and the other part crossing the Hellespont, into Asia. They again met in Asia and hired themselves to Nicomedes to help him to secure to himself the kingdom of Bithynia. When this had been accomplished, Nicomedes rewarded them by giving to them for their own habitation that part of the country of Asia Minor which from them was for ages afterward called Galatia.

14. About this time, 275 B. C., died Sosthenes, who had delivered Macedonia from the Gauls and restored order there. And affairs in Asia Minor being now quieted by the settlement of the Gauls, Antiochus, the son of Seleucus, decided to pass over to Macedonia to take possession of it. But he learned that Antigonus Gonatas, the son of Demetrius, had already seized it, upon the claim that his father had once possessed it. On both sides great

205

preparation was made for war. Nicomedes of Bithynia espoused the cause of Antigonus Gonatas, which caused Antiochus to lead his army into Bithynia to make that country the scene of action. After much loss of time in maneuvering for advantage, a treaty was made and a peace concluded, without any fighting, the basis of which was that Antiochus gave his sister to be the wife of Antigonus Gonatas, and, under cover of a dowry with her, resigned to Antigonus Gonatas the country of Macedonia. Meantime the Gauls had become such a terror to the peoples round their newly acquired Galatia, that it became necessary for Antiochus to give aid to his afflicted subjects. He chastised the Gauls so severely, and so completely delivered the people from their incursions, 275 B. C., that out of gratitude the people bestowed upon him the title of Soter (Savior), from which fact his name stands in the history, Antiochus Soter.

15. A certain Philetaerus, who had been treasurer for Lysimachus and also governor of the city of Pergamus, had established for himself, during these unsettled times after the death of Lysimachus, the little kingdom of Pergamus, composed of the city and its surrounding country. Philetaerus died in 262 B. C., and Antiochus Soter came down with an army to seize his dominions. But a nephew of Philetaerus named Eumenes, who stood

as successor to the little throne of Pergamus, raised a fine army, and met Antiochus near Sardis and utterly defeated him. Antiochus Soter returned to Antioch, his capital, where he died about the end of the year 261 B. C.

16. Antiochus, surnamed Theos, the son of Antiochus Soter, succeeded that king upon the throne of the "king of the north." The people of Miletus were sorely oppressed by the tyranny of Timarchus, the governor of Caria, who had revolted from the king of Egypt, to whom Caria belonged, and had set up for himself as ruler of Caria. The Miletians at last appealed to Antiochus to deliver them from the tyranny of Timarchus. Antiochus responded, and came with an army, and in a battle defeated and slew Timarchus. The Miletians out of gratitude for their deliverance bestowed upon Antiochus the title of Theos -- God.

206

17. Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, -- "the south," -- in the interests of his great library at Alexandria, conceived the design of obtaining a copy of the sacred writings of the Jews. He sent an embassy "with magnificent presents" to Jerusalem to present his request to the high priest. In return a complete and authentic copy of the Scriptures was sent to Philadelphus, with six elders from each of the twelve tribes of Israel authorized to translate the Scriptures into the Greek language. This translation has always been called the Septuagint, "for the sake of the round number seventy," though with direct reference to the seventy-two translators. This was accomplished in the year 277 B. C.

18. A brother of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Magas by name, was king of Libya and Cyrene. There had been bitter enmity between them, though by unforeseen events they had twice been prevented from engaging in actual war with each other. In the year 258 B. C. Magas proposed to end all differences by having his only daughter married to the eldest son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and giving to her all his dominions as a dowry. This overture was accepted, and a peace was concluded accordingly. However, Magas died before the marriage was celebrated, and his widow determined to defeat the plan, because it had been formed without her consent. She therefore sent to Macedonia and invited a certain Demetrius to come to her, assuring him that her daughter and the kingdom should be his. Demetrius came; but when the widow saw him, she was herself so captivated with him that she determined to have him for herself. Demetrius was perfectly willing to have it so, and feeling perfectly sure of his position, he began to put on kingly airs, and lord it over the young princess as well as over the ministers of the kingdom and the officers of the army. He did it, too, in such an insolent and overbearing way that they determined not to endure it, and formed a conspiracy and killed him. Then the young princess went straight to Egypt, and was married to the son of Ptolemy. This all occurred in the year 257 B. C.

19. The widow was sister to Antiochus Theos, and was therefore sent to his court at Antioch. There she so artfully presented her case and magnified her troubles, that by it she induced her brother,

207

Antiochus Theos, to declare war against Ptolemy Philadelphus. Theos gathered all his forces from Babylon and the east to join his forces in the west, that with all his power he might meet the great army of Philadelphus, 256 B. C. No decisive battle was fought, however, nor was any special advantage gained on either side; except that it was a real advantage to Philadelphus to be able to hold at bay the army of Theos, and so prevent him from invading Egypt itself.

20. The withdrawal of his armies from the east by Theos, was taken advantage of there to throw off his yoke entirely. The revolt began in Parthia, and was caused by the brutality of the governor of that province. A certain Arsaces with a few supporters killed this governor. Theos and his power being both so far away and so fully engaged, Arsaces found himself free in a province where there was now no governor. Very naturally it occurred to him that in such a juncture he might as well assert his own authority in that province. He did so, and in a very short time he found himself so strong as to be able to expel the few soldiers of Theos that remained in the province, and thus so firmly to establish his power there that the province was lost forever to Theos and his successors. And thus originated the kingdom, and later the empire, of the Parthians. This in the year 250 B. C.

21. In Bactria the governor himself revolted and made himself master of all the province, which likewise was forever lost to Theos. This example of Parthia and Bactria was followed almost at once by all the other provinces in that region, so that the end of the matter was that all of that part of the empire which lay east of Media and Persia was, with the exception of a single brief interval, lost forever to Theos and his successors.

22. The news of these great losses in the east caused Theos very much to desire peace with Ptolemy. Accordingly, peace was made between them. The conditions of this peace were that Theos should divorce his queen and disinherit his children of their title to the royal succession, and take Berenice the daughter of Ptolemy to be his queen, with the royal succession secured to the children whom he might have by her. Theos put away his queen and his two sons by

208

her. "Ptolemy then embarked at Pelusium, and conducted his daughter to Seleucia, a maritime city near the mouth of the Orontes. Antiochus came thither to receive his bride, and the nuptials were solemnized with great magnificence. Ptolemy had a tender affection for his daughter, and gave orders to have regular supplies of water from the Nile transmitted to her, believing it better for her health than any other water whatever, and therefore he was desirous she should drink none but that." -- Rollin.² This occurred in 249 B. C.

23. In the year 247 B. C. Philadelphus died. Theos had no sooner learned of the death of Philadelphus than he put away Berenice, and restored Laodice, his former wife, to her

place. Laodice determined not to risk being put through such an experience again, and therefore killed Theos, and secured the kingdom to her son Seleucus Callinicus. Nor did she stop with this: she persuaded this son to destroy Berenice and her infant son, with all the Egyptian attendants who had accompanied her to the kingdom (246 B. C.). And thus though the king's daughter of the south came to the king of the north as the seal of "an agreement," yet she did not retain the power of his arm; neither did he himself stand, nor his arm; but she was "given up, and that brought her, and he whom she brought forth, and he that strengthened her in these times."³

24. Ptolemy, the son of Philadelphus, had succeeded his father in the kingdom of Egypt; and he now determined to avenge the wrongs of his sister Berenice. The course of Laodice and Callinicus in the murder of Berenice and all hers, awoke such resentment among their own people, that a number of the cities of Asia Minor raised a considerable body of troops which joined the army of Ptolemy that had marched out of Egypt to make war against Callinicus. Ptolemy with this army was so successful that 246 B. C., without a single check, he took Syria and Cilicia, and indeed all the countries eastward to Babylon and the river Tigris.

25. In the taking of Babylon, Ptolemy secured about thirty million dollars in clear gold, untold quantities of gold and silver

209

vessels; twenty-five hundred statues, among which were the gods which Cambyses of Persia had carried away when he had invaded Egypt. When Ptolemy had brought back these gods to their own land, the people of Egypt expressed their gratitude by bestowing upon him the title of Euergetes -- Benefactor. And thus out of a branch of the roots of Berenice the daughter of Philadelphus, there reigned one who came "with an army" and entered "into the fortress of the king of the north," and dealt against him and prevailed; and also carried "captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and of gold." And so the king of the south came into his kingdom and returned into his own land.⁴

26. Before Ptolemy had started on this great expedition, his wife, who was also named Berenice, being solicitous for his welfare and safe return, vowed that if he should return safely, she would consecrate her hair to the gods in one of the chief temples of the country. When he did return so triumphantly, she did according to her vow. Not long afterward, however, the hair was by accident or theft lost from the temple; at which Ptolemy was so greatly offended that the priests were in danger of being punished. But there happened to be just then at the king's court a certain "Conon of Samos, an artful courtier and also a mathematician," who "took it upon him to affirm that the locks of the queen's hair had been conveyed to heaven; and he pointed out seven stars near the lion's tail, which till then had never been part of any constellation, declaring at the same time that those were the hair of Berenice. Several other astronomers, either to make their court as well as Conon or that they might not draw upon themselves the displeasure of

Ptolemy, gave those stars the same name [Coma Berenices], which is still used to this day." -- Rollin.5

210

27. Seleucus Callinicus, as soon as he learned that Ptolemy Euergetes had returned to Egypt, started with a considerable fleet to reduce and punish the revolted cities and people of Asia Minor; but he was overtaken by a terrible storm which swept to destruction the whole fleet, very few escaping besides Callinicus himself and his personal attendants. This calamity, 245 B. C., so stirred the pity of the revolted cities that they all restored to him their allegiance. This so encouraged him that he raised an army and undertook an expedition to recover the provinces that Euergetes had taken from him. The first battle, however, proved as disastrous to his army as the late storm had to his fleet. He then invited his brother, who had an army in Asia Minor, to join him in his efforts against Euergetes. Ptolemy heard of this, and, not desiring to meet both commanders at once, offered terms to Callinicus, which were accepted, 243 B. C., and a truce was agreed upon for ten years.

28. The terms upon which Callinicus had engaged his brother to assist him against Euergetes were that he should have the sovereignty of Asia Minor. But when his quarrel with Euergetes was settled without the assistance of his brother, Callinicus did not consider himself bound to bestow upon him this dignity. His brother, however, not only insisted that this should be done just the same as though he had made the expected campaign, but had formed a secret purpose to dethrone Callinicus and possess himself of the whole kingdom. Callinicus soon discovered this secret purpose, and war was the result. Callinicus marched into Asia Minor, and the battle was fought near Ancyra in Galatia, 242 B. C. Callinicus was defeated, but escaped and returned to his capital.

29. The brother of Callinicus had hired for his army a large number of the Gauls who inhabited Galatia; and these, upon a rumor that Callinicus had been slain in the battle, decided that if they could now destroy his brother, they could easily possess themselves of all the dominions of both. But just at this juncture Eumenes of the little city-kingdom of Pergamus came upon them with an army and dispersed both parties, by which he himself became the chief power in Asia Minor; and the aspiring brother of Callinicus became a wanderer till at last he sought refuge with Euergetes, who imprisoned

211

him, and as he was escaping he was killed by a band of robbers. Callinicus, in endeavoring to recover the provinces east of the Tigris, was defeated and taken prisoner by Arsaces, king of the Parthians, who kept him in honorable confinement "five or six years," till his death in 226 B. C.

30. Callinicus left two sons -- Seleucus and Antiochus. Seleucus succeeded his father in the kingdom, and gave himself the title of Ceraunus -- the Thunderer. He reigned but about three years. He was poisoned in 223 B. C., and was succeeded by his brother --

31. Antiochus the Great. As soon as he had become settled in the kingdom, he sent two brothers to be the governors of the two most important provinces of the east -- Molo to be governor of Media, and Alexander to be governor of Persia. When these two men had taken the places assigned them, each one set himself up as independent. Antiochus sent an army against them, but it was defeated. He sent a second army, and it was annihilated. He then went himself with an army, and was so successful that the two rebels killed themselves to avoid being captured (220 B. C.).

32. Ptolemy Philopator had come to the throne of Egypt in 221 B. C., on the death of his father Euergetes. During the reign of the father of Antiochus, the father of Philopator had made himself master of a goodly portion of Syria, and had taken even Seleucia, at the mouth of the Orontes, the harbor of Antioch. And now Antiochus decided to take from Philopator as much as possible of this territory. He was successful. He recovered not only Syria, but also Phenicia, except the city of Sidon; and part of Palestine, including Galilee, and all the country beyond Jordan as far south as the river Arnon and the border of Moab. Establishing garrisons to hold the country, he led the main part of his army back into Phenicia and put them in winter quarters at Ptolemais, 218 B. C. Thus one certainly came, and overflowed, and passed through; then he returned, even to his fortress.⁶

33. As soon as the spring of 217 B. C. opened, Ptolemy Philopator with an army of seventy-five thousand men and seventy-three elephants marched out of Egypt to do battle with Antiochus wherever

212

they might meet. Antiochus was also early in the field with seventy-eight thousand men and one hundred and two elephants. The battle was fought at Gaza. Antiochus was defeated with a loss of ten thousand killed and four thousand taken prisoners; upon which he abandoned all his late conquests, and with the remains of his army returned to his capital. Those countries which Antiochus had the year before overrun, now gladly returned to the protectorate of Philopator. Thus "the king of the south" was "moved with choler" and came forth and fought with the king of the north. And the king of the north "set forth a great multitude; but the multitude" was "given into his hand."⁷

34. This great success caused Philopator to become so elated that in honor of himself he made a pompous "progress" through all the provinces that had been recovered. As he passed through Palestine, he visited Jerusalem, and at the temple "offered sacrifices to the God of Israel, making at the same time oblations, and bestowing considerable gifts." But not content with this, he attempted to force his way into the temple itself; but suddenly, as in the like instance of Uzziah king of Judah, "he was smitten from God with such a terror and confusion of mind that he was carried out of the place in a manner half-dead. On this he departed from Jerusalem, filled with great wrath against the whole nation of the Jews for that which happened to him in that place, and venting many threatenings against them for it." -- Prideaux.⁸

35. On his return to Alexandria, Philopator resolved to be revenged upon the Jews who dwelt there, for his repulse and disgrace at the temple in Jerusalem. Accordingly he published a decree, 216 B. C., that none should be allowed to enter the palace gates who did not sacrifice to the gods. There were three ranks of people of the inhabitants of Alexandria, and by both Alexander the Great and the first of the Ptolemies, the Jews there were enrolled in the first rank. Philopator decreed that they should all be reduced to the third, or lowest, rank. This required them to be enrolled anew; and he decreed that when they presented themselves for enrolment, they should have the badge of Bacchus -- an ivy leaf -- impressed

213

upon them with a hot iron, and that all who should refuse this badge should be made slaves, and that if any refused to be slaves, they should be put to death. He did grant, however, that all who would renounce the worship of Jehovah, and accept initiation into the Egyptian religion, should retain their original rank and privileges.

36. There were three hundred who adopted the heathen religion. These were at once cut off from all communication of any kind whatever with the rest of the Jews. Philopator took this as a further insult to himself and his religion, and in further vengeance decided to destroy all the Jews in all his dominions, beginning with all Egypt. He therefore commanded that all the Jews that could be found in Egypt should be brought in chains to Alexandria. There he shut them up in the hippodrome, -- a large place where the games and races were celebrated, -- and appointed a day when they should be made a spectacle, and should be destroyed by elephants maddened and drunk with mingled wine and frankincense.

37. As a matter of course the devoted Jews were calling upon God, as in many a crisis in their history before. The great day came. The destruction was to be accomplished under the eye of the king himself. The great crowd was assembled in the hippodrome. The hour came; but the king had not arrived. The officers and the crowd waited; but still the king came not. Messengers were sent to inquire why the king delayed, and they found that he had got so drunk the night before that it was long after the hour appointed for the great spectacle before he awoke from his drunken stupor.

38. The spectacle was postponed till the next day. But he got drunk again; and when his officers wakened him the next day in time for the spectacle, he was still so drunk that they could not convince him that there was any such thing appointed; he thought the men out of their wits who were trying to convince him that any such thing was ever planned.

39. The spectacle was therefore postponed again till the next day. Then at the appointed hour the king came. When all was ready, the signal was given, and the drunken and maddened elephants were let loose. But lo! instead of rushing upon the Jews

214

as was expected, the elephants "turned their rage upon all those who came to see the show, and destroyed great numbers of them; and besides, several appearances were seen in the air, which much frightened the king and all the spectators. All which manifesting the interposal of a divine power in the protection of those people, Philopator durst not any longer prosecute his rage against them, but ordered them to be all again set free. And fearing the divine vengeance upon him in their behalf, he restored them to all their privileges, rescinding and revoking all his decrees which he had published against them." -- Prideaux.⁹

40. Three years afterward, however (213 B. C.) there was an insurrection of the Egyptians, of which Philopator made occasion to wreak his wrath against the Jews, slaying forty thousand of them. Thus he "cast down tens of thousands."¹⁰ After this Philopator gave himself up wholly to dissipation: "drinking, gaming, and lasciviousness, were the whole employments of his life." He was ruled by his concubines, and the country was ruled by their favorites.

41. In the year 212 B. C., Antiochus made an expedition into the east to check the growing power of the Parthians, who had become so strong that they had added even Media to their possessions. Antiochus was wonderfully successful. In that same year he recovered Media, and fixed it firmly again under his own power. In 211 he drove Arsaces completely out of Parthia into Hyrcania. In 210 he marched into Hyrcania, and there battled with Arsaces for two years. In 208 he concluded a peace with Arsaces, upon the agreement that Arsaces should possess Parthia and Hyrcania, and become his confederate against all the other provinces of the east, and aid him in bringing them again under his power. In 207 and 206 he recovered Bactria, and marched over the mountains into India, and made a league with the king of that country, and then returned through Arachosia and Drangiana into Carmania, where he spent the winter of 206-5. In 205 he marched from Carmania through Persia, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia, and returned to his

215

capital at Antioch, having in seven years of uninterrupted success covered the larger part of Alexander's eastern campaign, and so earned for himself the title of Magnus -- the Great. "By the boldness of his attempts, and the wisdom of his conduct through this whole war, he gained the reputation of a very wise and valiant prince, which made his name terrible through all Europe and Asia. And thereby he kept all the provinces of his empire in thorough subjection to him; and thus far his actions might well have deserved the name of the Great, which was given unto him; and he might have carried it with full glory and honor to his grave, but that he unfortunately engaged in a war with the Romans." -- Prideaux.¹¹

42. In 204 B.C., Ptolemy Philopator died, at the age of thirty-seven, having worn himself out by debauchery in a reign of seventeen years. His heir was a son only five years old, named Ptolemy Epiphanes. Seeing that the kingdom and the dominions of Egypt had thus fallen to an infant, Antiochus the Great and Philip king of Macedon formed a league to take the whole realm and divide it between them. Philip was to have

Caria, Libya, Cyrene, and Egypt; and Antiochus Magnus was to take all the rest. If successful, this would give to these two men the dominion of all the Eastern world, from the Adriatic Sea to the river Indus. They entered at once upon their enterprise. Antiochus Magnus led out his great and veteran army, and speedily took all the countries up to the very borders of Egypt. Thus "the king of the north" returned and "set forth a multitude greater than the former," and certainly came "after certain years with a great army and with much riches."¹²

43. The guardians of the infant king in Egypt, seeing that all the powers round about were against him, and that these would certainly succeed, determined in the year 202 B. C., to send an embassy to the Romans to ask them for help in this crisis. "Scipio having beaten Hannibal in Africa, and thereby put an end to the second Punic War with victory and honor, the name of the Romans began to be everywhere of great note, and therefore the Egyptian court, finding themselves much distressed by the league made between

216

Philip and Antiochus against their infant king, and the usurpations which had thereon been made by them on his provinces, sent an embassy to Rome to pray their protection, offering them the guardianship of their king and the regency of his dominions during his minority. . . . The Romans, thinking this would enlarge their fame, complied with what was desired, and took on them the tuition of the young king." -- Prideaux.¹³

44. "The Romans having complied with the request of the Egyptian embassy to them, sent three ambassadors to Philip king of Macedon and Antiochus king of Syria, to let them know that they had taken on them the tuition of Ptolemy king of Egypt during his nonage, and to require them that they therefore desist from invading the dominions of their pupil, and that otherwise they should be obliged to make war upon them for his protection. After they had delivered this embassy to both kings, M. AEmilius Lepidus, who was one of them, according to the instructions he had received from the Senate at his first setting out, went to Alexandria to take on him, in their names, the tuition of the young king; where, having regulated his affairs as well as the then circumstances of them would admit, he appointed Aristomenes, an Acarnanian, to be his guardian and chief minister, and then returned to Rome." -- Prideaux.¹⁴

45. And thus "in those times many stood up against the king of the south;" but just at the juncture when the king and the kingdom of "the south" would have been swallowed up, "the children of robbers exalted themselves," saved "the king of the south," and "established the vision."¹⁵

46. As at this point we are brought to the entrance of Rome into the field of history, we must now turn our attention to the rise and reign of that mighty, world-famed, and deeply interesting power.

1[Page 203] Dan 11:5.

2[Page 208] "Ancient History," book xvii, sec. viii, par. 25.

3[Page 208] Dan. 11:6, with margin.

4[Page 209] Dan 11: 7-9; Rollin's "Ancient History," book xvii. chap. ii, sec. i, pars. 1-6.

5[Page 209] Id. par. 8. Thus the heavens to-day bear testimony to the faithfulness of the word of God; for that constellation -- Coma Berenicees bears its name from this incident of the hair of Berenice. This incident of the hair of Berenice, grew out of that vow of Berenice for the return of her husband from his expedition against the king of the north. And that expedition of his against the king of the north with its victorious return was recorded in the Scripture two hundred and eighty-eight years before it occurred. "The name Coma Berenices applied to a constellation, commemorates this incident."-- Encyclopedia Britannica, latest edition, art., Berenice I.

6[Page 211] Dan 11:10.

7[Page 212] Dan 11:11.

8[Page 212] "Connexion," under 217 B.C.

9[Page 214] "Connexion," under B. C. 216; Philopator, 6.

10[Page 214] Dan, 11:12, R. V.

11[Page 215] "Connexion" under B. C. 205; Philopator 17.

12[Page 215] "Dan 11:13.

13[Page 216] "Connexion," under 202 B. C.

14[Page 216] Id. under 201 B. C.

15[Page 216] "Dan 11:14.

19. ROME -- THE REPUBLIC.

THE phrase, "the children of robbers," exactly defines the people of Rome. When, after the death of Remus, Romulus "found the number of his fellow settlers too small," "he opened an asylum on the Capitoline Hill;" and "all manner of people, thieves, murderers, and vagabonds of every kind, flocked thither." -- Niebuhr.¹ Such was the origin of "Rome, the city of strength and war and bloodshed," "this city which was destined to shed more blood than any [other] city of the world has done." Duruy.²

2. The most of these, if not all, were of course men; but in order that they might become a nation, there must be women. To secure these Romulus "asked those in the neighboring cities to unite themselves by marriages to his people. Everywhere they refused with contempt," saying to him, "Open an asylum for women, too." Then "Romulus had recourse to a stratagem, proclaiming that he had discovered the altar of Consus, the god of councils, an allegory of his cunning in general. In the midst of the solemnities the Sabine maidens, thirty in number, were carried off." "From this rape there arose wars, first with the neighboring towns, which were defeated one after another, and at last with the Sabines. . . . Between the Palatine and the Tarpeian rock a battle was fought in which neither party gained a decisive victory until the Sabine women threw themselves between the combatants, who agreed that henceforth sovereignty should be divided between the Romans and the Sabines. According to the annals, this

218

happened in the fourth year of Rome" (Niebuhr),³ which, as Rome was founded 753 B. C. , would be in 750 B. C.

3. Rome comes into this history, and into the affairs of the East, through Macedonia and Greece; and in order clearly to state this, we must return to the point where we left the history of Macedonia. It will be remembered (chap. xviii, par. 5) that Pyrrhus, by the desertion of his army to Lysimachus, was obliged to resign all claims to Macedonia, and retire to his own country of Epirus. Shortly after he had returned thus to his own country, 281 B. C., there came to him ambassadors from Tarentum, and from all the Greeks in Italy, bearing to him the invitation to become their general and lead them in war against the Romans. They promised that the Tarentines, the Lucanians, the Samnites, and the Messapians would bring into the field three hundred and seventy thousand troops.

4. Pyrrhus accepted the invitation, and immediately, as an evidence of good faith, sent three thousand of his own troops across to Tarentum. The Tarentines then sent over ships to transport to Italy the rest of the army that he would take with him -- twenty-five thousand men. On account of a violent storm he was driven to the coast of the Messapians, where he was obliged to land. The troops of the Messapians at once joined him, and he marched to Tarentum, where was to be the rendezvous of his whole army. Before the promised troops of his allies had come to him, he learned that a powerful army

of the Romans was marching against him. Pyrrhus sent a herald to ask the Romans whether they would accept him as arbiter between them and the Greeks in Italy. They replied: "The Romans neither take Pyrrhus as arbiter nor fear him as an enemy." A battle was fought, 280 B. C., near Heraclea in Italy, in which the Romans were defeated with the loss of fifteen thousand men, Pyrrhus himself losing thirteen thousand.

5. Pyrrhus next sent an ambassador to Rome to offer peace; but the Romans refused to receive any communication from him, or to listen to any single proposition of his until he should have

219

left Italy. A second battle was fought, 279 B. C., near Ausculum, in which Pyrrhus was again victorious, but with such great loss that when one of his officers congratulated him on the victory, Pyrrhus with grim humor replied: "If we gain such another, we are inevitably ruined."

6. While Pyrrhus was wondering what he should do next, and how he could get out of Italy with honor, an embassy arrived from Sicily, offering to him Syracuse, their capital city, and also other cities, if he would help them to drive out the Carthaginians from the island of Sicily. Just at the time, also, messengers arrived from Greece, conveying to him that news of the death of Seleucus Ceraunus, and offering to him the throne of Macedonia.

7. Pyrrhus accepted the offer of the Sicilians, and at once embarked his army and sailed to Sicily. The Sicilians delivered to him the promised cities as soon as he landed; and he soon so gained the hearts of the people, and made himself so powerful, that the Carthaginians asked for peace upon the condition that they might be allowed to retain in Sicily only the one city of Lilybaeum. Pyrrhus felt himself so secure that he not only refused to grant this request for peace, but even proposed to make an expedition against Carthage. He had a sufficient fleet to do this, but not enough sailors. To secure the necessary sailors he levied a draft of men on all the cities of Sicily, and punished the cities that would not furnish their quota. This caused great dissatisfaction to the people of Sicily; and as Pyrrhus pushed his exactions, he finally drove the Sicilians into a league with the Carthaginians and the Mamertines against him. However, just at this juncture, the Tarentines and Samnites sent word to him that they were shut up in their cities, and were surely lost unless he came to the rescue. He started immediately. He was obliged to fight the Carthaginians as he was leaving the harbor of Syracuse; and the Mamertines as soon as he landed in Italy. He was successful, however, at both points, and reaching Tarentum with twenty-three thousand men, marched against the Romans and met them in Samnium, near the city of Beneventum. This time the Romans were successful, and Pyrrhus was compelled to return to Epirus, which left all Italy subject to Rome (B. C. 274).

220

8. "The reputation of the Romans beginning now to spread through foreign nations by the war they had maintained for six years against Pyrrhus, whom at length they compelled to retire from Italy, and return ignominiously to Epirus, Ptolemy Philadelphus sent ambassadors to desire their friendship; and the Romans were charmed to find it solicited by so great a king." -- Rollin.⁴ The following year the Romans sent to Egypt four ambassadors in return for this courtesy from Philadelphus.

9. In the year 263 B. C. began the First Punic War, which continued twenty-four years. The Punic wars, which were three in number, were wars of the Romans against the Carthaginians. The reason these were called Punic wars is that Carthage was founded by Dido of Tyre, the great-granddaughter of the father of Jezebel; thus the city was a Phenician colony, and the western pronunciation of the word for "Phenician" turned it into "Punic." The Punic wars were, in short, simply a contest of one hundred and eighteen years, at intervals, between Rome and Carthage, to decide which should have the dominion of the world.

10. Illyria, on the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea, was held by petty kings who lived by piracy. The chief authority in Illyria in B. C. 228 was a certain Teuta, widow of Agron. The Romans sent an embassy to Teuta, complaining of these piracies. Teuta killed one of the ambassadors, upon which the Romans declared war against her, invaded Illyria, and conquered all the country. Peace was made upon a treaty in which Teuta was allowed the possession of but a few towns, was compelled to pay tribute to Rome, and was not to sail beyond the city of Lissus with more than two vessels, and these unarmed. This brought the Romans into so great favor with the Greeks, that when they sent to acquaint the Greeks with the subjugation of Illyria, their ambassadors were welcomed; and the Corinthians made a public decree that the Romans should be admitted to the Isthmian games on an equality with the Greeks. Athens gave

221

them the freedom of their city, and initiated them into the great mysteries. This was the first instance of any recognition of the Roman power in Greece.

11. Antigonos Gonatas, the son of Demetrius, the son of Antiochus, the general of Alexander, died in the year 242 B. C. , and was succeeded by his son Demetrius, who reigned ten years. This Demetrius died in B. C. 232, leaving as his successor his son Philip; but Philip being a child, he was committed to the guardianship of Antigonos Doson, who filled the office of regent until 221 B. C. , when, he dying, the scepter was bestowed upon Philip at the age of fourteen years, and at about the same time that Philopator ascended the throne of Egypt.

12. In the year 217 B. C., the Romans were defeated by Hannibal, of Carthage, at Lake Thrasymenus in Italy. When this news reached Macedonia, it was decided in council that Philip should go into Italy and join Hannibal in war upon the Romans. Because "that in case he should suffer the storm which was gathering in the west to burst upon Greece, it was very much to be feared that it would then be no longer in their power to take up

arms, to treat of peace, nor to determine their affairs in a manner agreeable to themselves, or as they might judge most expedient. . . . This is the first time that the affairs of Italy and Africa influence those of Greece and direct their motions. After this, neither Philip nor the other powers of Greece regulated their conduct, when they were to make peace or war, by the state of their respective countries; but directed all their views and attention toward Italy. The Asiatics and the inhabitants of the islands did the same soon after. All those who, from that time, had reasons to be dissatisfied with the conduct of Philip or Attalus, no longer addressed Antiochus or Ptolemy for protection; they no longer turned their eyes to the south or east, but fixed them upon the west." 5

13. In accordance with the advice of the council, Philip sent ambassadors into Italy to find Hannibal and make an alliance with him. The ambassadors fell into the hands of the Romans; but pretending that they were sent to make an alliance with the Romans,

222

they disarmed suspicion and escaped. They then went straight to Hannibal and accomplished their mission. But as they were making their way back, accompanied by ambassadors from Hannibal, and bearing the treaty of alliance that had been formed, they were again captured by the Romans: the whole plot was discovered, and the ambassadors were all carried to Rome and held there. By this mishap, Philip was obliged to send another embassy to Hannibal, which was successful in reaching Macedonia again with a copy of the treaty of alliance. Thus two years were lost by Philip, besides the disadvantage of having the Romans discover his plans.

14. In the winter of 216-215 B. C. , Philip built a fleet with which to cross the Adriatic, gathered together his army, and in the spring started for Italy, but turned aside to seize some cities on the coast of Epirus. The Roman commander at Brundisium, learning of this, embarked with a considerable force, sailed across to Epirus, recovered a city which Philip had already taken, and sent succor to another which he was then besieging. By a night march the Romans were enabled completely to surprise Philip's army, and inflict upon it such a defeat that even Philip himself barely escaped to his ships, and was even compelled to burn these to keep them from being captured by the Romans. He then returned by land to Macedonia.

15. In the year 211 B. C. , Greece and Macedonia were allotted by the Senate, to the Roman praetor, Valerius Levinus, as his province. Levinus persuaded the Aetolians to break their league with Philip, and ally themselves with the Romans: making great promises upon their being the first people of the east formally to join the Romans. The treaty was made accordingly. The next year Levinus was made consul in Rome. He was succeeded in Greece and Macedonia by Sulpitius, who, in 208 B. C., with Attalus, king of Pergamus, with a fleet, joined the Aetolians, who were now certain to be attacked by Philip. The allied forces were put under the command of Pyrrhias; but Philip defeated them twice, and shut them up in Lamia.

16. Soon after this, while Philip was presiding at the Nemean games at Argos, he received the news that Sulpitius was laying

223

waste all the country between Sicyon and Corinth. He left the games and took the command of his army, met Sulpitius and put him to flight, and returned to his place at the games. After the games were over, Philip marched into Elis, where he was defeated by Sulpitius. Then, learning that the barbarians had made an incursion into Macedonia, he returned to his own country. Upon this, Sulpitius and Attalus ravaged eastern Greece. Just at this time the war with Carthage, the Second Punic War, so engrossed the attention of the Romans that for two years nothing special was done by them in Greece; and the Aetolians for their own safety, concluded a peace with Philip. About the time, however, when they had settled this matter, Sempronius, a Roman general, arrived in Aetolia with eleven thousand troops, and was much offended to find that the Aetolians had made peace; but the affair with Carthage was so absorbing to the Romans that Sempronius himself decided it best to accommodate matters so as to conclude a general peace with Philip (204 B. C.).

17. The very next year it was, 203 B. C., that Philip and Antiochus Magnus joined themselves together to rob the infant Ptolemy of his dominions. Magnus succeeded in taking all the countries up to the frontiers of Egypt. Philip made an attempt upon both Rhodes and Pergamus, but these two powers joined themselves together against him, and defeated him with a slaughter of about twelve thousand of his troops. He then destroyed Cios, a city of Bithynia, and received the submission of some cities in Thrace and the Chersonesus, and laid siege to the city of Abydos, on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont. During the time in which these events occurred, Rome had defeated Carthage and ended the Second Punic War.

18. The guardians of young Ptolemy learning of this, sent an embassy to Rome to ask the Romans to protect them against Magnus and Philip. At this same time the Rhodians, and Attalus of Pergamus, also sent an embassy to Rome to complain against Magnus and Philip. Rome promptly responded, and immediately sent three ambassadors (201 B. C.). The three traveled together to Rhodes. From there, one of them, AEmilius, went to Philip at

224

Abydos, and in the name of the Senate and people of Rome, commanded Philip to stop the siege of that place and submit to arbitration his differences with Attalus and others; or else the Romans would make war on him. Philip began to justify himself; but AEmilius interrupted him with the question, "Did the Athenians and Abydenians attack you first?" This was a boldness of speech that Philip had never met before, and it angered him, and he replied: "Your age, your beauty, and especially the Roman name, exalt your pride to a prodigious degree. For my part I wish your republic may observe punctually the treaties it has concluded with me; but in case I shall be invaded by it, I hope to show that the

empire of Macedonia does not yield to Rome either in valor or reputation." AEmilius was obliged to depart with this answer. Philip continued his siege until he had captured the city of Abydos, in which he placed a strong garrison. He then returned to Macedonia. AEmilius went direct from Philip to Egypt, and in the name of the Senate and people of Rome assumed the guardianship of the young Ptolemy "pursuant to the instructions he had received from the Senate at his setting out."⁶

19. Philip paid no attention to the demands of Rome, but invaded and laid waste all Attica, and returned home laden with spoils. The Athenians sent off an embassy at once to Rome to make complaint. At Rome the ambassadors of Athens were joined by those of Rhodes and King Attalus, and the three parties presented together their complaints against Philip. While the Senate was deliberating upon these complaints, a second embassy arrived from Athens with the word that Philip was upon the point of invading Attica the second time, and that if help was not speedily sent, he would surely capture Athens. The Senate also at the same time received letters from their commanders in Greece to the effect that they were in danger of being attacked by Philip, and "that, the danger being imminent, they had no time to lose." Upon all these pleas, the Romans declared war against Philip, 200 B. C. , and at once sent Sulpitius the consul with a fleet and an army. By this time Philip had invaded Attica, and one portion of his army was

225

actually besieging Athens; while he, with the rest of the army, had marched against Attalus and the Rhodians. The Roman fleet arrived at the Piraeus just in time to save Athens.

20. Nothing further of note was accomplished during the next two years. At the beginning of the year 198 B. C., Antiochus Magnus attacked Attalus, king of Pergamus, by both sea and land. Attalus at once sent ambassadors to Rome, asking either that the Romans should send a force to help him or else allow him to recall his troops that were being used in behalf of the Romans in Greece. The Senate sent an embassy to Magnus, to whose remonstrances he listened, and immediately drew away all his forces from the territory of Attalus.

21. Aristomenes, whom the Romans had appointed guardian of the young king of Egypt, had recovered from Magnus, Palestine and Phenicia. Magnus now led his army to take these countries again for himself. In this he was completely successful; and that he might retain these countries in quietness, he made a proposition that if the young Ptolemy would marry his daughter Cleopatra as soon as they were both old enough, he would give back to Egypt those provinces as the dowry of his daughter. This proposal was accepted, and a treaty was concluded accordingly.

22. In this same year, 198 B. C., Titus Quintius Flamininus received the allotment of Macedonia as his province, and with his brother Lucius to command his fleet, he started at once to Macedonia.

23. Upon his arrival in Epirus, he found the Roman army encamped between Epirus and Illyria in the presence of Philip's army, Philip holding all the passes. Philip made proposals of peace; but terms could not be agreed upon, and the war went on. Finally some shepherds came to Flamininus and offered to lead him by a path over the mountains to the rear of the Macedonian forces. This plan succeeded; Philip was badly defeated and marched into Macedonia. Flamininus was continued in command in Macedonia for the year 197 B. C. Attalus of Pergamus, in pleading with the Boeotians to join the Romans and their allies, over-exerted himself and died shortly afterward. About the same time the Achaean League joined Rome. Flamininus defeated Philip twice, and then

226

concluded a peace, 196 B. C.; because Antiochus Magnus was then about to cross the Hellespont to the aid of Philip, and Flamininus did not want to meet both of these powerful commanders at once.

24. "It was now the time in which the Isthmian games were to be solemnized, and the expectation of what was there to be transacted had drawn thither an incredible multitude of people, and persons of the highest rank. The conditions of the treaty of peace, which were not yet entirely made public, formed the topic of all conversation, and various opinions were entertained concerning them; but very few could be persuaded that the Romans would evacuate all the cities they had taken. All Greece was in this uncertainty, when, the multitude being assembled in the stadium to see the games, a herald comes forward and publishes with a loud voice: --

"The Senate and people of Rome and Titus Quintius the general, having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, set at liberty from all garrisons and taxes and imposts, the Corinthians, the Locrians, the Phocians, the Euboeans, the Phtihot Achaeans, the Magnesians, the Thessalians, and the Perrhaebians, declare them free, and ordain that they shall be governed by their respective laws and usages.'

25. "At these words, which many heard but imperfectly because of the noise that interrupted them, all the spectators were filled with excess of joy. They gazed upon and questioned one another with astonishment, and could not believe either their eyes or ears; so like a dream was what they then saw and heard. It was thought necessary for the herald to repeat the proclamation, which was now listened to with the most profound silence, so that not a single word of the decree was lost. And now, fully assured of their happiness, they abandoned themselves again to the highest transports of joy, and broke into such loud and repeated acclamations that the sea resounded with them at a great distance; and some ravens which happened to fly that instant over the assembly, fell down in the stadium; so true it is, that of all the blessings of this life, none are so dear to mankind as liberty! The games and sports were hurried over, without any attention being paid to them; for so great was the general joy upon this occasion, that it extinguished all other sentiments. The games being ended, all the people ran in crowds to the Roman general;

227

and every one being eager to see his deliverer, to salute him, to kiss his hand, and to throw crowns and festoons of flowers over him, he would have run the hazard of being pressed to death by the crowd, had not the vigor of his years, for he was not above thirty-three years old, and the joy which so glorious a day gave him, sustained and enabled him to undergo the fatigue of it. . . .

26. "The remembrance of so delightful a day, and of the valuable blessings then bestowed, was continually renewed, and for a long time formed the only subject of conversation at all times and in all places. Every one cried in the highest transports of admiration, and a kind of enthusiasm, 'that there was a people in the world who, at their own expense and the hazard of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; and that not for their neighbors or people situated on the same continent; but who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universally law, equity, and justice. That by a single word, and the voice of a herald, liberty had been restored to all the cities of Greece and Asia. That a great soul only could have formed such a design; but that to execute it was the effect at once of the highest good fortune and the most consummate virtue.'

27. "They called to mind all the great battles which Greece had fought for the sake of liberty. 'After sustaining so many wars,' said they, 'never was its valor crowned with so blessed a reward as when strangers came and took up arms in its defense. It was then that almost without shedding a drop of blood, or losing scarce one man, it acquired the greatest and noblest of all prizes for which mankind can contend. Valor and prudence are rare at all times; but of all virtues, justice is most rare. Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades had great abilities for carrying on war, and gaining battles both by sea and land; but then it was for themselves and their country, not for strangers and foreigners, they fought. That height of glory was reserved for the Romans.'

28. "But the gratitude which the Greeks showed Flamininus and the Romans did not terminate merely in causing them to be praised: it also infinitely conduced to the augmentation of their power, by

228

inducing all nations to confide in them and rely on the faith of their engagements. For they not only received such generals as the Romans sent them, but requested earnestly that they might be sent; they called them in, and put themselves into their hands with joy. And not only nations and cities, but princes and kings, who had complaints to offer against the injustice of neighboring powers, had recourse to them, and put themselves in a manner under their safeguard; so that in a short time, from an effect of the Divine protection (to use Plutarch's expression), the whole earth submitted to their empire."⁷

29. As we have seen, this peace was made with Philip because Magnus was on his way from the east to aid Philip, and the Romans would not risk a war with the two powers united. This was in 196 B. C. Magnus had taken possession of Ephesus and several other

cities in Asia Minor, and Smyrna and Lampsacus, with some other cities, fearing his designs upon them, applied to the Romans for protection. "The Romans saw plainly that it was their interest to check the progress of Antiochus toward the west, and how fatal the consequences would be, should they suffer him to extend his power by settling on the coast of Asia, according to the plan he had laid down. They were, therefore, very glad of the opportunity those free cities gave them of opposing it, and immediately sent an embassy to him."⁸

30. While this was going on, Magnus had sent troops and begun the siege of both Smyrna and Lampsacus, while he himself with the great body of his army had crossed the Hellespont and possessed himself of all the Thracian Chersonesus. There also he began rebuilding the city of Lysimachia, with the design of making it the capital of a kingdom for his son which he would establish on the west of the Hellespont. At Selymbria, in Thrace, the Roman ambassadors found Magnus. They, by their spokesman L. Cornelius, "required Antiochus to restore to Ptolemy the several cities in Asia which he had taken from him, to evacuate all those which had been possessed by Philip, -- it not being just that he should reap the fruits

229

of the war which the Romans had carried on against that prince, -- and not to molest such of the Grecian cities of Asia as enjoyed their liberty. He added that the Romans were greatly surprised at Antiochus for crossing into Europe with two such numerous armies and so powerful a fleet, and for rebuilding Lysimachia, an undertaking which could have no other view but to invade them.

31. "To all this Antiochus answered that Ptolemy should have full satisfaction, when his marriage, which was already concluded, should be solemnized; that with regard to such Grecian cities as desired to retain their liberties, it was from him and not from the Romans they were to receive them. With respect to Lysimachia, he declared that he rebuilt it with the design of making it the residence of Seleucus his son; that Thrace and the Chersonesus, which was part of it, belonged to him; that they had been conquered from Lysimachus by Seleucus Nicator, one of his ancestors; and that he came thither as into his own patrimony. As to Asia and the cities he had taken there from Philip, he knew not what right the Romans could have to them; and therefore he desired them to interfere no further in the affairs of Asia than he did with those of Italy. The Romans desiring that the ambassadors of Smyrna and Lampsacus might be called in, they accordingly were admitted. They spoke with so much freedom as incensed Antiochus to that degree that he cried in a passion that the Romans had no business to judge of those affairs. Upon this the assembly broke up in great disorder; none of the parties received satisfaction, and everything seemed to tend to an open rupture."⁹

32. Just at this time Magnus received a report that young Ptolemy was dead; and leaving his son Seleucus in Thrace, he himself took his fleet and started to Egypt to take possession. The report was false; but the promptness of Antiochus to act upon it and attempt to seize Egypt, caused the Romans to be more determined than before to prevent

his gaining a permanent foothold on the west of the Hellespont. Accordingly, when the Roman commissioners who had settled the affairs of Greece returned to Rome in 195 B. C., "they told their Senate that they must expect and prepare for a new war, which would

230

be still more dangerous than they had just before terminated; that Antiochus had crossed into Europe with a strong army and a considerable fleet, that upon a false report which had been spread concerning Ptolemy's death, he had set out, in order to possess himself of Egypt, and that otherwise he would have made Greece the seat of the war; that the Aetolians, a people naturally restless, and turbulent, and ill-affected to Rome, would certainly rise on that occasion; that Greece fostered in its own bosom a tyrant (Nabis) more avaricious and cruel than any of his predecessors, who was meditating how to enslave it; and that thus having been restored in vain to its liberty by the Romans, it would only change its sovereign, and would fall under a more grievous captivity than before, especially if Nabis should continue in possession of the city of Argos."10

33. Flaminius was commanded to be particularly vigilant with respect to all the movements of Antiochus. This was made the more necessary just now by the arrival of Hannibal at the court of Antiochus to claim his protection. Hannibal had done this because the Romans were about to require the Carthaginians to deliver him up to them, to prevent his making an alliance with Antiochus. They feared that if Hannibal and Antiochus should unite, they would carry the war into Italy itself. Antiochus was delighted at the arrival of Hannibal, the inveterate enemy of the Romans, the greatest general of the age, and one of the greatest of any age. He therefore definitely resolved on a war with Rome, and began his preparations, which, in fact, were much protracted.

34. In the year 193 B. C. the marriage between Ptolemy and the daughter of Antiochus was solemnized according to the treaty which had been made to that effect. The preparations for war were steadily continued, Hannibal all the time urging that the war should be made in Italy. In 191 B. C. the Romans declared war against Antiochus, and started an army into Greece. Antiochus seized Thermopylae and added fortifications to its natural strength; but, strangely enough, set no efficient guard upon the path that led over the mountains, and the Romans sent a part of their army over that

231

path to the east, as Xerxes in his campaign had sent over it to the west. The result was now the same as then -- the forces of Magnus, attacked both in front and rear, were soon put to flight, and a great number of them perished.

35. Antiochus, with such of his army as escaped, made his way back to the Hellespont, and crossed into Asia as soon as possible. He then went to Ephesus, and there settled down at ease, assuring himself, and being also assured by his courtiers, that the Romans, being satisfied with having driven him out of Europe, would never follow him into Asia. Hannibal, however, constantly urged that the Romans would come into Asia against him,

and that he would be compelled shortly to fight both by sea and land in Asia and for Asia. He was at last sufficiently aroused to fortify some cities on both sides of the Hellespont to present the Romans from crossing, and to resolve to venture a naval engagement. His fleet was manned and sent out from Ephesus into the AEgean Sea to find the Roman fleet and attack it. They did so, and were badly defeated by the Romans, 191 B. C.

36. As early as possible in the spring of 190 B. C., the Romans were active again both by land and sea. Macedonia was by this time so entirely subject to the Roman power that even Philip with his army supported the Romans against Antiochus. Hannibal had been sent to Syria and Phenicia to bring to Antiochus at Ephesus the fleets of those countries. The Rhodians, who had joined the Romans, met Hannibal as he was on his way with the fleet, and succeeded in defeating him near Patara, and shutting him up so closely as to make it impossible for either him or his fleet to be of any service to Antiochus.

37. The news of this defeat reached Antiochus at the same time that word came to him that the Roman army was advancing by forced marches prepared to pass the Hellespont. He decided that the only way to prevent the Roman army from entering Asia, was to wipe out the Roman fleet, and then, being in control of the sea, sail with his fleet to the Hellespont and dispute its passage. But at his first attempt to regain possession of the sea, he suffered a worse defeat than before. This so disconcerted him that he

232

hurried away messengers to recall all his forces from the western side of the Hellespont. This was only to surrender to the Romans all his fortified cities there, and such a move could not, by any possible means, help to keep the Romans out of Asia. The Romans shortly came on, and were much pleased to find these fortified cities not only undefended, but containing large quantities of provisions and implements of war. Then, without meeting any opposition whatever, they conveyed the whole army over the Hellespont, and marched to Troy, where, 190 B. C., they and the Trojans grandly celebrated the arrival of the Romans upon the spot from which AEneas their progenitor had set out on his lonely journey so long, long before.

38. When Antiochus learned that the Roman army was actually in Asia, he sent an embassy to ask for peace. He proposed that he would lay no claim any more to any possessions in Europe, would give up his Asiatic cities to the Romans, would pay half the expenses of the war; and if the Romans would not be satisfied with Europe alone, he would yield some part of Asia, if only they would clearly define the limits of it. The Romans replied that as Antiochus had been the occasion of the war, he ought to pay all the expenses; that it was not enough that he should surrender his cities, but that he must surrender all Asia Minor west of the Taurus Mountains. "Antiochus thought that the Romans could not have prescribed harder conditions had they conquered him. Such a peace appeared to him as fatal as the most unfortunate war. He therefore prepared for a battle, as the Romans did also on their side."¹¹

39. The battle was fought at Magnesia in Phrygia. The army of Antiochus numbered seventy thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, and fifty-four elephants. The Romans had thirty thousand men and sixteen elephants. The army of Antiochus fought desperately, but all in vain. He was defeated with a loss of fifty-four thousand slain, one thousand four hundred prisoners, and fifteen elephants captured. The Romans lost but three hundred and twenty-four men. "By this victory the Romans acquired all the cities of Asia Minor, which now submitted voluntarily to them."

233

40. Antiochus, with such of his forces as remained, made his way as rapidly as possible to his capital at Antioch, and at once sent back from there to the Romans an embassy to sue for peace. They found the Roman consul at Sardis. "They did not endeavor to excuse Antiochus in any manner, and only sued humbly in his name for peace," saying, "'You have always pardoned with greatness of mind the kings and nations you have conquered. How much more should you be induced to do this after a victory which gives you the empire of the universe? Henceforth, being become equal to the gods, lay aside all animosity against mortals, and make the good of the human race your sole study for the future.'"

41. "When the consul and his council had considered the question, they announced that the terms of the peace would be only those that were offered before the war. These terms, now exactly defined, were that Antiochus should evacuate all Asia west of Mount Taurus, that he pay all the expenses of the war, which were computed at fifteen thousand Euboic talents [\$18,000,000]." The payments were to be five hundred talents down; two thousand five hundred when the Senate should have ratified the treaty; and the rest in twelve years, a thousand talents in each year. In addition to this, he was to pay Eumenes king of Pergamus four hundred talents, with some minor debts which he already owed to that king, and deliver to the Romans twenty hostages, these to be chosen by the Romans themselves. Then upon all these, they made this further heavy demand: "The Romans can not persuade themselves that a prince who gives Hannibal refuge is sincerely desirous of peace. They therefore demand that Hannibal be delivered up to them, as also Thoas the Aetolian, who was the chief agent in fomenting this war."¹²

42. All these terms, without any attempt to secure modification, were accepted by Antiochus Magnus. "L. Cotta was sent to Rome with the ambassadors of Antiochus, to acquaint the Senate with the particulars of the negotiation, and to obtain the ratification of it. Eumenes set out at the same time for Rome, whither the ambassadors of the cities of Asia went also. Soon afterward the five hundred

234

talents were paid to the consul at Ephesus; hostages were given for the remainder of the payment, and to secure the other articles of the treaty. Antiochus, one of the king's sons, was included among the hostages. He afterward ascended the throne, and was surnamed Epiphanes. The instant Hannibal and Thoas received advice that a treaty was negotiating,

concluding that they should be the victims, they provided for their own safety by retiring before it was concluded."13

43. "With the day of Magnesia, Asia was erased from the list of great States; and never perhaps did a great power fall so rapidly, so thoroughly, and so ignominiously as the kingdom of the Seleucidae under this Antiochus Magnus . . . It alone of all the great States conquered by Rome, never after the first conquest made a second appeal to the decision of arms." -- Mommsen.14

44. In the year 187 B. C. Antiochus Magnus was murdered by the people of the province of Elymas; because, driven by stress of collecting the tribute for the Romans, he had robbed then temple of all its treasures. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Seleucus Philopator. "But his reign was obscure and contemptible, occasioned by the misery to which the Romans had reduced that crown, and the exorbitant sum (1,000 talents [\$1,200,000] annually) he was obliged to pay, during the whole of his reign, by virtue of the treaty of peace concluded between the king his father and that people."15

45. This man attempted to rob the temple of God at Jerusalem, and sent his chief officer Heliodorus to accomplish the robbery. Upon his arrival at Jerusalem and approach to the temple, "immediately the whole city was seized with the utmost terror. The priests, dressed in their sacerdotal vestments, fell prostrate at the foot of the altar, beseeching the God of heaven, who enacted the law with regard to deposits, to preserve those laid up in His temple. Great numbers flocked in crowds and jointly besought the Creator upon their knees not to suffer so holy a place to be profaned. The

235

women and maidens, covered with sackcloth, were seen lifting up their hands to heaven. It was a spectacle truly worthy of compassion, to see such multitudes, and especially the high priest, pierced with the deepest affliction, under the apprehension of so impious a sacrilege.

46. "By this time Heliodorus, with his guards, was come to the gate of the treasury, and preparing to break it open. But the Spirit of the Almighty revealed himself by the most sensible marks, insomuch that all those who had dared to obey Heliodorus were struck down by a divine power, and seized with a terror which bereaved them of all their faculties. For there appeared to them a horse richly caparisoned, which, rushing at once upon Heliodorus, struck him several times with his forefeet. The man who sat on this horse had a terrible aspect, and his arms seemed of gold. At the same time there were seen two young men, whose beauty dazzled the eye, and who, standing on each side of Heliodorus, scourged him incessantly, and in the most violent manner.

47. "Heliodorus, falling to the ground, was taken up and put into his litter, and this man, who a moment before had come into the temple followed by a great train of guards, was forced away from this holy place, and had no one to succor him; and that because the power of God had displayed itself in the strongest manner. By the same power he was

east to the ground speechless, and without the least sign of life; whilst the temple, which before resounded with nothing but lamentations, now echoed with the shouts of all the people, who returned thanks to the Almighty for having raised the glory of His holy temple by the effect of His power. But now some of Heliodorus's friends besought the high priest to invoke God in his favor. Immediately Onias offered a sacrifice for his health. Whilst he was praying, the two young men above mentioned appeared to Heliodorus, and said to him: 'Return thanks to Onias the high priest; for it is for his sake that the Lord has granted you life. After having been chastened of God, declare unto the whole world His miraculous power.' Having spoken these words, they vanished.

48. "Heliodorus offered up sacrifices, and made solemn vows to Him who had restored him to life. He returned thanks to Onias

236

and went his way, declaring to every one the wonderful works of the Almighty, to which he himself had been an eye-witness. The king asking him whether he believed that another person might be sent with safety to Jerusalem, he answered: 'In case you have an enemy or any traitorous wretch who has a design upon your crown, send him thither; and you will see him return back flayed with scourging, if indeed he return at all. For He who inhabiteth the heavens is himself present in that place; He is the guardian and protector of it; and He strikes those mortally who go thither to injure it.'"16

49. "The protectorate of the Roman community now embraced all the States from the eastern to the western end of the Mediterranean. There nowhere existed a State that the Romans would have deemed it worth while to fear. But there still lived a man to whom Rome accorded this rare honor -- the homeless Carthaginian, who had raised in arms against Rome, first all the West, and then all the East, and whose schemes had been frustrated, solely perhaps, by infamous aristocratic policy in the one case, and by stupid court policy in the other. Antiochus had been obliged to bind himself in the treaty of peace to deliver up Hannibal; but the latter had escaped, first to Crete, then to Bithynia, and now lived at the court of Prusias, king of Bithynia, employed in aiding the latter in his wars with Eumenes [king of Pergamus], and victorious, as ever, by sea and by land. . .

50. "Flamininus, whose restless vanity sought after new opportunities for great achievements, undertook on his own part to deliver Rome from Hannibal as he had delivered the Greeks from their chains, and, if not to wield, -- which was not diplomatic, - - at any rate to whet and to point, the dagger against the greatest man of his time. Prusias, the most pitiful among the pitiful princes of Asia, was delighted to grant the little favor which the Roman envoy in ambiguous terms requested; and when Hannibal saw his house beset by assassins, he took poison. He had long been prepared to do so, adds a Roman; for he knew the Romans and the faith of kings.

51. "The year of his death is uncertain; probably he died in the latter half of the year 571 [of Rome, 183 B. C.], at the age of sixty-seven. When he was born, Rome was contending with doubtful

237

success for the possession of Sicily. He had lived long enough to see the West wholly subdued, and to fight his own last battle with the Romans against the vessels of his native city, which had itself become Roman; and he was constrained at last to remain a mere spectator while Rome overpowered the East as the tempest overpowers the ship that has no one at the helm, and to feel that he alone was the pilot that could have weathered the storm. There was left to him no further hope to be disappointed, when he died; but he had honestly, through fifty years of struggle, kept the oath which he had sworn when a boy.

52. "About the same time, probably in the same year, died also the man whom the Romans were wont to call his conqueror, Publius Scipio. On him fortune had lavished all the successes which she had denied to his antagonist -- successes which did belong to him, and successes which did not. He had added to the empire, Spain, Africa, and Asia; and Rome, which he had found merely the first community in Italy, was at his death the mistress of the civilized world. He himself had so many titles of victory, that some of them were made over to his brother and his cousin. And yet he, too, spent his last years in bitter vexation, and died when little more than fifty years of age in voluntary banishment, leaving orders to his relatives not to bury his remains in the city for which he had lived and in which his ancestors reposed." -- Mommsen.¹⁷

53. Soon after this Seleucus Philopator, desiring to have his brother Antiochus Epiphanes with him in the kingdom, sent his only son to Rome as hostage in place of Antiochus. This move caused the two heirs to the crown to be absent from the kingdom, and upon this happening, Heliodorus poisoned Seleucus and seized the kingdom. Antiochus Epiphanes, however, secured the aid of Eumenes, king of Pergamus, and easily expelled Heliodorus and took the throne that belonged to him by the death of Seleucus Philopator (175 B. C.). "He assumed the title of Epiphanes, that is, illustrious, which title was never worse applied. The whole series of his life will show that he deserved much more that of Epimanes (mad or furious), which some people gave him."¹⁸

238

54. In the year 173, Epiphanes, in sending his annual tribute to Rome, was obliged to make excuses to the Senate for having sent the tribute later than was stipulated by the treaty. By his ambassador he also asked "that the alliance and friendship which had been granted his father should be renewed with him, and desired that the Romans would give him such orders as suited a king who valued himself on being their affectionate and faithful ally," and that he, "could never forget the great favors he had received from the Senate, from all the youths of Rome, and from persons of all ranks and conditions, during his abode in that city, where he had been treated not merely as a hostage, but as a monarch."¹⁹

55. In the year 171, the Romans were obliged to engage in a war with Perseus, the son of Philip, king of Macedon. Antiochus Epiphanes, taking advantage of this engagement of the Roman forces, attempted to seize Egypt, though the young Ptolemy was now of an age to reign in his own right, and was also nephew to Epiphanes. "In the meantime, to observe measures with the Romans, he sent ambassadors to the Senate to represent the right he had to the provinces of Coele-Syria and Palestine, of which he was actually possessed, and the necessity he was under of engaging in a war in order to support that right, immediately after which he put himself at the head of his army and marched toward the frontiers of Egypt. Ptolemy's army came up with his near Mount Casius and Pelusium, and a battle was fought, in which Antiochus was victorious. He made so good a use of his success that he put the frontier in a condition to serve as a barrier, and to check the utmost efforts the Egyptians might make to recover those provinces."²⁰

56. In this year, however, he made no further progress toward Egypt, but led his army back to Tyre, and spent the whole winter in strengthening his forces and making preparations for the invasion of Egypt the following year.

57. Early in the spring of 170, he invaded Egypt by both land and sea. Young Ptolemy raised such an army as he could, but was unable to save his country from invasion. A battle was fought at

239

the frontier; but the Egyptians were defeated, the city of Pelusium was captured, and Antiochus Epiphanes marched "into the very heart of Egypt. In this last defeat of the Egyptians it was in his power not to have suffered a single man to escape, but the more completely to ruin his nephew, instead of making use of the advantage he had gained, he himself rode up and down on all sides, and obliged his soldiers to discontinue the slaughter. This clemency gained him the hearts of the Egyptians; and when he advanced into the country, all the inhabitants came in crowds to pay their submission to him, so that he soon took Memphis and all the rest of Egypt except Alexandria, which alone held out against him. Philometor was either taken or else surrendered himself to Antiochus, who set him at full liberty. After this they had but one table, lived, seemingly, in great friendship, and for some time Antiochus affected to be extremely careful of the interests of the young king, his nephew, and to regulate his affairs as his guardian. But when he had once possessed himself of the country, under that pretext he seized whatever he thought fit, plundered all places, and enriched himself, as well as his soldiers, with the spoils of the Egyptians."

58. While Antiochus was in Egypt, a false report of his death was spread through Palestine, upon which a certain Jason marched against Jerusalem with about one thousand men, and with the assistance of certain partizans in the city, captured it.

59. When news of this was brought to Antiochus in Egypt, he hastily concluded that the Jews had made a general insurrection, and marched at once to Jerusalem, laid siege to it,

took it by storm, and gave it up to sack and slaughter for three days, in which about eighty thousand people were slain, forty thousand were made prisoners, and about forty thousand were sold as slaves. He also entered the temple, and even into the holy of bodies, which he polluted, being guided by the traitor Menelaus, and when he departed, he took with him the altar of incense, the table for the showbread, and the candlestick, as well as a large share of the other golden utensils of the temple. He appointed as governor of Judea a certain Phrygian named Philip, a man of great cruelty. "He nominated Andronicus, a man of the like barbarous disposition, governor of Samaria,

240

and bestowed on Menelaus, the most wicked of the three, the title of high priest, investing him with the authority annexed to the office."²¹

60. The people of Alexandria, as we have seen, had not submitted to Antiochus Epiphanes, and when they saw his nephew, the young Ptolemy Philometor, in his hands, as they supposed permanently, they took Ptolemy's younger brother, Ptolemy Euergetes, and made him king, 169 B. C. As soon as Antiochus had learned this, he marched again into Egypt "under the specious pretense of restoring the dethroned monarch; but in reality to make himself absolute master of the kingdom. He defeated the Alexandrians in a sea fight near Pelusium, marched his forces into Egypt, and advanced directly toward Alexandria, in order to besiege it."²²

61. In a great council that was called, it was decided to send an embassy to Antiochus to make peace, if possible. Antiochus received the embassy very graciously, and pretended to a joint agreement, but postponed the actual settlement of conditions and the conclusion of peace, stating at the same time that he would do nothing without their knowledge and co-operation. The purpose of this, however, was only to disarm the leaders in behalf of the new king; and when this was accomplished, Antiochus marched directly to Alexandria and laid siege to it. "In this extremity, Ptolemy Euergetes and Cleopatra, his sister, who were in the city, sent ambassadors to Rome, representing the deplorable condition to which they were reduced, and imploring the aid of the Romans. The ambassadors appeared, in the audience to which they were admitted by the Senate, with all the marks of sorrow used at that time in the greatest afflictions, and made a speech still more affecting. They observed that the authority of the Romans was so much revered by all nations and kings, and that Antiochus particularly had received so many obligations from them, that if they would only declare by their ambassadors that the Senate did not approve of his making war against kings in alliance with Rome, they did not doubt but Antiochus would immediately draw off his troops from Alexandria, and return to Syria; that should the Senate refuse to afford them their

241

protection, Ptolemy and Cleopatra, being expelled from their kingdom, would be immediately reduced to fly to Rome; and that it would reflect a dishonor on the Romans to have neglected to aid the king and queen at a time when their affairs were so desperate.

62. "The Senate, moved with their remonstrances, and persuaded that it would not be for the interest of the Romans to suffer Antiochus to attain to such a height of power, and that he would be too formidable should he unite the crown of Egypt to that of Syria, resolved to send an embassy to Egypt to put an end to the war. C. Popilius Lenas, C. Decimus, and C. Hostilius were appointed for this important negotiation. Their instructions were that they should first wait upon Antiochus and afterward on Ptolemy; should order them in the name of the Senate to suspend all hostilities and put an end to the war; and that should either of the parties refuse compliance, the Romans would no longer consider them as their friend or ally. As the danger was imminent, three days after the resolution had been taken in the Senate, they set out from Rome with the Egyptian ambassadors."

63. Meantime Antiochus had raised the siege of Alexandria, and returned to his capital at Antioch, still retaining, however, full possession of Pelusium, the key of Egypt. Then the two brothers, Ptolemy Philometor and Ptolemy Euergetes, came to terms and united their interests, in hope to withstand Antiochus and save Egypt. As soon as Antiochus learned of this understanding of the brothers Ptolemy, "he resolved (168 B. C.) to employ his whole force against them. Accordingly, he sent his fleet early into Cyprus, to preserve the possession of that island; at the same time he marched at the head of a powerful army with the design to conquer Egypt openly, and not pretend, as he had before done, to fight the cause of one of his nephews," but to "make an absolute conquest of the whole kingdom."

64. He "penetrated as far as Memphis, subjecting the whole country through which he passed, and there received the submission of almost all the rest of the kingdom. He afterward marched toward Alexandria, with design to besiege that city, the possession of which would have made him absolute master of all Egypt. He would

242

certainly have succeeded in his enterprise, had he not been checked in his career by the Roman embassy, which broke all the measures he had been so long taking in order to possess himself of Egypt." Thus "the king of the north" came and "cast up a mount," and took "the most fenced cities;" and "the arms of the south" could not withstand, neither was there "any strength to withstand."²³

65. "We before observed that the ambassadors who were nominated to go to Egypt, had left Rome with the utmost diligence. They landed at Alexandria just at the time Antiochus was marching to besiege it. The ambassadors came up with him at Eleusine, which was not a mile from Alexandria. The king, seeing Popilius, with whom he had been intimately acquainted at Rome when he was a hostage in that city, opened his arms to embrace him as his old friend. The Roman, who did not consider himself on that occasion as a private man, but a servant of the public, desired to know before he answered his compliment whether he spoke to a friend or an enemy of Rome. He then gave him the decree of the Senate, bade him read it over, and return him an immediate

answer. Antiochus, after perusing it, said he would examine the contents of it with his friends, and give his answer in a short time. Popilius, enraged at the king for talking of delays, drew with the wand he had in his hand a circle around Antiochus, and then raising his voice, said: 'Answer the Senate before you stir out of that circle.'

66. "The king, quite confounded at so haughty an order, after a moment's reflection, replied that he would act according to the desire of the Senate. Popilius then received his civilities, and behaved afterward in all respects as an old friend. How important was the effect of this blunt loftiness of sentiment and expression! The Roman with a few words strikes terror into the king of Syria and saves the king of Egypt.

67. "Antiochus having left Egypt at the time stipulated, Popilius returned with his colleagues to Alexandria, where he brought to a conclusion the treaty of union between the two brothers, which had hitherto been but slightly sketched out. He then crossed to Cyprus; sent home Antiochus's fleet, which had gained a

243

victory over that of the Egyptians; restored the whole island to the kings of Egypt, who had a just claim to it; and returned to Rome in order to acquaint the Senate with the success of his embassy.

68. "Ambassadors from Antiochus, and the two Ptolemies and Cleopatra, their sister, arrived there almost at the same time. The former said 'that the peace which the Senate had been pleased to grant their sovereign appeared to him more glorious than the most splendid conquests, and that he had obeyed the commands of the Roman ambassadors as strictly as if they had been sent from the gods.'"24

69. "Egypt voluntarily submitted to the Roman protectorate, and thereupon the kings of Babylon also desisted from the last effort to maintain their independence against Rome." -- Mommsen.²⁵ Thus when the king of the north had come and east up a mount, and had taken the most fenced cities; and when the arms of the south could not withstand, and there was no strength to withstand; then "he" -- Rome -- that came "against him" -- Antiochus, the king of the north -- did "do according to his own will."²⁶

70. The circumstance which made the Roman Popilius so bold as to draw a circle around Antiochus Epiphanes, and bid him answer before he stepped out of it, and which made Epiphanes so submissive as to comply with such a narrow condition, "was the news, that arrived just before, of the great victory gained by the Romans over Perseus, king of Macedonia."²⁷ This victory, which destroyed the kingdom of Macedonia, and added that country finally to the Roman Empire, was gained in the battle of Pydna, June 22, 168 B. C. "Thus perished the empire of Alexander the Great, which had subdued and Hellenized the East, one hundred and forty-four years after his death.

71. "All the Hellenistic States had thus been completely subjected to the protectorate of Rome, and the whole empire of Alexander the Great had fallen to the Roman commonwealth,

244

just as if the city had inherited it from his heirs. From all sides kings and ambassadors flocked to Rome to congratulate her, and they showed that fawning is never more abject than when kings are in the antechamber.

72. "The moment was at least well chosen for such homage. Polybius dates from the battle of Pydna the full establishment of the empire of Rome. It was, in fact, the last battle in which a civilized State confronted Rome in the field on a footing of equality with her as a great power; all subsequent struggles were rebellions, or wars with peoples beyond the pale of the Romano-Greek civilization -- the barbarians, as they were called. The whole civilized world thenceforth recognized in the Roman Senate the supreme tribunal, whose commissioners decided in the last resort between kings and nations; and to acquire its language and manners, foreign princes and youths of quality resided in Rome." -- Mommsen.²⁸

73. As for Macedonia, by the Roman Senate "it was decreed in particular that the Macedonians and Illyrians should be declared free, in order that all nations might know that the end of the Roman arms was not to subject free people, but to deliver such as were enslaved; so that the one, under the protection of the Roman name, might always retain their liberty, and the other, who were under the rule of kings, might be treated with more lenity and justice by them, through consideration for the Romans; or that, whenever war should arise between those kings and the Roman people, the nations might know that the issue of those wars would be victory for the Romans and liberty for them."²⁹

74. "The reader begins to discover, in the events related, one of the principal characteristics of the Romans, which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece, and produce an almost general change in the universe: I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself only by degrees; and it is only by insensible progressions, which at the same time are rapid enough, that it is carried at last to its greatest height.

245

75. "It must be confessed that this people, on certain occasions, show such a moderation and disinterestedness, as (judging of them only from their outside) exceed everything we meet with in history, and to which it seems inconsistent to refuse praise. Was there ever a more delightful or more glorious day than that in which the Romans, after having carried on a long and dangerous war, after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim claim in a general assembly that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty, and desired to reap no other fruit from their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glory sufficed

to endear them to the Romans? The description of what passed on that immortal day can hardly be read without tears, and without being affected with a kind of enthusiasm of esteem and admiration.

76. "Had this deliverance of the Grecian States proceeded from a principle of generosity, void of all interested motives, had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans never belied such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august or more capable of doing honor to a nation. But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded upon a profound policy,³⁰ -- wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness which has been so highly extolled on the present occasion. It may be affirmed that the Grecians then abandoned themselves to a stupid joy, fondly imagining that they were really free because the Romans declared them so.

77. "Greece, in the times I am now speaking of, was divided between two powers, -- I mean the Grecian republics and Macedonia, -- and they were always engaged in war, the former to preserve the remains of their ancient liberty, and the latter to complete their subjection. The Romans, being perfectly well acquainted with this state of Greece, were sensible that they needed not be under any apprehensions from those little republics, which were grown weak through length of years, intestine feuds, mutual jealousies, and the wars they had been forced to support against foreign

246

powers. . . . Therefore, the Romans declared loudly in favor of those republics, made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors. And, further to attach them by still stronger ties, they held out to them a specious bait as a reward for their fidelity, -- I mean liberty, -- of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous, and which the Macedonian monarchs had perpetually disputed with them. The bait was artfully prepared,³¹ and swallowed very greedily by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no further. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them discovered the danger that lay beneath this charming bait, and accordingly they exhorted the people from time to time in their public assemblies to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the west, and which, changing on a sudden into a dreadful tempest, would break like thunder over their heads to their utter destruction.³²

78. "Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation toward such States and nations as addressed them for protection. They succored them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences and in suppressing all commotions which arose amongst them, and did not demand the least recompense from their allies for all these services. By this means their authority gained strength daily, and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

79. "And, indeed, under pretense of offering them their good offices, of entering into their interests, and of reconciling them, the Romans rendered themselves the sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them, to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility

247

of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome. Afterward they used, with plenary authority, to summon those who refused to come to an agreement, obliged them to plead their cause before the Senate, and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators, being become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. Thus there arose, in the Roman Senate, a tribunal which judged all nations and kings, and from which there was no appeal.

80. "This tribunal, at the end of every war, determined the rewards and punishments due to all parties. They dispossessed the vanquished nations of part of their territories in order to bestow them on their allies, by which they did two things from which they reaped a double advantage; for they thereby engaged in the interest of Rome such kings as were noways formidable to them, and from whom they had something to hope; and weakened others, whose friendship the Romans could not expect, and whose arms they had reason to dread. We shall hear one of the chief magistrates in the republic of the Achaeans inveigh strongly in a public assembly against this unjust usurpation, and ask by what title the Romans were empowered to assume so haughty an ascendant over them; whether their republic was not as free and independent as that of Rome; by what right the latter pretended to force the Achaeans to account for their conduct; whether they would be pleased, should the Achaeans, in their turn, officiously pretend to inquire into their affairs; and whether matters ought not to be on the same footing on both sides. All these reflections were very reasonable, just, and unanswerable; and the Romans had no advantage in the question but force.

81. "They acted in the same manner, and their politics were the same, with regard to their treatment of kings. They first won over to their interest such among them as were the weakest, and consequently the least formidable; they gave them the title of allies, whereby their persons were rendered in some measure sacred and inviolable, and which was a kind of safeguard against other kings

248

more powerful than themselves; they increased their revenue and enlarged their territories, to let them see what they might expect from their protection. It was this which raised the kingdom of Pergamus to so exalted a pitch of grandeur.

82. "In the sequel, the Romans invaded, upon different pretenses, those great potentates who divided Europe and Asia. And how haughtily did they treat them, even before they had conquered! A powerful king confined within a narrow circle by a private man of Rome was obliged to make his answer before he quitted it: how imperious was this! But then, how did they treat vanquished kings? They command them to deliver up their children, and the heirs to their crown, as hostages and pledges of their fidelity and good behavior; oblige them to lay down their arms; forbid them to declare war, or conclude any alliance, without first obtaining their leave; banish them to the other side of the mountains, and leave them, in strictness of speech, only an empty title, and a vain shadow of royalty, divested of all its rights and advantages.

83. "We can not doubt but that Providence had decreed to the Romans the sovereignty of the world, and the Scriptures had prophesied their future grandeur; but they were strangers to those divine oracles, and besides, the bare prediction of their conquests was no justification of their conduct. Although it is difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from the first formed a plan in order to conquer and subject all nations, it can not be denied but that if we examine their whole conduct attentively, it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this; and that a kind of instinct had determined them to conform to it in all things.

84. "But be this as it will, we see by the event in what this so much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans terminated. Enemies to the liberty of all nations, having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchy, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped, with insatiable ambition, the conquests of the whole world. They seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed

249

no other limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass."³³

85. Daniel, while he lived in Babylon, 606-534 B. C., had written that in the latter time of the kingdoms that succeeded to the great dominion of Alexander the Great, a power of "fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences" should "stand up;" that his power would be "mighty, but not by his own power;" that it would "destroy wonderfully, and prosper and practise;" that "through his policy" he would "cause craft to prosper in his hand;" that "by peace" he would "destroy many;" and that he would "devour and break in pieces, and stamp the residue with his feet."³⁴ And so, in Rome, it came to pass.

1[Page 217] "Lectures on the History of Rome," lect. iii. par. 11. See also the letter of Mithradateson page 269 of this book.

2[Page 217] "History of Rome," chap. i, pars. 1, 8. "The Greek word for Rome means strength; and the city's secret name was perhaps Valentia from the verb valere, which has the same meaning." -- Id., pars, 1, 6, note.

3[Page 218] "Lectures on the History of Rome," lect. iii. par. 11; and Duruy's "History of Rome," chap. i. par. 11.

4[Page 220] "Ancient History," book xvii, sec. vii, par. 88. The period covered in this chapter is treated of to a greater or less extent in all the standard histories of early Rome, or of that time -- Niebuhr, Mommsen. Arnold, Duruy, Prideaux, and Rollin. As, taken altogether. Rollin's history is written in greatest detail, it is here used as the guide. All quotations in this chapter not otherwise credited are from Rollin.

5[Page 221] "Ancient History," book xviii, sec. iii, par. 58.

6[Page 224] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. i, sec. i, pars. 18, 19.

7[Page 228] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. i, sec. iii, pars. 44-53.

8[Page 228] Id., sec. iv, par. 3.

9[Page 229] Id., pars. 4-7.

10[Page 230] Id., par. 12.

11[Page 232] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. i, sec. vii, par 27.

12[Page 233] Id., par. 44.

13[Page 234] Id., par. 45.

14[Page 234] "History of Rome," book iii. chap. ix. Under the years 189 and 187 B. C.

15[Page 234] "Ancient History," book xviii, chap. i, sec. ix. par, 1.

16[Page 236] Id., ii, sec. ii. pars. 3-6; 2 Mac. 2.

17[Page 237] "History of Rome," book iii. chap. ix, last two paragraphs.

18[Page 237] "Ancient History," chap. ii, sec. ii, par. 12.

19[Page 238] Id., par. 20.

20[Page 238] Id., par. 23.

21[Page 240] Id., par. 32.

22[Page 240] Id., par. 34.

23[Page 242] Dan. 11:15.

24[Page 243] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. ii, sec. ii, pars. 36, 37, 45, 46, 48; and Prideaux's "Connexion," under 168 B. C.

25[Page 243] "History of Rome," book iii, chap. x, 168 B. C.

26[Page 243] Dan 11:15, 16.

27[Page 243] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. ii. sec. ii, par. 47.

28[Page 244] "History of Rome," book iii, chap. x, 168 B. C., third and second paragraphs from end of chapter.

29[Page 244] "Ancient History," book xx, art. i, sec. iv, par. 69.

30[Page 245] Dan. 8:25. "Through his policy," etc.

31[Page 246] Dan. 8:25. "He shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." This bait was so well prepared and so deftly played that no less than four kingdoms -- Pergamus, Bithynia, Cyrenaica, and Egypt -- were actually left by "let by "last will and testament" to the Romans.

32[Page 246] Dan. 8:25. "By peace shall destroy many."

33[Page 249] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. i. sec. vii. "Reflections," at end of section.

34[Page 249] Dan. 8:24, 25; 7:7, 19, 23.

20. ROME -- THE FAILURE OF THE REPUBLIC.

WITH the exception of Britain, all the permanent conquests of Rome were made by the arms of the republic, which, though "sometimes vanquished in battle," were "always victorious in war." But as Roman power increased, Roman virtue declined; and of all forms of government, the stability of the republican depends most upon the integrity of the individual.

2. Abraham Lincoln's definition of a republic is the best that can ever be given: "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." A republic is a government "of the people" -- the people compose the government. The people are governed by "the people" -- by themselves. They are governed by the people, "for the people" -- they are governed by themselves, for themselves. Such a government is but self-government; each citizen governs himself, by himself, -- by his own powers of self-restraint, -- and he does this for himself, for his own good, for his own best interests. In proportion as this conception is not fulfilled, in proportion as the people lose the power of governing themselves, in the same proportion the true idea of a republic will fail of realization.

3. It is said of the early Romans that "they possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge," with the sole exception of the Anglo-Saxons. And by virtue of this, in the very nature of the case, they became the most powerful nation of all ancient times.

4. But their extensive conquests filled Rome with gold. "In twelve years the war indemnity levied upon Carthage, Antiochus, and the Aetolians, had amounted to \$28,800,000. The gold, silver, and bronze borne by the generals in their triumphs represented as much more. These \$57,600,000 will be easily doubled if we add

251

all the plunder that was taken by the officers and the soldiers, the sums distributed to the legionaries, and the valuables, furniture, stuffs, silverware, bronzes, brought to Europe from the depths of Asia; for nothing escaped the rapacity of the Romans." -- Duruy.¹

5. In the forty years from 208 to 168 B. C., the wealth brought to Rome from conquered and plundered kings and countries was nearly \$192,000,000. "It was not allowed to a proconsul to return with empty hands, though he had been making war on the poorest of men -- upon those intractable tribes from whom he could not even make prisoners that might be sold as slaves. There was no profit so small that the Romans disdained it. . . . To these revenues arising from the plunder of the world, must be added the gifts made willingly, it was said, by the cities and provinces. The Aetolians offered Fulvius a gold crown of one hundred and fifty talents; a king of Egypt sent one to Pompeius, which weighed four thousand gold pieces; and there was no city favored by exemption from tribute, no people declared free, that did not feel itself obliged to offer to a victorious

proconsul one of these crowns, whose weight was measured by the servility of the giver. At his triumph, Manlius carried two hundred of them." -- Duruy.²

6. With wealth came luxury; as said Juvenal, --

"Luxury came on more cruel than our arms,
And avenged the vanquished world with her charms."

"The army of Manlius, returning from Asia, imported foreign luxury into the city. These men first brought to Rome gilded couches, rich tapestry, with hangings, and other works of the loom. At entertainments likewise were introduced female players on the harp and timbrel, with buffoons for the diversion of the guests. Their meals also began to be prepared with greater care and cost; while the cook, whom the ancients considered as the meanest of their slaves, became highly valuable, and a servile office began to be regarded as an art. The price of a good cook rose to four talents [about \$4,500]. Then was seen a young and handsome slave costing more than a fertile field, and a few fishes more than a yoke of oxen. . . . Formerly, all

252

the senators had in common one silver service, which they used in rotation when they entertained foreign ambassadors. Now some of them had as much as a thousand pounds' weight of plate, and a little later Livius Drusus had ten thousand pounds. They required for their houses and villas, ivory, precious woods, African marble, and the like." -- Duruy.³

7. And in the train of luxury came vice. "There was now gluttony and drunkenness and debauchery hitherto unknown. Listen to Polybius, an eye-witness. 'Most of the Romans,' he says, 'live in strange dissipation. The young allow themselves to be carried away in the most shameful excesses. They are given to shows, to feasts, to luxury and disorder of every kind, which it is too evident they have learned from the Greeks during the war with Perseus.' . . . Greek vices hitherto unknown in Rome, now become naturalized there." -- Duruy.⁴

8. "It is from the victory over Antiochus, and the conquest of Asia, that Pliny dates the depravity and corruption of manners in the republic of Rome, and the fatal changes which took place there. Asia, vanquished by the Roman arms, in its turn vanquished Rome by its vices. Foreign wealth extinguished in that city a love for the ancient poverty and simplicity in which its strength and honor had consisted. Luxury, which in a manner entered Rome in triumph with the superb spoils of Asia, brought with her in her train irregularities and crimes of every kind, made greater havoc in the cities than the mightiest armies could have done, and in that manner avenged the conquered globe." -- Rollin.⁵

9. Thus the native Roman self-restraint was broken down; the power of self-government was lost; and the Roman republic failed, as every other republic must fail, when that fails by virtue of which alone a republic is possible. The Romans ceased to govern themselves,

and, consequently, they had to be governed. They lost the faculty of self-government, and with that vanished the republic: and its place was supplied by an imperial tyranny supported by a military despotism.

253

10. Rome had now spread her conquests round the whole coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and had made herself the supreme tribunal in the last resort between kings and nations." "The southeast of Spain, the coast of France from the Pyrenees to Nice, the north of Italy, Illyria and Greece, Sardinia, Sicily, and the Greek islands, the southern and western shores of Asia Minor, were Roman provinces, governed directly under Roman magistrates. On the African side, Mauritania (Morocco) was still free. Numidia (the modern Algeria) retained its native dynasty, but was a Roman dependency. The Carthaginian dominions, Tunis and Tripoli, had been annexed to the empire. The interior of Asia Minor up to the Euphrates, with Syria and Egypt, was under sovereigns called allies, but, like the native princes in India, subject to a Roman protectorate.

11. "Over this enormous territory, rich with the accumulated treasures of centuries, and inhabited by thriving, industrious races, the energetic Roman men of business had spread and settled themselves, gathering into their hands the trade, the financial administration, the entire commercial control of the Mediterranean basin. They had been trained in thrift and economy, in abhorrence of debt, in strictest habits of close and careful management. Their frugal education, their early lessons in the value of money, good and excellent as those lessons were, led them as a matter of course, to turn to account their extraordinary opportunities. Governors with their staffs, permanent officials, contractors for the revenue, negotiators, bill-brokers, bankers, merchants, were scattered everywhere in thousands. Money poured in upon them in rolling streams of gold." -- Froude.⁶

12. The actual administrative powers of the government were held by the body of the senators, who held office for life. The Senate had control of the public treasury, and into its hands went not only the regular public revenue from all sources, but also the immense spoil of plundered cities and conquered provinces. With the Senate lay also the appointment, and from its own ranks, too, of all the governors of provinces; and a governorship was the goal of wealth. A governor could go out from Rome poor, perhaps a

254

bankrupt, hold his province for one, two, or three years, and return with millions. The inevitable result was that the senatorial families and leading commoners built up themselves into an aristocracy of wealth ever increasing.

13. Owing to the opportunities for accumulating wealth in the provinces much more rapidly than at home, many of the most enterprising citizens sold their farms and left Italy. The farms were bought up by the Roman capitalists, and the small holdings were merged into vast estates. Besides this, the public lands were leased on easy terms by the

Senate to persons of political influence, who, by the lapse of time, had come to regard the land as their own by right of occupation. The Licinian law passed in 367 B. C., provided that no one should occupy more than three hundred and thirty-three acres of the public lands; and that every occupant should employ a certain proportion of free laborers. But at the end of two hundred years these favored holders had gone far beyond the law in both of these points; they extended their holdings beyond the limits prescribed by the law; and they employed no free laborers at all, but worked their holdings by slave labor wholly. Nor was this confined to the occupiers of the public lands; all wealthy landowners worked their land by slaves.

14. When, in the Roman conquests, prisoners were taken in battle, or upon the capture or the unconditional surrender of a city, they were all sold as slaves. Thus the Roman slaves were Spaniards, Gauls, Greeks, Asiatics, Carthaginians, etc., etc. Of course they were made up of all classes, yet many of them were intelligent, trained, and skillful; and often among them would be found those who were well educated. These were bought up by the wealthy Romans by the thousands. The skilled mechanics and artisans among them were employed in their owners' workshops established at Rome; the others were spread over the vast landed estates, covering them with vineyards, orchards, olive gardens, and the products of general agriculture; and all increasing their owners' immense incomes.

15. "Wealth poured in more and more, and luxury grew more unbounded. Palaces sprang up in the city, castles in the country,

255

villas at pleasant places by the sea, and parks, and fish-ponds, and game preserves, and gardens, and vast retinues of servants," everywhere. The effect of all this absorbing of the land, whether public or private, into great estates worked by slaves, was to crowd the free laborers off the lands and into the large towns, and into Rome above all. There they found every trade and occupation filled with slaves, whose labor only increased the wealth of the millionaire, and with which it was impossible successfully to compete. The only alternative was to fall into the train of the political agitator, become the stepping-stone to his ambition, sell their votes to the highest bidder, and perhaps have a share in the promised more equable division of the good things which were monopolized by the rich.

16. For to get money, by any means, lawful or unlawful, had become the universal passion. "Money was the one thought, from the highest senator to the poorest wretch who sold his vote in the Comitia. For money judges gave unjust decrees, and juries gave corrupt verdicts." -- Froude.⁷ It has been well said that "with all his wealth, there were but two things which the Roman noble could buy -- political power and luxury." -- Froude.⁸ And the poor Roman had but one thing that he could sell -- his vote. Consequently, with the rich, able only to buy political power, and with the poor, able only to sell his vote, the elections, once pure, became matters of annual bargain and sale between the candidates and the voters.

17. "To obtain a province was the first ambition of a Roman noble. The road to it lay through the praetorship and the consulship; these offices, therefore, became the prizes of the State; and being in the gift of the people, they were sought after by means which demoralized alike the givers and the receivers. The elections were managed by clubs and coteries; and, except on occasions of national danger or political excitement, those who spent most freely were most certain of success. Under these conditions the chief powers in the commonwealth necessarily centered in the rich. There was no longer an aristocracy of birth, still less of virtue. . . . But the door of promotion was open to all who had the golden key. The great commoners bought their way into the magistracies. From

256

the magistracies they passed into the Senate." -- Froude.⁹ And from the Senate they passed to the governorship of a province.

18. To obtain the first office in the line of promotion to the governorship, men would exhaust every resource, and plunge into what would otherwise have been hopeless indebtedness. Yet having obtained the governorship, when they returned, they were fully able to pay all their debts, and still be millionaires. "The highest offices of State were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined, in fact, to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged for distinctions of wealth. The struggle between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege was over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society." -- Froude.¹⁰

19. Senatorial power was the sure road to wealth. The way to this was through the praetorship and the consulship. These offices were the gift of the populace through election by popular vote. The votes of the great body of the populace were for sale; and as only those who could control sufficient wealth were able to buy enough votes to elect, the sure result was, of course, that all the real powers of the government were held by the aristocracy of wealth. Then, as these used their power to increase their own wealth and that of their favorites, and only used their wealth to perpetuate their power, another sure result was the growth of jealousy on the part of the populace, and a demand growing constantly louder and more urgent, that there should be a more equitable division of the good things of life which were monopolized by the favored few. "All orders in a society may be wise and virtuous, but all can not be rich. Wealth which is used only for idle luxury is always envied, and envy soon curdles into hate. It is easy to persuade the masses that the good things of this world are unjustly divided, especially when it happens to be the exact truth." -- Froude.¹¹

20. And as these two classes were constantly growing farther apart, -- the rich growing richer and the poor poorer, -- there ceased

257

to be any middle class to maintain order in government and society, by holding the balance of power. There remained only the two classes, the rich and the poor, and of these the rich despised the poor, and the poor envied the rich. And there were always plenty of men to stir up the discontent of the masses, and present schemes for the reorganization of society and government. Some of these were well-meaning men, -- men who really had in view the good of their fellow men; but the far greater number were mere demagogues, -- ambitious schemers who used the discontent of the populace only to lift themselves into the places of wealth and power which they envied others, and which, when they had secured, they used as selfishly and as oppressively as did any of those against whom they clamored. But whether they were well-meaning men or demagogues, in order to hold the populace against the persuasions and bribes of the wealthy they were compelled to make promises and concessions which were only in the nature of larger bribes, and which in the end were as destructive of free government as the worst acts of the Senate itself.

21. In the long contest between the people and the Senate, which ended in the establishment of an imperial form of government, the first decisive step was taken by Tiberius Gracchus, who was elected tribune of the people in the year 133 B. C. On his way home from Spain shortly before, as he passed through Tuscany, he saw in full operation the large estate system carried on by the wealthy senators or their favorites, -- the public lands unlawfully leased in great tracts, "the fields cultivated by the slave gangs, the free citizens of the republic thrust away into the towns, aliens and outcasts in their own country, without a foot of soil which they could call their own." He at once determined that the public lands should be restored to the people; and as soon as he was elected tribune, he set to work to put his views into law.

22. As the government was of the people, if the people were only united they could carry any measure they pleased in spite of the Senate. As the senators and their wealthy favorites were the offenders, it was evident that if any such law should be secured, it would have to be wholly by the people's overriding the Senate; and

258

to the people Tiberius Gracchus directly appealed. He declared that the public land belonged to the people, demanded that the monopolists should be removed, and that the public lands should be redistributed among the citizens of Rome. The monopolists argued that they had leased the land from the Senate, and had made their investments on the faith that the law was no longer of force. Besides this they declared that as they were then occupying the lands, and as the lands had been so occupied for ages before, with the sanction of the government, to call in question their titles now, was to strike at the very foundations of society. Tiberius and his party replied only by pointing to the statute which stood unrepealed, and showing that however long the present system had been in vogue, it was illegal and void from the beginning.

23. Yet Tiberius did not presume to be arbitrary. He proposed to pay the holders for their improvements; but as for the public land itself, it belonged to the people, and to the

people it should go. The majority of the citizens stood by Tiberius. But another of the tribunes, Octavius Caecina by name, himself having large interests in the land question, went over to the side of the Senate; and in the exercise of his constitutional right, forbade the taking of the vote. From the beginning, the functions of the tribunes were that they should be the defenders of the people and the guardians of the rights of the people, against the encroachment of the consulate and the Senate. And now, when one of their own constitutional defenders deserted them and went over to the enemy, even though in doing so he exercised only his constitutional prerogative, the people would not bear it. It was to support an unlawful system that it was done; the people were all-powerful, and they determined to carry their measure, constitution or no constitution.¹² Tiberius called upon them to declare Caecina deposed from the tribunate; they at once complied. Then they took the vote which Caecina had treacherously forbidden, and the land law of Tiberius Gracchus was secured.

259

24. Three commissioners were appointed to carry into effect the provisions of the law. But from whatever cause, the choosing of the commissioners was unfortunate -- they were Tiberius himself, his younger brother, and his father-in-law. Being thus apparently a family affair, the aristocrats made the most of it, and bided their time; for the tribunes were elected for only a year, and the aristocrats hoped so to shape the elections when the year should expire, as to regain their power. But when the year expired, Tiberius unconstitutionally presented himself for re-election, and the prospect was that he would secure it. When the election day came, the aristocrats, with their servants and hired voters, went armed to the polls, and as soon as they saw that Tiberius would surely be chosen, they raised a riot. The people, being unarmed, were driven off. Tiberius Gracchus and three hundred of his friends were killed and pitched into the Tiber. Yet thought they had killed Tiberius, they did not dare to attempt at once the repeal of the law which he had secured, nor openly to interfere with the work of the commissioners in executing the law. Within two years the commissioners had settled forty thousand families upon public lands which the monopolists had been obliged to surrender.

25. The commissioners soon became unpopular. Those who were compelled to resign their lands were exasperated, of course. On the other hand, those to whom the land was given were not in all cases satisfied. It was certain that some would be given better pieces of land than others, and that of itself created jealousy and discontent. But the greatest trouble was, that in the great majority of cases it was not land that they wanted, in fact. It was money that they wanted first of all; and although the land was virtually given to them, and well improved at that, they could not get money out of it without work. It had to be personal work, too, because to hire slaves was against the very law by virtue of which they had received the land; and to hire freemen was impossible, (1) because no freeman would work for a slave's wages, -- that in his estimate would be to count himself no better than a slave, -- and (2) the new landed proprietor could not afford to pay the wages demanded by free labor, because he had to meet the competition of the wealthy

260

landowners who worked their own land with slave labor. The only alternative was for the new landholders to work their land themselves, and do the best they could at it. But as the money did not come as fast as they wished, and as what did come was only by hard work and economical living, many of them heartily wished themselves back amid the stir and bustle of the busy towns, working for daily wages, though the wages might be small. The discontented cries soon grew loud enough to give the Senate its desired excuse to suspend the commissioners, and then quietly to repeal the law, and resume its old supremacy.

26. Just nine years after the death of Tiberius Gracchus, his brother Caius was elected a tribune, and took up the work in behalf of which Tiberius had lost his life. The Senate had been jealous of him for some time, and attacked him with petty prosecutions and false accusations; and when he was elected tribune, the Senate knew that this meant no good to it. Caius revived the land law that had been secured by his brother ten years before, but he did not stop there; he attacked the Senate itself.

27. All important State cases, whether civil or criminal, were tried before a court composed of senators -- about sixty or seventy. This privilege also the senator should turned to their own profit by selling their verdicts. It was no secret that the average senatorial jurymen was approachable with money; if not in the form of a direct bribe, there were many other ways in which a wealthy senator could make his influence felt. Governors could plunder their provinces, rob temples, sell their authority, and carry away everything they could lay hands on: yet, although in the eyes of the law these were the gravest offenses, when they returned to Rome, they could admit their fellow senators to a share in their stealings, and rest perfectly secure. If the plundered provincials came up to Rome with charges against a governor, the charges had to be passed upon by a board of senators, who had either been governors themselves or else were only waiting for the first chance to become governors, and a case had to be one of special hardship, and notorious at that, before any notice would be taken of it in any effective way. The general course was only to show that the law was a mockery where

261

the rich and influential were concerned. At this system of corruption, Caius Gracchus aimed a successful blow. He carried a law disqualifying forever any senator from sitting on a jury of any kind, and transferring these judicial functions to the equities, or knights. The knights were an order of men below the dignity of senators, yet they had to be possessed of a certain amount of wealth to be eligible to the order. By this measure, Caius bound to himself the whole body of the knights.

28. But these attacks upon the Senate, successful though they were, and these favors to the knights, were of no direct benefit to the people; therefore to maintain his position with them, Caius was obliged to do something that would be so directly in their favor that there could be no mistaking it. It was not enough that he should restore the land law that had been secured by his brother. That law, even while it was working at its best, was satisfactory to but few of its beneficiaries. The law was restored it is true, but the prospect

of leaving Rome and going perhaps to some distant part of Italy to engage in hard work, was not much of a temptation to men who had spent any length of time in Rome, involved in its political strifes, and whose principal desire was to obtain money and the means of subsistence with as little work as possible. It required something more than the restoration of the land law to satisfy these, and Caius granted it.

29. With the "enthusiastic clapping" of every pair of poor hands in Rome, he secured the passage of a law decreeing that in Rome should be established public granaries, to be filled and maintained at the cost of the State, and that from these the wheat should be sold to the poor citizens at a merely nominal price. This law applied only to Rome, because in Rome the elections were held. "The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the State, to crowd the circus and to clamor at the elections, available no doubt immediately to strengthen the hands of the popular tribune, but certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid highest for their voices." -- Froude.¹³

262

30. We have already seen that the only stock in trade of the poor citizen was his vote, and the effect of this law was greatly to increase the value of that commodity; because as he was now virtually supported by the State, he became more nearly independent, and could easily devote more time to political agitation, and could demand larger returns for his influence and his vote. But Caius carried his law, and so bound to himself, and greatly multiplied, too, the mass of voters in Rome; and having secured the support of both the knights and the populace, he carried all before him, and was even re-elected to the tribunate, and could have been elected the third time; but he proposed a scheme that estranged the mob, and his power departed.

31. He proposed that in different parts of the empire, Roman colonies should be established with all the privileges of Roman citizenship, and one of these places was Carthage. That city, while it existed, had always been the greatest earthly menace to Rome, and when it had been reduced to ashes and the Roman plowshare drawn over it, it was cursed forever. And now the mere suggestion to restore it was magnified by Caius's enemies to a height that made the proposition appear but little short of treason. This of itself, however, might not have defeated him; but if this colonization scheme should be carried out, many of the populace would have to leave Rome and go to some distant part of the empire; and worse than all else, they would have to work. No longer could they be fed at the public expense and spend their lives in the capital, in the whirl of political excitement and the amusements of the Roman circus. Even to contemplate such a prospect was intolerable; still more, and as though Caius deliberately designed to add insult to injury, he proposed to bestow the franchise upon all the freemen of Italy. This would be only to cut down in an unknown ratio the value of the votes of those who now possessed the franchise. Such a calamity as that never could be borne. The course of the Senate might have been one of misrule, but this of Caius Gracchus was fast developing into unbearable despotism. The election day came, riots were raised, and Caius Gracchus

and three thousand of his friends were killed, as had been his brother and his friends ten years before.

263

The mob having now no leader, the Senate resumed its sway as before, and went on in the same old way, except that the laws actually passed by Caius had to stand.

32. In 123 B. C. the corruption of justice by the senators had made it necessary to deprive them of the right to sit on juries, and this privilege was bestowed upon the knights. Yet within about thirty years the same evil had grown to such a height among the knights as to call loudly for a reform. Accordingly, in 91 B. C., Marcus Livius Drusus, a tribune, brought forward a proposal to reform the law courts; and thereby incurred the deadly enmity of the whole Equestrian order. With this he proposed both new land laws and new corn laws, which increased the hatred of the senatorial order toward the populace. These laws were passed; but the Senate declared them null and void.

33. Mithradates, king of Pontus, had set out (89 B. C.) to reduce all the East in subjection to himself. The Roman governors had made such a tyrannical use of their power that all the provinces of the East were ready to revolt at the first fair opportunity that offered. The fleets of Mithradates, coming out over the Black Sea, poured through the Hellespont and the Dardanelles into the Grecian Archipelago. All the islands, and the provinces of Ionia, Caria, and Lydia, taking advantage of this, rose at once in determined revolt, and put to death many thousands of the Roman residents (88 B. C.). Not only the governors, but the merchants, the bankers, and the farmers of the taxes, with their families, were promiscuously murdered.

34. Mithradates himself, with a powerful army, followed close upon the success of his fleet, crossed the Bosphorus, and penetrated into Greece, which received him as a deliverer (87 B. C.). All this compelled Rome to declare war upon Mithradates; but this was only to deepen her own local contests; for there was bitter rivalry and contention as to who should command the armies to be sent against Mithradates. Marius was a great favorite; but there was a strong rival to his popularity, in the person of Lucius Cornelius Sulla.

35. Sulla had made himself the favorite of the soldiers by allowing them to indulge "in plundering, and in all kinds of license."

264

He had already made one journey into the East with an army, had defeated one of the generals of Mithradates, had restored order, for a time, in the Eastern provinces, and had received an embassy from the Parthians which was sent to solicit an alliance with Rome, B. C. 92. He had returned to Rome in 91. Sulla was one of the aristocracy, "a patrician of the purest blood;" but he had made an immense bid for the favor of the populace by exhibiting in the arena a hundred African lions.

36. Everybody in Rome, and for that matter in all Italy, knew that the contest for the command of the troops in the Mithradatic War lay between Marius and Sulla; and every one knew that the contest stood: Sulla and the senatorial party against Marius and the people. The contest deepened, and it was more and more evident that, in the existing state of things, it could not be decided without a crisis.

37. A tribune -- Sulpicius Rufus -- proposed that Marius should be given command in the Mithradatic War. This pleased the great majority of the people, but only aroused both the Senate and Sulla to the most determined opposition. Yet it soon became evident that the motion of Rufus would be carried. The consuls, -- Sulla was one of them, -- to prevent it, proclaimed the day a public holiday. Rufus armed his party and drove the consuls from the Forum, compelled them to withdraw the proclamation of a holiday, and carried his laws. But Sulla put himself at the head of his soldiers and marched them into the city, and "for the first time a Roman consul entered the city of Rome at the head of the legions of the republic." There was resistance, but it was utterly vain. Marius escaped to Africa, Rufus was taken and killed, and twelve others of the popular leaders were put to death without a trial. Sulla, at the head of his troops and supported by the Senate, settled affairs to suit himself; and, with his legions, departed for the East in the beginning of the year 87 B. C. Marius died Jan. 13, 86.

38. Sulla was everywhere successful against Mithradates; and in the year 84 B. C. a peace was concluded by which Mithradates was reduced to the position of a vassal of Rome. In 83 Sulla determined to return to Italy, which had been almost entirely turned against

265

him. The Italians dreaded to have Sulla return, and raised an army to prevent it; but Sulla landed in Italy with forty thousand veteran troops, and was there joined by Pompey with a legion which he had raised. Yet with this strong force it took Sulla about a year to bring all the country into subjection. As soon as he had made his position secure, he had the Senate to appoint him dictator, which made him master of everything and everybody in Italy. He then entered upon a course of continuous and systematic murder of all who were in any way opposed to him.

39. "Four thousand seven hundred persons fell in the proscription of Sylla,¹⁴ all men of education and fortune. The real crime of many of them was the possession of an estate or a wife which a relative or a neighbor coveted. The crime alleged against all was the opinion that the people of Rome and Italy had rights which deserved consideration as well as the senators and nobles. The liberal party were extinguished in their own blood. Their estates were partitioned into a hundred and twenty thousand allotments, which were distributed among Sylla's friends, or soldiers, or freedmen. The land reform of the Gracchi was mockingly adopted to create a permanent aristocratic garrison. There were no trials, there were no pardons. Common report or private information was at once indictment and evidence, and accusation was in itself condemnation." -- Froude.¹⁵

40. Reform was popular, and Sulla must needs be a reformer; but his was a reformation which aimed to make the Senate both supreme and absolute. He had already, while consul in 88, crippled the power of both the tribunes and the people, by passing a law that no proposal should be made to the assembly without the sanction of the Senate; and now the value of the office of tribune was lowered by the provision that any one who should become a tribune should never afterward be chosen to any other office. In another form, also, he lessened the power of the people: he enacted a law that no man should be elected consul who was not forty-three years old, and who had not already been a praetor or a quaestor; and that no one

266

should be made consul a second time within ten years. He also took entirely away from the knights the right of sitting as the court of justice, and restored to the Senate this privilege. As in the matter of the election of tribunes and consuls, he had so far deprived the people of the exercise of their power, he now went further, and enacted a law that the assembly of the people should not even be called together without the Senate's sanction. But the heaviest stroke of all that he made against the populace was to abolish entirely the grants of grain, and to shut up the public granaries.

41. Thus the power of the Senate was made absolute; and to render it secure, ten thousand slaves were enfranchised and formed into a senatorial guard. But in the existing order of things, it was impossible that such power could be respected, or that it could long be exercised. The only means by which Sulla was enabled to create such a power at all, was the army which was so entirely devoted to himself.

42. From this time forth, in the very nature of things, it became more and more certain that the army would be the real source of power; that whosoever should have the support of the strongest body of troops would possess the power; and that just as soon as that power should be turned against the Senate instead of for it, all this system which had been so carefully built up would be scarcely more tangible than the stuff that dreams are made of. Sulla himself had set the example in 88, it had been readily followed by Cinna in 87, it was repeated here by Sulla in 81, and he himself saw in Pompey a readiness to follow it this same year.

43. Pompey had been sent to Sicily and Africa to reduce things to order there; and he was eminently successful. When he returned to Rome, "Sylla, with all the people, went out to meet him, and saluted him with the title of 'the Great.' But Pompey wanted a triumph, a magnificent triumph, and he had brought back from Africa elephants to draw his chariot; but Sylla refused it to him, for the young general [he was about twenty-five] was not even as yet a senator. Upon this, Pompey went so far as to bid Sylla beware, and remember that the rising sun has more worshipers than the setting. His words produced an immense effect upon the crowd; and

267

Sulla, overcome with surprise, for the first time in his life yielded. 'Let him triumph !' he said, and repeated the words. The people applauded Pompey's boldness, and gazed with delight upon this general who did not tremble before the man whom all the world feared." -- Duruy.¹⁶

44. By this act of Pompey's, Sulla saw that it would be the best thing to do to bind Pompey securely to himself. Pompey was already married to Antistia, a lady whose father had been murdered for standing up for Sulla, and whose mother had been driven to madness and to suicide by her husband's terrible fate. But Sulla had a stepdaughter, Emilia, whom he proposed that Pompey should marry. Emilia was already married, and was soon to become a mother; yet at Sulla's invitation Pompey divorced Antistia, and married Emilia.

45. There was just then another youth in Rome whom it was to Sulla's interest to gain also; and he proposed to secure his allegiance in much the same way as he had gained Pompey's. That youth was Julius Caesar. 46. Caesar was the nephew of the great Marius; and had married Cornelia, the daughter of Cinna, by whom he had a daughter named Julia. He was at this time about twenty years of age. Sulla proposed to him that he should divorce Cornelia, and marry some woman whom Sulla should choose. Caesar flatly refused. Sulla tried to compel him to it: he deprived him of his office of the priesthood; he took his wife's dowry from him, and confiscated his estate. But Caesar would not yield a hair's breadth. Next Sulla hired assassins to kill him, and he escaped only by bribing the assassins. Caesar's friends interceded, and finally obtained his pardon; but he, not willing to trust himself within Sulla's reach, left Italy, and joined the army in Asia. In 79 Sulla resigned his dictatorship, and died the following year.

47. The power which Sulla had given to the Senate was only used to build up itself. As, by the new legislation, no election could now be had without the appointment of the Senate, the elections soon fell under the control of senatorial rings and committees. No candidate could hope to succeed who had not the favor of the

268

Senate; and the surest means of securing the favor of the senatorial party was the possession of wealth, and a willingness to spend it to secure an office.

48. The distribution of the land by Sulla had resulted no better than had that by the Gracchi, in fact hardly as well; because since that there had been forty years of degeneracy and political violence, and a part of the time almost anarchy. Extravagance in living had increased at a rapid rate among all classes, -- among the really wealthy, in an ostentatious display, or the exhaustion of pleasure; among those of moderate fortunes, in an effort to ape the ways of the wealthy; and even among the poor, owing to the virtually free distribution of wheat. For so long as they could get the main part of their living for nothing, they were not likely to cultivate habits of economy. It was easy enough to distribute land to those who had neither land nor money. The difficulty was to keep it so distributed. Those to whom Sulla had distributed land, especially his soldiers, lived far

beyond their means; their lands were soon mortgaged, and at last forfeited, falling once more into the hands of the wealthy landowners, to be worked by slaves, while the free citizens were again crowded into the cities. 49. Besides the vast numbers of slaves who were put to use on farms and in shops all over Italy, there were many who were kept and trained to fight one another in the amphitheater, solely for the amusement of the populace. Nothing made a person so popular as to set forth a few pairs of gladiators in the circus to murder one another. At Capua, about seventy-five miles south of Rome, was the most famous training-school for gladiators. In the year 73 B. C. two hundred of these gladiators, led by Spartacus, broke away from their "stables" at Capua, and were soon joined by escaped slaves from all the surrounding country, in such numbers that in a little while Spartacus found himself at the head of seventy thousand men ready for any sort of desperate action. For two years they spread terror from one end of Italy to the other, till Pompey and Crassus led forth an army and annihilated the whole host, B. C. 71. Spartacus was killed, sword in hand, and six thousand captives were crucified all along the highway from Capua to Rome.

269

50. Pompey and Crassus were made consuls for the year 70. Sulla's legislation was undone, and everything was set back as it had been before, except that the prerogative of sitting as a court of law was not restored entirely to the knights. This privilege the senators had again prostituted to their old purposes; and as the knights could not be fully trusted either, the court was now to be composed of two-thirds knights and one-third senators. The power of the tribunes was fully restored, also the right of the populace to assemble at their own wish. The public granaries were once more opened. The mob was happy, the Senate was embittered, and the way was again opened for the full tide of political violence which immediately followed.

51. Mithradates had again entered the field with a powerful army, having secured the alliance of Tigranes, king of Armenia. He tried to gain also the alliance of the king of the Parthians. In his letter to this king he used language so vigorous and so true, concerning the Romans, that it is worth repeating for everlasting remembrance. Mithradates wrote, in part, as follows: --

"Do not deceive yourself; it is with all the nations, States, and kingdoms of the earth that the Romans are at war; and two motives, as ancient as powerful, put their arms into their hands: the unbounded ambition of extending their conquests, and the insatiable thirst of riches. . . . Do you not know that the Romans, when they found themselves stopped by the ocean in the west, turned their arms in this way? That, to look back to their foundation and origin, whatever they have, they have from violence, -- home, wives, lands, and dominions? A vile herd of every kind of vagabond, without country, without forefathers, they established themselves for the misfortune of the human race. Neither divine nor human laws restrain them from betraying and destroying their allies and friends, remote nations or neighbors, the weak or the powerful. They reckon as enemies all that are not their slaves; and especially whatever bears the name of king. . . .

"It will be for your immortal glory to have supported two great kings, and to have conquered and destroyed these robbers of the world. This is what I earnestly advise and exhort you to do, by warning you to choose rather to share with us, by a salutary alliance, in the conquest of the common enemy, than to suffer the Roman Empire to extend itself still farther by our ruin."17

270

52. Lucullus had contended against Mithradates eight years, 74-66 B. C., when, against the will of the Senate, and by the unanimous voice of the people, Pompey, in 66, was appointed to the command in the East, relieving Lucullus. In a single battle, Pompey destroyed the army of Mithradates; and that last great foe of the Romans became a fugitive, perishing in 63 B. C. Pompey established the Roman authority over Armenia, concluded an alliance with the Parthians, led his legions through the country of the Albanians, and into that of the Iberians at the foot of the Caucasus Mountains. "In reaching the Caucasus, Pompey had left behind him the historic lands of the Roman Republic, and entered upon the regions of fable. Having conquered these tribes, he came round to the river Phasis." He returned to Amisus in Armenia "where, during the winter [65-64], he held his court with all the barbaric splendor of an Oriental potentate. Surrounded by Asiatic chiefs, and ambassadors from all the kings, he distributed commands and provinces; granted or denied the alliance of Rome; treated with the Medes and Elymaeans, who were rivals of Parthia, and refused to Phraates [king of Parthia] the title of 'King of Kings.'" -- Duruy.¹⁸ In the spring of 64 he organized Pontus into a Roman province, and passed over the Taurus Mountains into Syria to set things in order there. In Syria he came also into connection with the affairs of the Jews, which, just at this time, were of considerable importance in the East.

53. In the year 130 B. C., the king of Syria was slain in a battle with the Parthians. Then John Hyrcanus, the high priest of the Jews, "took the advantage of the disturbances and divisions that thenceforth ensued . . . to make himself absolute and wholly independent. For after this, neither he nor any of his descendants owned any further dependence on the kings of Syria; but thenceforth wholly freed themselves from all manner of homage, servitude, or subjection, to them." -- Prideaux.¹⁹ And thus the government of the now independent country of Judea was merged in the high priests, in succession: the high priest being the head of both religion

271

and the State. In the year 129 B. C., the same high priest conquered the Idumaeans, -- Edomites, -- and "reduced them to this necessity: either to embrace the Jewish religion or else to leave the country and seek new dwellings elsewhere." They chose to adopt the Jewish religion, rather than be driven from their country. But under such circumstances they were as much Idumaeans as before, except only in the forms of worship. About the year 128 B. C., Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome "to renew the league of friendship they had with the Romans." "And when the Senate had received their epistle, they made a league of friendship with them;" and "decreed" "to renew their league of friendship and

mutual assistance with these good men, and who were sent by a good and friendly people." -- Josephus.²⁰

54. In the year 106 B. C., Aristobulus, the eldest son of John Hyrcanus, regularly succeeded to the high-priesthood, and, being also the head of the State, resolved "to change the government into a kingdom;" and "first of all put a diadem on his head, four hundred and eighty-one years and three months after the people had been delivered from Babylonish slavery, and were returned to their own country again." -- Josephus.²¹ This piece of worldly ambition opened among the Jews the flood-gates of jealousy, strife, assassination, and domestic war, which evils were, if possible, more indulged than among the nations round.

55. After Aristobulus, Alexander Jannaeus reigned; and after him his widow, Alexandra. While Alexandra was queen, Hyrcanus, the eldest son of Jannaeus, was high priest. At the court there was a shrewd and ambitious Idumaeen, Antipater by name. He studiously gained the ascendant over Hyrcanus. This he did in the hope that when Hyrcanus should become king, at the death of his mother, he himself would virtually rule the kingdom. However, when the time actually came, Antipater saw all his plans upset by the revolt of Aristobulus II, the brother of Hyrcanus. For Hyrcanus was defeated in a battle, and was obliged to resign to Aristobulus the office of high priest and king. Yet Antipater did not despair; he

272

immediately set on foot, and persistently wrought, an intrigue to replace Hyrcanus upon the throne.

56. Such was the condition of affairs in Judea when Pompey came into Syria of Damascus. To Pompey at Damascus came ambassadors from both Hyrcanus and Aristobulus -- Antipater the Idumaeen on behalf of Hyrcanus, and more for himself. Also there came ambassadors from the people to make representations against both Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, and to plead that the kingship be abolished and the governorship be only in the high priest as such. Pompey heard them all; but deferred the decision until he should arrive in Judea. By the time that Pompey reached Judea, Aristobulus had taken a course greatly to offend him. But Pompey coming to Jerusalem, Aristobulus repented and went out to meet him, and offered to receive him into the city and give him money. But the partizans of Aristobulus would not accept this arrangement. They stationed themselves at the temple and prepared for a siege.

57. The siege of the temple was promptly begun by Pompey; but he was obliged to spend three months of hard work and fierce fighting before it was taken. However, when the temple was finally taken, Pompey refrained from plundering it of its wealth or of anything, though he passed into the most holy place within the veil. Judea was now held in subjection, and laid under tribute, to the Roman power, from which she never escaped except by annihilation.

58. "Now the occasions of this misery which came upon Jerusalem were Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, by raising a sedition one against the other; for now we lost our liberty, and became subject to the Romans, and were deprived of that country which we had gained by our arms from the Syrians, and were compelled to restore it to the Syrians. Moreover the Romans exacted of us, in a little time, above ten thousand talents [about \$12,000,000]; and the royal authority, which was a dignity formerly bestowed on those that were high priests by the right of their family, became the property of private men." -- Josephus.²²

59. "Pompey committed Coele-Syria, as far as the river Euphrates and Egypt, to Scaurus with two Roman legions, and then went away

273

to Cilicia, and made haste to Rome." -- Josephus.²³ Joppa, Gaza, and other coast towns were added to the province of Syria, which was the cause of that province's reaching to Egypt. Thus the Euphrates was made by Pompey the eastern boundary of the Roman Empire.

60. As the cause of Hyrcanus had been represented throughout by Antipater the Idumaeen, he succeeded in so gaining the favor of Pompey and the Romans that he sustained confidential relations with them and with Pompey's successor in the East, Gabinius, who "settled the affairs which belonged to the city of Jerusalem, as was agreeable to Antipater's inclination." -- Josephus.²⁴

61. When Gabinius "came from Rome to Syria as commander of the Roman forces," there was in his army a young officer named Mark Antony. In Judea young Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, had "suddenly got together ten thousand armed footmen and fifteen hundred horsemen, and fortified Alexandrium, a fortress near Coreae, and Macherus, near the mountains of Arabia." In subduing the revolt of Alexander, Antony and Antipater were brought into such relationship that a firm friendship was established between them, and which in after years, out of a curious combination of events wholly undreamed of now by either of them, had a positive bearing upon one of the most significant occurrences in the world's history.

62. In Rome, Caesar was now fast becoming popular. He and Bibulus had been elected aediles for the year 65. The office of the aediles was to take charge of the public buildings, the games, and the theaters. "They were expected to decorate the city with new ornaments, and to entertain the people with magnificent spectacles." Caesar acquitted himself so well in this as to make himself the favorite of the whole multitude of the people. Then, as he felt his influence becoming more firmly established, he set on foot an inquiry into the proscription that had been carried on by Sulla. A committee of investigation was appointed, of which Caesar himself was made chairman.

63. The people decided next to make Caesar the head of religion by electing him to the office of pontifex maximus, which became

vacant just at this time. This was the greatest honor that could come to a Roman citizen. The office was for life, and until now had always been held by members of the aristocracy. Sulla had sought to confine it exclusively to these by giving to the sacred college the privilege of electing its own chief. Labienus being tribune, had succeeded in carrying a vote in the assembly, by which this privilege was restored to the people.

64. To fill the vacant office of pontifex maximus, two of the aristocracy were presented by the senatorial party, and Caesar was nominated by the people. Immense sums of money were spent by the senatorial party to buy sufficient votes to elect one or the other of their two candidates. Caesar likewise spent money freely, although deep in debt already. When he left home for the Forum on the morning of the election day, and his mother kissed him good-by, he told her he would either come home pontifex maximus or would not come home at all. Such an extreme alternative, however, was not necessary; because he was elected by a vote larger than that of both the other candidates put together. This was in the year 63, and soon afterward Caesar was elected praetor for the next year.

65. The land monopoly had again become as notorious as at any time before. The small proprietors had sold out, and large holdings had increased, until the land had fallen into a few hands, and Rome was crowded with a rabble of poor citizens largely fed at public expense. Pompey's conquests in the East had brought to the State large quantities of land, and his honest conduct of affairs there had filled the treasury with money. Here was a grand opportunity for reform. Rullus, a tribune, brought forward a proposition that part of the territory acquired by Pompey should be sold, and the money used to buy land in Italy upon which to settle poor citizens from Rome. Cicero, as consul, opposed it strenuously. He railed on Rullus with all the bitterness his abusive tongue could utter.

66. Rullus had stated that the populace of Rome was become so powerful as to be dangerous; and that for the good of the State it would be proper that some should be removed from the city, and placed upon lands where they could support themselves. This was all true,

as Cicero well knew; yet he hesitated not a moment to curry favor with these, by setting it before them in as objectionable a light as possible, in order to defeat the aim of Rullus.

67. Cicero hated the influence of the people as much as anybody else in Rome; but he hated Rullus's proposition more, because it would lessen the power of the aristocracy, whose favor he just now longed for more than for anything else. He therefore pretended to be the friend of the people, and to be defending them against the ulterior scheme of Rullus. He succeeded. Rullus's bill was defeated, and his plan came to nothing. And had his plan even succeeded, it would likewise have come to nothing; because now the cry

had become popular, and was becoming more and more imperative: "Bread for nothing, and games forever!"

1 [Page 251] "History of Rome," chap. xxxv, sec. ii, par. 5.

2 [Page 251] Id., pars. 6, 7.

3 [Page 252] Id., par. 4.

4 [Page 252] Id., pars. 1, 2.

5 [Page 252] "Ancient History," book xix, chap. 1, sec. vii, par. 59.

6 [Page 253] "Caesar," chap. ii, par. 6.

7 [Page 255] Id., par. 8.

8 [Page 255] Id., par. 7.

9 [Page 256] Id., pars. 8, 9.

10 [Page 256] Id., chap. i, par. 5.

11 [Page 256] Id., chap. ii, par. 9.

12 [Page 258] Reference to the Roman Constitution must not be understood in the American sense as being a written constitution. The Roman Constitution was, as is the British, merely a system of precedents and unwritten rules of long-established usage.

13 [Page 261] "Caesar," chap. iii, par. 5.

14 [Page 265] Froude and Duruy use the spelling "Sylla" instead of "Sulla." The latter form is preferred here. It is that used by Merivale, Mommsen, and the Encyclopedia Britannica.

15 [Page 265] "Caesar," chap. viii, pars. 10, 13.

16 [Page 267] "History of Rome," chap. xlviii, sec. ii, par. 5

17 [Page 269] Rollin's "Ancient History," book xxiii, sec. iii, par. 30.

18 [Page 270] "History of Rome," chap. i, sec. ii, pars. 10, 11.

19 [Page 270] "Connexion," under 130 B. C.

20 [Page 271] "Antiquities of the Jews," book xiii, chap. x, par. 2.

21 [Page 271] Id., chap. xi, par. 1.

22 [Page 272] "Antiquities of the Jews," book xiv, chap. iv, par. 5.

23 [Page 273] Id.

24 [Page 273] "Antiquities of the Jews," book xiv, chap. vi, par. 4.

21. ROME -- THE FIRST TRIUMVIRATE.

THE senators held office for life, and therefore the Senate was always in possession of power; while owing to the fact that the elections were annual, the power of the people was but spasmodic at the best. Whenever some extraordinary occasion, or some leader who could carry the multitude with him, arose, the people would awake and carry everything before them. But when the particular occasion was past, or the leader fallen, the people would drop back into the old easy way, though there was scarcely ever an election without a riot, and the Senate would gradually regain all its former power, each time using it only the more despotically, in revenge for the checks which had been put upon it, and the insults which it had received. With politics, as it had universally become, it was inevitable, and in fact essential, that there should arise a power constantly active, which should balance that of the Senate, and hold in check its despotic tendencies. This power, as had already appeared, lay in the army. But the army must be led. Consequently the logic of the situation was that a coalition should be formed representing the different classes of the people, but depending upon the army for support. Such a coalition was demanded by the times and events, and was actually created in 60 B. C.

2. Pompey's work was done in the East, and in December, 62 B. C., he returned to Rome to display and enjoy such a triumph as had never before been seen on earth. A long train of captive princes of the conquered countries as trophies of his victories, and wagons laden with all manner of treasure as an offering to the State, followed the triumphant general as he returned to the capital. A triumphal column was erected in his honor, with an inscription which declared "that Pompey, 'the people's general,' had in three years

277

captured fifteen hundred cities, and had slain, taken, or reduced to submission, twelve million human beings." The offerings which he brought filled the treasury to overflowing, and the income from the countries subdued made the annual revenue of the republic double what it had been before. All this was lost upon the Senate, however, except to deepen its jealousy of Pompey. By a special vote, indeed, he "was permitted to wear his triumphal robe in the Senate as often and as long as it might please him;" but with this the Senate intended that favors to Pompey should cease.

3. At the border of Italy, Pompey had disbanded his troops; and he entered Rome as a private citizen, with only his political influence to sustain him. And just here Pompey failed. Although he was every inch a general, he was no politician. He could victoriously wield an army, but he could do nothing with a crowd. He could command legions, but could not command votes. More than this, during his absence, the senatorial party had employed the time in strenuous efforts and by all means in their power, to destroy his influence in the city, and to create jealousy and distrust between Caesar and Pompey.

4. When Pompey had departed for Asia, it was with the friendship of Caesar, whose influence had helped to secure his appointment. During Pompey's absence, Caesar's

influence and popularity had constantly increased in Rome. He held the people's favor, and Pompey held the military power. The senatorial party decided, if possible, to divide this power by estranging Pompey and Caesar from one another. The tale was carried to Pompey that his wife, Mucia, had been seduced by Caesar. This accomplished its intended purpose, and Pompey divorced her. Pompey's prompt action in disbanding his troops at the border of Italy had relieved the Senate from dread of his military power; yet Pompey's troops, although disbanded, and of no force as a military power, were an important element in the elections, so long as Pompey could retain their sympathies.

5. Pompey asked that his acts in Asia might be ratified; but the Senate and its partizans, though not openly refusing to do so, raised so many questions and created so many delays as to amount in effect

278

to a refusal. He also asked that public lands might be distributed to his soldiers, and this also was so successfully opposed as to defeat him. He then attempted to gain his wishes by political influence and action. By the free use of money he secured the election of both the consuls for the year 60 B. C.; but he was disappointed in both. One had not sense enough to be a consul; and the other, Metellus Celer, was the brother of Mucia, whom Pompey had divorced, and under pretense had only lent himself to Pompey in order to take revenge for the reproach thus cast upon his sister. Celer immediately went over to the senatorial party, and engaged in the most violent opposition to Pompey. The tribune Flavius, who had proposed Pompey's measures, went so far as to seize Celer, and put him in prison. Celer called the senators to his cell to deliberate there. The tribune set up his tribunal at the prison door, so that the senators might not enter; but the senators had the prison walls torn down, and went in spite of the tribune.

6. The Senate, not content with estranging Pompey and Caesar from one another, and openly insulting Pompey besides, proceeded to offend Caesar. At the close of Caesar's praetorship, at the end of 62 B. C., the province of Further Spain had been assigned to him. But he was in debt two hundred and fifty millions of sesterces -- about twelve millions of dollars. To pay his debts and make the necessary preparations for his journey to Spain, he borrowed from Crassus eight hundred and thirty talents -- nearly thirteen millions of dollars. The senatorial party, however, endeavored to prevent his departure from Rome, and a decree was passed to the effect that the praetors should not go to their provinces until certain important questions of State and religion had been finally settled. Caesar knew that this was aimed at him, and therefore in defiance of the decree he went at once to his province, and put himself at the head of the legions there. This was the first real opportunity that Caesar had ever had to prove his ability as a military leader, and he acquitted himself well. He "effected the complete subjugation of the districts of Lusitania north of the Tagus, including the wild fastnesses of the Herminian Mountains and the rapid waters of the Durius. Brigantium in Galicia, protected on the land side by the difficult character

279

of the surrounding country, he attacked with a naval armament, and erected his victorious standard at the farthest extremity of his province." -- Merivale.¹

7. The complete conquest of his province, and the settlement of its civil administration upon a permanent basis, were all accomplished in a little more than a year. His great success entitled him to a triumph, and he desired also to stand for the consulship during the ensuing year. He addressed the Senate soliciting the award of the triumph which he said justly earned. The Senate knew that he wanted also to be a candidate for the consulship. The law was that no general to whom was granted a triumph should come into Rome until the time of triumphal entry, which time was to be fixed by the Senate; and the custom, which had the force of law, was that every candidate for the consulship must appear publicly in the Forum on three distinct occasions, and must be present personally in the Forum on the day of the election.

8. The Senate designed to prevent Caesar's candidacy for the consulship by granting the triumph and setting the time on a day beyond the day of the election, thus keeping him out of the city, so that it would be impossible for him to be present in the Forum as a candidate. This custom could be, and in fact had been, dispensed with on important occasions; but the Senate was very tenacious of both law and custom when they could be turned to its own advantage. Caesar applied to the Senate for a dispensation allowing him to be a candidate in his absence. The Senate would not grant it, and when Caesar's friends began to urge the matter, Cato defeated them by obtaining the floor and talking all the rest of the day. When Caesar learned of the determination of the Senate to shut him out of the consulship by granting a triumph on a day after the election, he checkmated their nicely planned move. He renounced the triumph, went at once to Rome, went through the necessary forms, and appeared as a candidate for the consulship.

9. The Senate had now offended Pompey and embittered his soldiers, and committed itself to open and determined hostility to Caesar. Pompey took in the situation, saw his opportunity, and

280

acted upon it at once. He made overtures to Caesar, who received him willingly, and an alliance was formed. Caesar and Crassus were already firm friends, and had been working together for some time. But Crassus and Pompey were bitter enemies. Caesar's tact, however, soon tempered the feud, and reconciled the enmity.

10. Caesar was the idol of the people; Pompey was the idol of the soldiers; and Crassus, the richest individual in the Roman world, represented the moneyed class, the farmers of the taxes, etc., who were not of the nobility. These three men covenanted together "that no proceedings should be allowed to take place in the commonwealth without the consent of each of the three contracting parties. United they constituted a power beyond all the resources of the commonwealth to cope with." -- Merivale.² Thus the first triumvirate

became an accomplished fact, and though there were a few expiring struggles, the power of the Roman Senate was virtually gone forever.

11. Caesar was elected consul by acclamation; and only by the very desperation of bribery and corruption did the senatorial party succeed in electing Bibulus as his colleague. It was the custom, immediately upon the election of the consuls, to name the province which should be theirs at the expiration of the year of their office. The Senate sought to cast a slur upon Caesar by assigning to him the department of roads and forests. But he cared not for that, as he held the power of the State, and had a full year in which to use it before anything in that line was to be performed.

12. Caesar's consulship was for the year 59 B. C. The first act of his administration was to secure the publication of the proceedings of the Senate, that the people might know what was done therein. He next brought forward the land law for the reward of Pompey's veterans, which the Senate had already refused to allow. This measure, however, like that of Tiberius Gracchus, included thousands of the free citizens who had sold their lands and crowded into Rome.

13. In the long interval since the repeal of the land law of Sulla, things had fallen back into the same old way. The public lands

281

had fallen from those to whom the State had distributed them, to the great landed proprietors. Caesar's land law, like all those before it, proposed to buy the rights of these proprietors, as represented in their improvements, and distribute the lands among Pompey's veterans and several thousands of the unemployed population of the city. He showed to the Senate that there was plenty of money in the treasury, which Pompey's soldiers themselves had brought to the State, to supply all the land required under the act. The Senate would not listen.

14. Cato took the lead in the opposition, and talked again for a whole day; he grew so violent at last that Caesar ordered the lictors to take him off to prison. Many of the senators followed Cato. As nothing could be done, however, Caesar ordered Cato to be set free, at the same time telling the senators that as they had refused to take part in legislation, henceforth he would present his propositions at once to the people. Bibulus, however, was owned by the Senate, and he as consul might obstruct and delay the proceeding in the assembly. Besides this, the Senate had bribed three tribunes to assist Bibulus.

15. Caesar did not hesitate. A day was appointed, and he presented his bill in the Forum, which before daylight the populace had filled to overflowing, to prevent the senatorial party from getting in. As Bibulus was consul, a passage was made for him through the crowd, and he took his place with Caesar on the porch of the temple of Castor and Pollux. Caesar stepped forward, and read from a tablet the proposed law, and turning to Bibulus

asked if he had any fault to find with it. Bibulus answered that there should be no revolutions while he was consul, at which the assembly hissed. This made Bibulus yet more angry, and he burst out to the whole assembly, "During my year you shall not obtain your desire, not though you cried for it with one voice."

16. Pompey and Crassus, though not officials, were both present. Caesar now signaled to them; they stepped forward, and he asked whether they would support the law. Pompey made a speech in which he declared that he spoke for his veterans and for the poor citizens, and that he approved the law in every letter of it. Caesar

282

then asked, "Will you then support the law if it be illegally opposed?" Pompey replied: "Since you, consul, and you, my fellow citizens, ask aid of me, a poor individual without office and without authority, who nevertheless have done some service to the State, I say that I will bear the shield if others draw the sword."

17. At this, a mighty shout arose from the assembly. Crassus followed with a speech to the same purpose. He likewise was cheered to the echo. Bibulus rushed forward to forbid the vote to be taken. The bribed tribunes interposed their veto. Bibulus declared that he had consulted the auspices, -- had read the sky, -- and that they were unfavorable to any further proceeding that day, and declared the assembly dissolved. But the assembly had not come together to be dissolved by him, nor in any such way as that. They paid no attention. He then declared all the rest of the year to be holy time. This was met by a yell that completely drowned his voice. The assembly rushed upon the platform, pushed Bibulus off, broke his insignia of office, bandied him about with the bribed tribunes, and trampled upon them; but they were able to escape without serious injury. Then Cato took up the strain, pushed his way to the rostra, and began to rail at Caesar. He was met with a roar from the assembly that completely drowned his voice, and in a moment he was arrested and dragged away, raving and gesticulating. The law was then passed without a dissenting voice.

18. The next day Bibulus asked the Senate to pass a decree annulling the act of the assembly; but this failed. Cato, Celer, and Favonius openly refused to obey the law, upon which a second law was passed, making it a capital offense to refuse to swear obedience to the law. Bibulus then shut himself up in his own house, and refused to act as consul any more. This left the triumvirate absolute, with the actual power in Caesar's hands for the rest of the year. Pompey's soldiers had been provided for by the land law which had just been passed, and his acts in Asia were confirmed. In addition to this an act was passed in behalf of Crassus. The farmers of the taxes throughout the provinces had taken the contract at too high a price, and now they were not making as much money as they expected. Crassus was the chief of all these, and an act

283

was passed granting new terms. By these acts Caesar had more firmly bound to himself both Pompey and Crassus. He then proceeded more fully to gratify the people by a magnificent display of plays and games.

19. In legislation, the Senate was totally ignored; Caesar acted directly with the assembly of the people, and passed such laws as he pleased. Yet it must be said that he passed none that were not good enough in themselves; but they were laws which in fact meant nothing. There was no public character to sustain them, and consequently they were made only to be broken. There was a law for the punishment of adultery, when not only Caesar, but nine tenths of the people, were unblushing adulterers. There were laws for the protection of citizens against violence, when every citizen was ready to commit violence at a moment's notice. There were laws to punish judges who allowed themselves to be bribed, when almost every man in Rome was ready both to offer and to receive bribes. There were laws against defrauding the revenue, when almost every person only desired an opportunity to do that very thing. There were laws against bribery at elections, when every soul in Rome, from Caesar to the lowest one of the rabble that shouted in the Forum, was ready to bribe or to be bribed. "Morality and family life were treated as antiquated things among all ranks of society. To be poor was not merely the sorest disgrace and the worst crime, but the only disgrace and the only crime; for money the statesman sold the State, and the burgess sold his freedom; the post of the officer and the vote of the juryman were to be had for money; for money the lady of quality surrendered her person, as well as the common courtesan; falsifying of documents, and perjuries, had become so common that in a popular poet of this age an oath is called 'the plaster for debts.' Men had forgotten what honesty was; a person who refused a bribe was regarded not as an upright man, but as a personal foe. The criminal statistics of all times and countries will hardly furnish a parallel to the dreadful picture of crimes -- so varied, so horrible, and so unnatural." -- Mommsen.³ In this condition of affairs such laws were simply a legal farce.

284

20. Caesar's consulship was about to expire, and as above stated, when he was elected the Senate had named as his "province" the department of roads and forests instead of a province. As this was intended at the first to be only a slur upon Caesar, and as both he and the people fully understood it, the people set aside this appointment, and voted to Caesar for five years the command of Illyria and Gaul within the Alps; but as there were some fears from the barbarians of Gaul beyond the Alps, a proposition was introduced to extend his province to include that. Pompey and Crassus heartily assented, and the Senate, seeing that it would be voted to him anyway by the assembly, made a virtue of necessity, and bestowed this itself. Pompey now married Caesar's daughter Julia, which more firmly cemented the alliance while Caesar should be absent.

21. The triumvirate had been formed to continue for five years. As the term drew to a close, the triumvirate was renewed for five years more. Pompey and Crassus were made consuls for the year 55 B. C., with the understanding that while in office they should extend Caesar's command in Gaul for five years longer after the expiration of the first

five; and that at the expiration of their consulate, Pompey should have Spain as his province, and Crassus should have Syria.

22. The first thing to be done by the new consuls was to secure the assembly's endorsement of the triumvirs' arrangement of the provinces. This also the senators opposed by every means to the very last. Cato raved as usual; and when at the expiration of his allotted time he refused to sit down, he was dragged away by an officer, and the meeting adjourned. The next day the assembly came together again. When the senatorial party saw that the action of the triumvirs was to be ratified in spite of them, Atticus, a tribune, and Cato were lifted to men's shoulders, and the tribune cried out, as Bibulus on the like occasion formerly, that the skies were unfavorable, and the proceedings illegal. Other tribunes ordered the proceedings to go on, at which a riot began. Clubs and stones and swords and knives were freely used. The senatorial party was driven out; the arrangement of the provinces was fully ratified, and the assembly dismissed. The people had no sooner

285

gone out than the senatorial party came back, presented a motion for Caesar's recall, and proceeded to vote upon it. The assembly returned, and drove them out with more bloodshed; and certainly to prevent all question as to what had been done, passed a second time the motion upon Caesar's appointment.

23. Pompey, yet more to please the populace, dedicated a new theater, which would seat forty thousand people. It was decorated with marble and adorned with precious stones in such abundance as had never before been seen in Rome. The dedication with music, games, chariot races, and contests between men and beasts, continued five days, during which five hundred lions -- one hundred each day -- were turned loose in the arena only to be killed. Besides this, eighteen elephants were compelled to fight with bands of gladiators, the piteous cries of the poor creatures finding a response even in the savage sympathies of Romans.

24. By the strifes of parties, the election of consuls for the year 54 was prevented until the expiration of 55, and the consulates of Pompey and Crassus had expired. Crassus departed for the East, robbing the temple at Jerusalem as he passed. Pompey assumed command of the province of Spain, but instead of going to Spain, remained in Rome.

25. In 54, Pompey's wife, Caesar's daughter, died; in June, 53, Crassus was killed in that memorable defeat by the Parthians; and the triumvirate was dissolved. Pompey had now been so long separated from the army that his influence with the soldiery was almost gone, while Caesar's uninterrupted course of victory in Gaul had made him the idol of the army, as well as the pride of the people. The triumvirate was no sooner broken by the death of Crassus, than the Senate began earnestly to try to win Pompey, and compass Caesar's destruction. "No aristocracy was ever more short-sighted at the crisis of its fate than the once glorious patriciate of Rome. It clung desperately to its privileges, not from a fond regard to their antiquity, or their connection with any social or religious

prejudices; disdained to invoke the watchwords of patriotism or utility; it took up its ground upon the enactments which Sulla had made to enhance its own wealth and power and depress

286

those of its rivals, and contended with its assailants upon purely selfish considerations. Without a policy and without a leader, the nobles went staggering onward in their blind conflict with the forces arrayed against them." -- Merivale.⁴

26. Pompey took his stand with the Senate. Although he was in Rome, he was really commander of the province of Spain, and was thus in possession of an army, though that army was at a distance. Under pretense of a need of troops in Syria against the Parthians who had defeated and slain Crassus, the Senate drew from Caesar two legions, and stationed them at Capua. A motion was then made in the Senate for Caesar's recall, and the appointment of his successor.

27. But just then an obstacle presented itself which disconcerted all their plans. Scribonius Curio had been one of the most violent partizans of the senatorial party, and largely on account of this he had been elected tribune by the favor of the Senate. But Curio went over to the interests of Caesar. When the motion was made to appoint a successor to Caesar, Curio moved an amendment to the effect that Pompey be included, and that when Caesar was relieved of his command, Pompey should be relieved of his command also. This amendment met with such approval that it was accepted by an overwhelming majority; and the people were so jubilant that they strewed flowers in Curio's way as he returned from the assembly. The adoption of this amendment completely blocked the effort of the Senate to depose Caesar.

28. Curio so persistently interposed his veto to all proceedings against Caesar, that at last an attempt was made to get rid of him. One of the censors pronounced him unworthy of a place in the Senate; the consul Marcellus put the question to vote, and it was defeated. Then the consul and his partizans dressed themselves in mourning, and went straight to Pompey, declared the city in danger, placed its safety in his hands, and gave him the two legions that were at Capua. Pompey refused to accept the charge unless it was sanctioned by the consuls who had been elected for the next year. These both confirmed the appointment, and promised their support

287

when they should come into office. Caesar's enemies had now both an army and a commander. This, being by the official act of the consular authority, WAS A CONFESSION THAT LEGAL GOVERNMENT WAS AT AN END; AND WAS VIRTUALLY THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNMENT ONLY BY MILITARY FORCE.

29. Curio's tribunate ended with the year 50, and he closed his term of office with an appeal to the people, in which he declared that justice was violated, that the reign of law was past, and that a military domination reigned in the city. He then left the city, and went to Caesar, who was encamped at Ravenna with a legion.

30. The consuls for the year 49 were both avowed enemies to Caesar. Two of the tribunes for the year were Mark Antony and Cassius Longinus, -- friendly to Caesar and ready to veto every proposition that appeared to be to his disadvantage. Caesar sent Curio back to Rome early in January with a letter in which he offered any one of three things: (1) That the agreement long before made should stand, and he be elected consul in his absence; or (2) that he would leave his army if Pompey would disband his troops; or (3) that he would surrender to a successor all Gaul beyond the Alps, with eight of his ten legions, if he were allowed to retain his original province of Illyria and Northern Italy with two legions.

31. The consuls objected to the reading of the letter; but the demands of the tribunes prevailed. When it had been read through, the consuls prohibited any debate upon it, and made a motion to consider the state of the republic. None of Caesar's propositions would they consider for a moment. Lentulus, one of the consuls, took the lead in urging prompt and determined action, and others followed to the same purpose. Some advised delay till they were better prepared, others advised that a deputation be sent to treat further with Caesar.

32. The majority supported Lentulus. It was moved that Caesar should dismiss his troops by a certain day which the Senate should name, and return to Rome as a private citizen, or be declared a public enemy. The two tribunes interposed their vetoes on the ground that it had been decreed by the people that Caesar should be allowed to stand for the consulship in his absence; but their plea was totally

288

disregarded, and the motion was passed almost unanimously. The tribunes then protested against the illegality of the proceedings, and cried aloud that they were refused the free exercise of their official prerogatives. The assembly in reply voted the State in danger, suspended the laws, ordered an immediate levy of troops, and gave the consuls sole power to provide for the public safety. The Senate next proposed to punish the two tribunes. They were given to understand that if they entered the Senate house, they would be expelled by force. They, with Curio, fled to Caesar. The consuls made Pompey commander-in-chief of the forces, and gave him the freedom of the public treasury. Pompey went to Capua to take charge of the two legions there, and organize the new levies.

33. When the news of these proceedings reached Caesar at Ravenna, he assembled his legions and laid the whole matter before them. The Senate had satisfied itself with the pleasing illusion that Caesar's legions were so dissatisfied with him and discouraged by the long, tedious campaigns in barbarous Gaul, that they only waited for a good

opportunity to desert him in a body. But never had they been more mistaken than they were in this. The soldiers were ready to support him to the utmost. They not only offered to serve without pay, but actually offered him money for the expenses of the war. Only one officer out of the whole army failed him. This one slipped away secretly, and fled to Pompey, and Caesar sent all his baggage after him.

34. Caesar sent orders to Gaul beyond the Alps for two legions to follow him, and he set out toward Rome with the one legion (5,000 men) that was with him. About twenty miles from Ravenna, a little stream called the Rubicon formed part of the boundary between the territory of Rome proper and the provinces which had been assigned to Caesar. To cross this boundary with an armed force was to declare war; but as the Senate had already by its actions more than once openly declared war, Caesar had no hesitation in crossing the boundary. He passed it, and marched ten miles onward to Rimini. There he halted and waited for the two legions ordered from Gaul, one of which reached him about the end of January, and the other about the middle of February.

289

35. By the time that Caesar had arrived at Rimini, the rumor had reached Rome that he was coming, and a panic seized his enemies throughout the whole city. Their excited imaginations and guilty fears pictured him as coming with all his legions, accompanied by hosts of the terrible barbarians of Gaul, hurrying on by forced marches, nearer and yet nearer, and breathing forth fiery wrath. "Flight, instant flight, was the only safety. Up they rose, consuls, praetors, senators, leaving wives and children and property to their fate, not halting even to take the money out of the treasury, but contenting themselves with leaving it locked. On foot, on horseback, in litters, in carriages, they fled for their lives to find safety under Pompey's wing in Capua." -- Froude.⁵

36. Instead of Caesar's marching toward Rome, however, he was waiting quietly at Rimini for his legions to come from Gaul, and his waiting there was working doubly to his advantage, to say nothing of the results of the panic-stricken fears of his enemies in Rome. Not only did the two legions come promptly from Gaul, but troops flocked to him from all the country round. Cities on the way to Rome began to declare for him, and were ready to open their gates as soon as he should arrive. Ahenobarbus, with a few thousand men, occupied a strong place in the mountains directly in Caesar's way. Caesar surrounded the place, and captured the whole body of them. He then let them all go. Ahenobarbus and some of his officers went away, but his troops unanimously declared for Caesar.

37. As soon as Pompey and the nobles at Capua heard of the capture of Ahenobarbus and the desertion of these troops, they took up their flight again for Brundisium on the east coast of Italy, where they might take ships for Epirus. The greater part of them sailed away at once. Pompey remained with a portion of his army for the ships to return to take them away. Caesar hurried to Brundisium, where he arrived on the ninth of March. Pompey was there. Caesar asked for a meeting, but Pompey refused. Caesar began a

siege, but the ships soon came, and Pompey and his army sailed away for Durazzo on the coast of Epirus. Caesar had no ships, and

290

could follow the fugitives no farther. He therefore went directly to Rome. She threw wide her gates to receive him. He entered and took possession.

38. The remains of the Senate was convened by the tribunes who had fled to Caesar; but it would do nothing. The assembly of the people voted him the money in the treasury. He took what he needed; and as Spain and the Mediterranean coast of Gaul were yet subject to Pompey, he went in a few days to bring these into subjection. This was all accomplished before winter. He was made dictator in his absence. He returned to Rome in October. He appointed a day for the election of consuls for the year 48, and himself and Servilius Isauricus were chosen without opposition. Thus Caesar was elected consul for the very year that had been promised him long before by the Senate and assembly, although the Senate had declared that he never should have it at all.

39. The election of the other lawful magistrates soon followed, the form of legal government was restored, and he set out at once to find Pompey and the Senate. He marched to Brundisium, and sailed to Epirus. There he found that Pompey had gone to Macedonia. After much maneuvering, the armies met at Pharsalia, in Thessaly, and Pompey's army was completely routed. Pompey fled to Egypt. Caesar followed closely; but Pompey had been murdered and beheaded before he had fairly landed, and only his head was preserved and rendered, an unwelcome present, to Caesar.

40. While Caesar was in Egypt, Antipater the Idumaeen became of great service to him; for he and Mithradates, king of Pergamus, were chiefly instrumental in bringing Egypt into complete subjection to Caesar. And when they had taken Pelusium, and in a severe engagement had subdued "the whole Delta," "Mithradates sent an account of this battle to Caesar, and openly declared that Antipater was the author of this victory and of his own preservation, insomuch that Caesar commended Antipater then, and made use of him all the rest of that war in the most hazardous undertakings; he also happened to be wounded in one of these engagements. However, when Caesar, after some time, had finished that war and was sailed away from Syria, he honored Antipater greatly, and confirmed Hyrcanus

291

in the high-priesthood, and bestowed on Antipater the privilege of a citizen of Rome, and freedom from taxes everywhere." -- Josephus.⁶

41. And when one came to Caesar with accusations against Hyrcanus and Antipater, hoping to have himself put in their places, again "Caesar appointed Hyrcanus to be high priest, and gave Antipater what principality he himself should choose, leaving the determination to himself; so he made him procurator of Judea. He also gave Hyrcanus

leave to raise up the walls of his own city, upon his asking that favor of him; for they had been demolished by Pompey. And this grant he sent to the consuls of Rome, to be engraven in the capitol. The decree of the Senate was this that follows: --

"Caius Caesar, consul the fifth time, hath decreed: That the Jews shall possess Jerusalem, and may compass that city with walls; and that Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander, the high priest and ethnarch of the Jews, retain it, in the manner he himself pleases; and the Jews be allowed to deduct out of their tribute, every second year the land is let [in the sabbatic period], a corus of that tribute; and that the tribute they pay be not let to farm, nor that they pay always the same tribute."⁷

42. Antipater the Idumaeon "was in great repute with the Idumaeans also; out of which nation he married a wife, who was the daughter of one of their eminent men, and her name was Cypros, by whom he had four sons -- Phasael, and Herod, who was afterward made king, and Joseph, and Pheroras, and a daughter named Salome."

43. "Antipater made Phasaelus, his eldest son, governor of Jerusalem and the places that were about it, but committed Galilee to Herod, his next son, who was then a very young man; for he was but twenty-five years of age. But as he was a youth of great mind, he presently met with an opportunity of signalizing his courage. For, finding there was one Hezekiah, a captain of a band of robbers, who overran the neighboring parts of Syria with a great troop of them, he seized him and slew him, as well as a great number of the other robbers that were with him, for which action he was greatly beloved by the Syrians. For when they were very

292

desirous to have their country freed from this nest of robbers, he purged it of them; so they sung songs in his commendation in their villages and cities, as having procured them peace and the secure enjoyment of their possessions. And on this account it was that he became known to Sextus Caesar, who was a relative of the great Caesar, and was now president of Syria."⁸

44. Caesar spent the time till the autumn of 47 setting things in order in Egypt and the East, then he returned to Rome. Finding that Pompey was dead, and that all hope of support from him was gone, Caesar's enemies in Rome became his most servile flatterers. Those who had plunged the State into civil war rather than allow him while absent to be even a candidate for the consulship, now in his absence made him dictator for a whole year, and were ready to heap upon him other preferences without limit.

45. A part of the year 46 was spent in subduing the opposing forces in Africa. This was soon accomplished, and the servile flatterers went on with their fawning adulations. Even before his return, the Senate voted in his favor a national thanksgiving to continue forty days. When he returned, they voted him not one triumph, but four, with intervals of several days between, and that his triumphal car should be drawn by white horses. They made him inspector of public morals for three years. And as though they would be as

extravagant in their adulation as they had been in their condemnation, they voted that he should be dictator for ten years, with the right to nominate the consuls and praetors each year; that in the Senate his chair should always be between those of the two consuls; that he should preside in all the games of the circus; that his image carved in ivory should be borne in processions among the images of the gods, and be kept laid up in the Capitol over against the place of Jupiter; that his name should be engraved on a tablet as the restorer of the capital; and finally that a bronze statute of him standing on a globe should be set up with the inscription, "Caesar, the Demigod."

46. Caesar was not wanting in efforts to maintain the applause of the populace. He gave to each soldier about a thousand dollars,

293

and to each citizen about twenty dollars, with house rent free for a year; and provided a magnificent feast for the citizens, who were supported by the public grants of grain. Twenty-two thousand tables were spread with the richest viands, upon which the two hundred thousand State paupers feasted, while from hogsheads the finest wine flowed freely. Above all this, he furnished the finest display of games and bloody battles of gladiators that had ever been seen. So great was it, indeed, and so bloody, and so long continued, that it fairly surfeited the savage Roman appetite; and the people began to complain that the vast sums of money spent on the shows would have been better employed in donations direct to themselves. Time and space would fail to tell of the numbers, the magnitude, and the magnificence of the buildings with which he adorned the city.

47. In the winter of 46-45 Caesar was compelled to go to Spain to reduce the last remains of the senatorial forces. This was accomplished before the month of April was passed, yet he did not return to Rome until September. As soon as the news of his victory reached Rome, however, the Senate, which sincerely hoped he would be killed, began once more to pour forth its fulsome flattery. It voted a national thanksgiving to continue fifty days, decreed him another triumph, conferred upon him the power to extend the bounds of the city, and erected another statue of him with the inscription, "To the Invincible Deity."

48. When he returned and had enjoyed his triumph, he again celebrated the occasion with games, combats, and shows no less splendid than those which he had given before, only not so long continued. After this was all over, he took up the regulation of the affairs of society and State. He gave his soldiers lands; but instead of trying to provide lands in Italy for all of them, he distributed the most of them in colonies in the provinces. He cut down the quantity of public grants of grains, and sent thousands upon thousands of citizens away beyond the seas to establish Roman provinces. Eighty thousand were sent to rebuild Carthage. Another host was sent to rebuild Corinth, which had been destroyed by the Romans a hundred years before.

294

49. To lessen the evils that had rent the State so long in the annual elections, he enacted that the elections to the lesser offices of the State should be held only once in three years. He enacted that at least one third of the hired help of farmers, vineyardists, stock raisers, etc., should be Roman citizens. He enacted that all physicians, philosophers, and men of science should be Roman citizens. This privilege was likewise bestowed upon large numbers of people in Gaul, Spain, and other places.

50. In the early days of Rome, unions of the different trades and handicrafts had been formed for mutual benefit. In the times which we have sketched, they had become nothing but political clubs, and withal had become so dangerous that they had to be utterly abolished. In 58 B. C., Clodius, to strengthen his political influence, had restored them. Caesar now abolished them again, but allowed bona fide trade-unions to be organized upon the original plan of mutual benefit.⁹

51. As inspector of public morals he next attempted, as he had when he was consul in 59, to create reform by law. It was a time of unbounded luxury and of corresponding license and licentiousness. He forbade the rich young nobles to be carried in litters. Sea and land were being traversed for dainties for the tables of the rich; Caesar appointed inspectors of the tables and the provision stores to regulate the fare, and any prohibited dish found on any table was picked up and carried away, even though the guests were sitting at the table at the moment.

52. The marriage relation had fallen to very loose ways. He enacted that any Roman citizen who was the father of three legitimate children born in Rome, or four in Italy, or five anywhere else, should be exempted from certain public obligations, and that the mothers in such cases should be allowed the special dignity of riding in litters, dressing in purple, and wearing necklaces of pearls. Divorces were as frequent as anybody chose to make them, and Caesar, who had divorced his own wife merely upon suspicion, essayed to regulate divorces; and he who from his youth had

295

enjoyed the personal favors of the chief women of Rome, he who "had mistresses in every country which he visited, and liaisons with half the ladies in Rome," and who was at the time maintaining an adulterous connection with the queen of Egypt, -- he presumed to enact laws against adultery!

53. One thing, however, he did, which was more lasting than all his other acts put together, and, in fact, of more real benefit. This was the reform of the calendar; though it was done against the jests and mockings of Cicero and other would-be wits.

54. All this time the Senate was heaping upon him titles and honors in the same extravagant profusion as before. One decree made him the father of his country, another liberator, another made him imperator, and commander-in-chief of the army for life with the title to be hereditary in his family. They gave him full charge of the treasury; they

made him consul for ten years, and dictator for life. A triumphal robe and a crown of laurel were bestowed on him, with authority to wear them upon all occasions. A figure of his head was impressed upon the coin. His birthday was declared to be a holiday forever; and the name of the month, Quinctilius, was changed to Julius, and is still our July. Next his person was declared sacred, and any disrespect to him in word or action was made to be sacrilege. It was decreed that the oath of allegiance should be sworn by the Fortune of Caesar. The Senate itself took this oath, and by it swore sacredly to maintain his acts, and watch over the safety of his person. To complete the scale, they declared that he was no more Caius Julius, a man, but Divus Julius, a god; and that a temple should be built for the worship of him, and Antony should be the first priest.

55. Then, having exhausted the extremest measure of the most contemptible sycophancy, March 15, B. C. 44, THEY MURDERED HIM.

1[Page 279] "History of the Romans under the Empire," chap. iv. par. 22.

2[Page 280] Id., par. 33.

3[Page 283] "History of Rome," book v, chap. xi, par. 72.

4[Page 286] "Romans under the Empire," chap. xi, par. 4 from end.

5[Page 289] "Caesar," chap. xxi, par. 3.

6[Page 291] "Antiquities," book xiv, chap. viii, pars. 2. 3.

7[Page 291] Josephus's "Antiquities, book xiv, chap. ix, par. 4.

8[Page 292] Id., chap. vii, par. 3. and chap. ix, par. 2.

9[Page 294] Plutarch's "Lives," Numa, chap. xxxi: Merivale's "Romans under the Empire."chap. iv, par. 42; and chap. xx, par. 11.

22. ROME -- THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE.

CAESAR was dead; but all that had made him what he had been, still lived. Pretended patriots assassinated Caesar to save the republic from what they supposed was threatened in him; but in that act of base ingratitude and cruel "patriotism," there was accomplished that which they professed to fear from him, and which in fact they realized from those who were worse than he. It was with the Romans at this time, as it was with the Athenians when Demosthenes told them that if there were no Philip they themselves would create a Philip.

2. Affairs had reached that point in the Roman State where a Caesar was inevitable, and though to avoid it they had killed the greatest Roman that ever lived, the reality was only the more hastened by the very means which they had employed to prevent it. This they themselves realized as soon as they had awakened from the dream in which they had done the desperate deed. Cicero exactly defined the situation, and gave a perfect outline of the whole history of the times, when, shortly after the murder of Caesar, he bitterly exclaimed, "We have killed the king; but the kingdom is with us still. We have taken away the tyrant; the tyranny survives." That tyranny survived in the breast of every man in Rome.

3. At the death of Caesar, the reins of government fell to Mark Antony, the sole surviving consul. Lepidus, Caesar's general of cavalry, was outside the walls with a legion of troops about to depart for Spain. He took possession of the Camp of Mars, and sent to Antony assurances of support. As night came on, with a body of troops he entered the city and camped in the Forum. He and Antony at once came to a mutual understanding. Antony as consul

297

agreed to secure for Lepidus the office of pontifex maximus made vacant by the murder of Caesar; and the alliance was completed by Antony's daughter being given in marriage to the son of Lepidus. Antony secured Caesar's will and all his private papers, besides a great sum of money.

4. As the will showed that Caesar had bequeathed his private gardens to the people of Rome forever as a pleasure ground; and to each citizen a sum of money amounting to nearly fourteen dollars; this bound the populace more firmly than ever to the memory of Caesar. And as Antony stood forth as the one to avenge Caesar's death, this brought the populace unanimously to his support. By the help of all this power and influence, Antony determined to put himself in the place which Caesar had occupied. Among Caesar's papers he found recorded many of Caesar's plans and intentions in matters of the government. These he made to serve his purpose as occasion demanded; for the Senate dared not dissent from any of Caesar's recorded wishes and designs. When the legitimate papers were exhausted, he bribed one of Caesar's clerks to forge and declare to be

Caesar's purpose, such State documents as Antony chose to have made laws, all of which by the power of Caesar's name were carried against all opposition.

5. Soon, however, there came a serious check upon the success of Antony's soaring ambition. Octavius appeared upon the scene. Caius Octavius was the grandson of one of Caesar's sisters, and by Caesar's will was left his heir and adopted son. He was then in the nineteenth year of his age. He was in Apollonia when Caesar was killed; and upon learning of the murder he immediately set out for Rome, not knowing the particulars, nor yet that Caesar had left a will in his favor. These he learned when he reached the coast of Italy.

6. Without delay, he incorporated Caesar's name with his own, -- Caius Julius Caesar Octavius, -- and presented himself to the nearest body of troops as the heir of the great general. When he reached Rome, Antony received him coldly, refused to give him any of the money that had been left by Caesar, and caused him all the trouble he possibly could in securing possession of the inheritance.

298

Notwithstanding all this, the young Octavius succeeded at every step, and checked Antony at every move. Antony had lost much of his own influence with the populace by failing to fulfil, or even to promise to fulfil, to them the provisions of Caesar's will. And by refusing to Octavius any of Caesar's money, he hoped so to cripple him that he could not do it.

7. Octavius promptly assumed all the obligations of the will. He raised money on that portion of the estate which fell to him; he persuaded the other heirs to surrender to his use their shares in the inheritance; he borrowed from Caesar's friends; and altogether succeeded in raising sufficient funds to discharge every obligation. By paying to the people the money that Caesar had left them, he bound the populace to himself.

8. At the time of Caesar's funeral, one of the tribunes, a fast friend to Caesar, but who unfortunately bore the same name as one of Caesar's enemies, was mistaken by the populace for the other man, and in spite of his cries and protestations, was literally torn to pieces. The time came for the vacant tribunate to be filled. Octavius strongly favored a certain candidate. The people proposed to elect Octavius himself, though he was not yet of legal age to hold office. Antony, as consul, interfered to stop the proceedings. This roused the spirit of the people, and as they could not elect Octavius, they stubbornly refused to elect anybody.

9. Antony, seeing his power with the people was gone, next tried to secure the support of the army. The six best legions of the republic were stationed in Macedonia, destined for service in Parthia. Five of these legions Antony wheedled the Senate into transferring to him. Next he intrigued to have the province of Gaul within the Alps bestowed on him instead of the province of Macedonia, which had already been given him. This the Senate hesitated to do, and interposed so many objections that Antony found his purpose about

to be frustrated; and he made overtures to Octavius. Octavius received him favorably; a pretended reconciliation was accomplished between them; and by the support of Octavius, Antony secured the change of provinces which he desired. Antony called four of his legions from Macedonia to Brundisium, and went to that place

299

to assume command. As soon as Antony went to Brundisium, Octavius went to Campania, to the colonies of veterans who had been settled there upon the public lands; and by the offer of about a hundred dollars to each one who would join him, he soon secured a force of ten thousand men. These he took to the north of Italy, to the border of Antony's province, and put them in camp there.

10. When Antony met his legions at Brundisium, he found them sullen; and instead of their greeting him with acclamations, they demanded explanations. They declared that they wanted vengeance for Caesar's death; and that instead of punishing the assassins, Antony had dallied with them. They called upon him to mount the tribunal, and explain his conduct. He replied that it was not the place of a Roman commander to explain his conduct, but to enforce obedience. Yet he betrayed his fear of them by mingling promises with his threats and pledges with his commands. He offered them about twenty dollars apiece, and drew a contrast between the hard service in Parthia, and the easy time that was before them in the province to which he was to take them. This did not satisfy them. He put some to death, yet the others would not be quiet. The agents of Octavius were among them contrasting the hundred dollars to each man, that he was paying, with the paltry twenty dollars that Antony was offering. Antony was obliged to increase his bid, but it was not yet near the price Octavius was offering.

11. Antony broke up his command into small bodies, and ordered them to march separately thus along the coast of the Adriatic, and unite again at Rimini; and he himself returned to Rome. He had barely time to reach his home, when a messenger arrived with the word that one of his legions had gone over bodily to Octavius. This message had scarcely been delivered when another came saying that another legion had done likewise. He went with all haste to where they were, hoping to win them back; but they shut against him the gates of the city where they were, and shot at him from the walls. By raising his bid to the same amount that Octavius was paying, he succeeded in holding the other two legions in allegiance to himself.

300

12. War could be the only result of such counterplotting as this, and other circumstances hastened it. Antony now had four legions; Lepidus had six; three were in Gaul under the command of Plancus; and Octavius had five. When Antony had obtained the exchange of provinces, the one which he secured -- Gaul within the Alps -- was already under the command of a proconsul, Decimus Brutus. But with the command of the province, Antony had received authority to drive out of it any pretender to the government. He commanded Decimus to leave the province. Decimus refused, and Antony declared war.

Decimus shut himself up in a stronghold, and Antony laid siege to him there. Octavius saw now an opportunity to humble Antony and strengthen himself; he offered his service to the Senate.

13. The two consuls whose term of office had expired came up, January, 43 B. C., and Octavius joined his forces to theirs. Two battles were fought in April, in both of which Antony was worsted, though both the proconsuls were slain. Antony left the field of battle, and marched across the Alps and joined Lepidus. Decimus desired to follow with all the forces present; but as he was one of the murderers of Caesar, Octavius would not obey him. Also the troops of Octavius declared that Caesar's heir was their leader, and Decimus their enemy. Decimus then marched also across the Alps, and joined his forces to those of Plancus. This left Italy wholly to Octavius, and he made the most of the opportunity. He demanded that the Senate grant him a triumph. His demand was treated only with contempt. The Senate in turn sent to him a peremptory command to lead his army against "parricides and brigands" that had joined their forces in Gaul. He replied by sending to Rome four hundred of his soldiers to demand for him the consulship for the year 42.

14. The soldiers presented their demand in the Senate house. It was refused. One of them then laid his hand upon his sword and declared with an oath, "If you do not grant it, this shall obtain it for him." Cicero replied, "If this is the way that you sue for the consulship, doubtless your chief will acquire it." The soldiers returned to Octavius, and reported upon their embassy. Octavius

301

with his legions immediately crossed the Rubicon and started for Rome, giving up to the license of his soldiers all the country as he passed.

15. As soon as the Senate learned that Octavius was coming with his army, they sent an embassy to meet him, and to tell him that if only he would turn back, they would grant everything he asked, and add yet above all about five hundred dollars for each of his soldiers. But he, knowing that he had the Senate in his power, determined to make his own terms after he should get possession of the city. The Senate turned brave again, put on a blustering air, and forbade the legions to come nearer than ninety miles to the city. As two legions had just come from Africa, the senators supposed they had a military power of their own. They threw up fortifications and gave the praetors military command of the city.

16. By this time Octavius and his army had reached Rome. The senators again suddenly lost all their bravery. Such of them as had least hope of favor fled from the city or hid themselves. Of the others, each one for himself decided to go over to Octavius; and when each one with great secrecy had made his way to the camp of the legions, he soon found that all the others had done the same thing. The legions and the praetors who had been set to defend the city went over bodily to Octavius. The gates were thrown open; Octavius with his legions entered the city; the Senate nominated him for consul; the assembly was

convened, and he was elected, September 22, 43 B. C., with his own cousin, Pedius, chosen as his colleague, and with the right to name the prefect of the city. Octavius became twenty years old the next day.

17. An inquiry was at once instituted upon the murder of Caesar, and all the conspirators were declared outlaws; but as Brutus and Cassius, the two chief assassins, were in command of the twenty legions in Macedonia and Asia Minor, Octavius needed more power. This he obtained by forming an alliance with Antony and Lepidus. These two commanders crossed the Alps, and the three met on a small island in the river Reno, near Bologna. There, as a result of their deliberation for three days, the second triumvirate was formed, and the tripartition of the Roman world was made.

302

18. They assumed the right to dispose of all the offices of the government; and all their decrees were to have the force of law, without any question, confirmation, or revision by either the Senate or the people. In short, they proposed that their power should be absolute -- they would do what they pleased. Yet they were compelled to consider the army. To secure the support of the legions, they pledged to them eighteen of the finest districts in Italy, with an addition of about a thousand dollars to each soldier. The conditions of the compact were put into writing, and when each of the triumvirs had taken an oath faithfully to observe them, they were read to the troops. The soldiers signified their approval upon condition that Octavius should marry the daughter of Antony's wife Fulvia.¹

19. When the powers of the triumvirate had thus been made firm, the triumvirs sat down "with a list of the noblest citizens before them, and each in turn pricked [with a pin] the name of him whom he destined to perish. Each claimed to be ridded of his personal enemies, and to save his own friends. But when they found their wishes to clash, they resorted without compunction to mutual concessions." Above all other men Cicero was the one upon whom Antony desired to execute vengeance; and in return for this boon, he surrendered to Octavius his own uncle on his mother's side. Lepidus gave up his own brother. "As they proceeded, their views expanded. They signed death warrants to gratify their friends. As the list slowly lengthened, new motives were discovered for appending to it additional names. The mere possession of riches was fatal to many; for the masters of so many legions were always poor; the occupation of pleasant houses and estates sealed the fate of others, for the triumvirs were voluptuous as well as cruel. Lastly, the mutual jealousy of the proscribers augmented the number of their victims, each seeking the destruction of those who conspicuously favored his colleagues, and each exacting a similar compensation in return. The whole number extended, we are told, to three hundred senators and two thousand knights; among them were brothers, uncles, and favorite officers of the triumvirs themselves." -- Merivale.²

303

20. When this list had been arranged, the triumvirs with their legions started to Rome. Before they reached the city, they sent to the consuls the names of seventeen of the most prominent citizens, with an order to put them all to death at once. Cicero was one of the seventeen. The executioners "attacked the houses of the appointed victims in the middle of the night: some they seized and slew unresisting; others struggled to the last, and shed blood in their own defense; others, escaping from their hands, raised the alarm. throughout the city, and the general terror of all classes, not knowing what to expect, or who might feel himself safe, caused a violent commotion." -- Merivale.³

21. Cicero had left the city; but he was overtaken by the messengers of blood, his head and his hands were cut off and carried to Antony, who exulted over the ghastly trophies; and Fulvia, in a rage of gloating anger, took the bloody head and held it upon her knees, and, looking into the face, poured forth a torrent of bitter invective against him whose face it was; and then in a perfect abandon of fury seized from her hair her golden bodkin, and pierced through and through the tongue that had so often, so exultantly, and so vilely abused both her husbands.

22. The triumvirs reached Rome one after another. "Octavius entered first; on the following day Antony appeared; Lepidus came third. Each man was surrounded by a legion and his praetorian cohort. The inhabitants beheld with terror these silent soldiers taking possession of every point commanding the city. Rome seemed like a place conquered and given over to the sword." -- Duruy. 4 A tribune called an assembly of the people; a few came, and the three commanders "were now formally invested with the title of triumvirs, and all the powers they claimed were conferred upon them" November 27, 43 B. C. The following night there was posted throughout the city this edict: --

"M. Lepidus, Marcus Antonius, and Octavius Caesar, chosen triumvirs for the reconstitution of the republic, thus declare: Had not the perfidy of the wicked answered benefits by hatred; had not those whom Caesar in his clemency spared after their defeat, enriched, and loaded with honors, become his murders, we too should disregard those who have declared

304

us public enemies. But perceiving that their malignity can be conquered by no benefits, we have chosen to forestall our enemies rather than be taken unawares by them. Some have already been punished; with the help of the gods we shall bring the rest to justice. Being ready to undertake an expedition against the parricides beyond the seas, it has seemed to us and will appear to you necessary that we should not leave other enemies behind us. Yet we will be more merciful than a former emperor, who also restored the ruined republic, and whom you hailed with the name of Felix. Not all the wealthy, not all who have held office, will perish, but only the most dangerous evil-doers. These offenders we might have seized unawares; but for your sakes we have preferred to draw up a list of proscribed persons rather than to order an execution by the troops, in which harm might have come to the innocent. This then is our order: Let no one hide any of those whose names follow; whosoever shall aid in the escape of a proscribed man shall

be himself proscribed. Let the heads be brought to us. As a reward, a man of free condition shall receive twenty-five thousand Attic drachmae, a slave ten thousand, together with freedom and the name of citizen. The names of persons receiving these rewards shall be kept secret." -- Duruy.⁵

23. Attached to this document were one hundred and thirty names of senators and knights who were devoted to death. Another list of one hundred and fifty was almost immediately added; and yet others followed in quick succession. Guards had been placed at all the gates, all places of refuge had been occupied, and all means of escape had been cut off. The slaughter began. "The executioners, armed with the prostituted forms of authority, rushed unresisted and unhindered in pursuit of their victims. They found many to aid them in the search, and to stimulate their activity. The contagious thirst of blood spread from the hired assassins to all who had an ancient grudge to requite, a future favor to obtain. Many fell in the confusion whose names were not included in the list of the proscribed. Many a private debt was wiped out in the blood of the creditor. Robbers and cut-throats mingled with the bitter partizan and the private enemy. While the murderer carried the head of his victim to fix it on a spike before the rostra, and claim the proffered reward, the jackals of massacre entered the tenantless house, and glutted themselves with plunder." -- Merivale. 6

24. When the names of the published lists had been exhausted, and all their political enemies had been slain, the triumvirs published

305

yet another list, not of more to be put to death, but of those whose property should be confiscated. When this list was exhausted, then "all the inhabitants of Rome and Italy, -- citizens and foreigners, priests and freedmen," -- who had possessions amounting to more than twenty thousand dollars, were obliged to "lend" to the triumvirs one tenth of all their possessions, and "give" one year's income besides. Then, "glutted with blood and rapine," Lepidus, for the triumvirate, announced to the Senate that the proscription was at an end. Octavius, however, reserved the right to kill some more, and "declared that the only limit he had fixed to the proscription was that he should be free to act as he pleased." -- Suetonius.⁷ Then the fawning Senate voted to the triumvirs civic crowns as "the saviors of their country"!

25. In the beginning of the year 42 B. C., Antony and Octavius, leaving Lepidus in command of Rome and Italy, started to the East to destroy Brutus and Cassius, the murderers of Caesar; but it was summer before they got all their troops together in Macedonia. Brutus and Cassius, with their united forces, had returned from Asia Minor into Europe. The two armies met at Philippi in Macedonia. The forces of Brutus and Cassius numbered about one hundred thousand, and those of Antony and Octavius about one hundred and twenty thousand. Two battles, twenty days apart, were fought on the same ground. In the first Cassius lost his life; in the second the army of Brutus was annihilated, and Brutus committed suicide.

26. It became necessary now to pay the soldiers the money, and put them in possession of the land, which had been promised them when the triumvirate was formed. A sum equal to a thousand dollars had been promised to each soldier, and, as there were now one hundred and seventy thousand soldiers, a sum equal to one hundred and seventy million dollars was required. Antony assumed the task of raising the money from the wealth of Asia; and Octavius the task of dispossessing the inhabitants of Italy and distributing their lands and cities among the soldiers.

27. Antony's word to the people of Pergamos describes the situation both in Italy and all the countries of Asia. He said: --

306

"You deserve death for rebellion; this penalty I will remit; but I want money, for I have twenty-eight legions, which with their auxiliary battalions amount to 170,000 men, besides cavalry and detachments in other quarters. I leave you to conceive what a mass of money must be required to maintain such armaments. My colleague has gone to Italy to divide its soil among these soldiers, and to expel, so to speak, the Italians from their own country. Your lands we do not demand; but instead thereof we will have money. And when you hear how easily, after all, we shall be contented, you will, we conceive, be satisfied to pay and be quit of us. We demand only the same sum which you have contributed during the last two years to our adversaries; that is to say, the tribute of ten years; but our necessities compel us to insist upon receiving this sum within twelve months."⁸

28. As the tribute was much reduced by the time it reached the coffers of Antony, the levy was doubled, and the command given that it should be paid in two instalments the same year. To this the people replied, "If you force us to pay the tribute twice in one year, give us two summers and two harvests. No doubt you have also the power to do so." But instead of considering the distress of the people caused by these most burdensome exactions, "Antony surrounded himself with flute-players, mountebanks, and dancing-girls. He entered Ephesus, preceded by women dressed as Bacchantes, and youths in the garb of Fauns and Satyrs. Already he assumed the attributes of Bacchus, and set himself to play the part by continual orgies." -- Duruy.⁹

29. The greed of Antony for money stood Herod of Judea in good stead. For when ambassadors from all parts met him in Bithynia, among them "the principal men of the Jews came to accuse" Herod and his brother Phasaelus, and to charge that though "Hyrcanus had indeed the appearance of reigning, these men had all the power. But Antony paid great respect to Herod, who was come to him to make his defense against his accusers, on which account his adversaries could not so much as obtain a hearing, which favor Herod had gained of Antony for money." -- Josephus.¹⁰

30. While Cassius was in Asia Minor, he had compelled Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, to supply him with troops and money. As

these had been used against the triumvirs, Antony sent from Tarsus in Cilicia, and called her to account for her conduct. She came, representing Venus, to render her account in person. And "when she first met Mark Antony, she pursed up his heart on the river of Cydnus."

"The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne,
Burned on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
The water, which they beat, to follow faster,
As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
It beggared all description: she did lie
In her pavilion (cloth of gold and tissue),
O'er-picturing that Venus, where we see
The fancy out-work nature; on each side her,
Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling cupids,
With divers colored fans, whose wind did seem
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,
And what they undid, did. . . .

"Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,
So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,
And made their bends adornings; at the helm
A seeming mermaid steers; the silken tackle
Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands
That yarely frame the office. From the barge
A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
Of the adjacent wharfs. The city cast
Her people out upon her; and Antony,
Enthroned in the market-place, did sit alone,
Whistling to the air, which, but for vacancy,
Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra, too,
And made a gap in nature. . . .

"Upon her landing, Antony sent to her,
Invited her to supper; she replied,
It should be better he became her guest,
Which she entreated. Our courteous Antony,
Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak,
Being barbered ten times o'er, goes to the feast;
And, for his ordinary, pays his heart
For what his eyes eat only."

-- Shakespeare. 11

31. To Antony in Cilicia there came again "a hundred of the most potent of the Jews to accuse Herod and those about him, and set the men of the greatest eloquence among them to speak." But "when Antony had heard both sides at Daphne, he asked Hyrcanus who they were that governed the nation best. He replied, 'Herod and his friends.' Hereupon Antony, by reason of the old hospitable friendship he had made with his father [Antipater], . . . made both Herod and Phasaelus tetrarchs, and committed the public affairs of the Jews to them, and wrote letters to that purpose." -- Josephus. 12

32. Antony went with Cleopatra to Alexandria, B. C. 41. Fulvia died in the spring of 40. Antony's giddy infatuation with the voluptuous queen of Egypt was fast estranging him from Octavius and the Roman people. The matter was patched up for a little while by the marriage of Antony and Octavia, the sister of Octavius, B. C. 40; and "the triumvirs returned to Rome to celebrate this union." -- Duruy. 13

33. In the same year, at the instance of a certain Antigonus, the Parthians made an incursion into Judea, gained possession of Jerusalem, and captured Hyrcanus and Phasaelus, with many of their friends. But Herod with his betrothed, with some of his family and a number of his friends, accompanied by a strong guard, all escaped and made their way to Petra in Idumaea. Thus by means of the Parthians, Antigonus obtained the power in Judea. He cut off the ears of Hyrcanus so that, being maimed, he could not, according to the law, hold the high-priesthood. Phasaelus being imprisoned, and knowing he was devoted to death, "since he had not his hands at liberty, -- for the bands he was in prevented him from killing himself thereby, -- he dashed his head against a great stone, and thereby took away his own life."

34. Herod shortly went from Idumaea to the king of Arabia, and from there to Egypt, stopping first at Pelusium. There the captains of the ships befriended him and took him to Alexandria, where Cleopatra received him and entertained him; "yet was she not able to prevail with him to stay there, because he was making

haste to Rome, even though the weather was stormy, and he was informed that the affairs of Italy were very tumultuous and in great disorder."

35. Having through violent storms, severe reverses, and much expense, reached Rome, "he first related to Antony what had befallen him in Judea," and how "that he had sailed through a storm, and contemned all these terrible dangers, in order to come, as soon as possible, to him who was his hope and only succor at this time."

36. "This account made Antony commiserate the change that had happened in Herod's condition. And, reasoning with himself that this was a common case among those that were placed in such great dignities, and that they are liable to the mutations that come

from fortune, he was very ready to give him the assistance that he desired; and this because he called to mind the friendship he had had with Antipater; because Herod offered him money to make him king, as he had formerly given it to him to make him tetrarch; and chiefly because of his hatred to Antigonus, for he took him to be a seditious person and an enemy to the Romans.

37. "Caesar[Octavius] was also the forwarder to raise Herod's dignity, and to give him his assistance in what he desired, on account of the toils of war which he had himself undergone with Antipater his father in Egypt, and of the hospitality he had treated him withal, and the kindness he had always shown him, as also to gratify Antony, who was very zealous for Herod.

38. "So the Senate was convoked; and Messala first and then Atratinus, introduced Herod into it, and enlarged upon the benefits they had received from his father, and put them in mind of the goodwill he had borne to the Romans. At the same time they accused Antigonus, and declared him an enemy, not only because of his former opposition to them, but that he had now overlooked the Romans, and taken the government from the Parthians. Upon this the Senate was irritated; and Antony informed them further that it was for their advantage in the Parthian War that Herod should be king. This seemed good to all the senators, and so they made a decree accordingly.

310

39. "When the Senate was dissolved, Antony and Caesar went out of the Senate house with Herod between them, and with the consuls and other magistrates before them, in order to offer sacrifices, and to lay up their decrees in the capital. Antony also feasted Herod the first day of his reign. And thus did this man receive the kingdom, having obtained it on the one hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad [July, 40 B. C], when Cneius Domitius Calvinus was consul the second time, and Caius Asinius Pollio the first time." -
- Josephus.14

40. And thus when Herod, a full-blooded Idumaeon, had become king of Judea, the scepter had departed from Judah, and a lawgiver from between his feet; and the time was at hand when Shiloh should come, to whom the gathering of the people should be. 15

41. Within two years after his marriage with Octavia, Antony was again swallowed up in the charms of Cleopatra, from whom he never again separated. Two children whom he had by her he named respectively the Sun and the Moon; and when Cleopatra assumed the dress and professed the attributes of Isis, Antony played the part of Osiris. He publicly rejected Octavia in 35, divorced her in 32, and war was declared the same year. The war began and ended with the naval battle of Actium, September 2, 31 B. C.

42. In the midst of the battle Cleopatra hoisted sail and fled. Antony left everything and followed her. They sailed home to Alexandria, and there committed suicide. In the meantime Lepidus had been set aside, and now, just thirteen and one-half years from the murder of Caesar, the State, having again gone through the same course precisely, came

again to the exact point where it had been then, only in worse hands, and Octavius was the head of one hundred and twenty millions of people, and SOLE MASTER OF THE ROMAN WORLD.

1[Page 302] The girl's name was Clodia. She was Fulvia's daughter by Clodius, her former husband.

2[Page 302] "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxvi. par 13.

3[Page 303] Id., par. 14.

4[Page 303] "History of Rome," chap. lix, sec, iv, par. 10.

5[Page 304] Id.

6[Page 304] "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxvi, par. 15.

7[Page 305] "Lives of the Caesars," Augustus, chap. xxvii.

8[Page 306] Merivale's "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxvii, par. 2.

9[Page 306] "History of Rome," Chap. lx, sec. iii, par. 1.

10[Page 306] "Antiquities," book xiv, chap. xii, par. 2.

11[Page 307] "Antony and Cleopatra," act ii, scene ii.

12[Page 308] "Antiquities," book xiv, chap. xiii, par. i.

13[Page 308] "History of Rome," chap. lx, sec. xii, par. 3.

14[Page 310] "Antiquities," book xiv, chap. xiv, pars. 1-5.

15[Page 310] Gen. 49:10.

23. ROME -- THE EMPIRE.

THE "mask of hypocrisy" which Octavius had assumed at the age of nineteen, and "which he never afterward laid aside," was now, at the age of thirty-four, made to tell to the utmost in firmly establishing himself in the place of supreme power which he had attained. Having before him the important lesson of the fate of Caesar in the same position, when the Senate bestowed upon him the flatteries, the titles, and the dignities which it had before bestowed upon Caesar, he pretended to throw them all back upon the Senate and people, and obliged the Senate to go through the form of absolutely forcing them upon him. For he "was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the Senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom." He therefore "wished to deceive the people by an image of civil liberty, and the armies by an image of civil government." -- Gibbon.¹

2. In this way he finally merged in himself the prerogatives of all the regular officers of the State -- tribune, consul, prince of the Senate, proconsul, imperator, censor, pontifex maximus -- with all the titles and dignities which had been given by the Senate to him, as before to Caesar. In short, he himself became virtually the State; his will was absolute.

3. Having thus drawn to himself "the functions of the Senate and the magistrate, and the framing of the laws, in which he was thwarted by no man," the title of "Father of His Country" meant much more than ever it had before. The state was "the common parent" of the people. The State being now merged in one man, when that man became the father of his country, he likewise became

312

the father of the people. And "the system by which every citizen shared in the government being thrown aside, all men regarded the orders of the prince as the only rule of conduct and obedience." -- Tacitus.² Nor was this so merely in civic things; it was equally so in religious affairs. In fact there was in the Roman system no such distinction known as civil and religious. The State was divine, therefore that which was civil was in itself religious.

4. One man now having become the State, it became necessary that some title should be found which would fit this new dignity and express this new power. The Senate had exhausted the vocabulary of flattering titles in those which it had given to Caesar. Although all these were now given to Octavius, there was none among them which could properly define the new dignity which he possessed. Much anxious thought was given to this great question. "At last he fixed upon the epithet 'Augustus,' a name which no man had borne before, and which, on the contrary, had been applied to things the most noble, the most venerable, and the most sacred. The rites of the gods were called august; their temples were august. The word itself was derived from the holy auguries; it was

connected in meaning with the abstract term 'authority,' and with all that increases and flourishes upon earth. The use of this glorious title could not fail to smooth the way to the general acceptance of the divine character of the mortal who was deemed worthy to bear it. The Senate had just decreed the divinity of the defunct Caesar; the courtiers were beginning now to insinuate that his successor, while yet alive, enjoyed an effluence from deity; the poets were even suggesting that altars should be raised to him; and in the provinces, among the subjects of the State at least, temples to his divinity were actually rising, and the cult of Augustus was beginning to assume a name, a ritual, and a priesthood."³

5. The "Augustan Age" was the glorious, the golden age of Roman power. At this point, therefore, it will be well to take a survey of the extent of the Roman monarchy. In the interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, the word of the Lord came, saying:

313

"And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." And in the vision of Daniel, seventh chapter, there was seen "a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: and it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." And in the interpretation the angel said, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces."

6. Therefore the fourth kingdom from that of Nebuchadnezzar must be stronger than the third, the Grecian under Alexander the Great. And as that third kingdom bore rule over all the then known earth, the extent of this fourth one could be no less than the dominion of the known earth in its day. This thought is well expressed in some lines already quoted, and which may properly be repeated here: "History may allow us to think that Alexander and a Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation, which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work, and to found a wider and still more enduring empire." -- Arnold.⁴

7. Octavius bearing by inheritance the greatest name then in the world, -- Caesar, -- and the most sacred and authoritative title known to the Roman world, -- Augustus, -- his name now took the form Caesar Augustus. "And it came to pass that in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed;"⁵ not immediately taxed in the sense of levying and collecting money; but rather enrolled, or as now it would be better expressed, he ordered a census of the empire to be taken, in order to the levying and collecting of a tax. And as the Roman Empire was to be taxed, "all the world" was to be taxed; for this was the domain of --

"Rome

That sat on her seven hills, and from her throne
Of beauty ruled the world."

8. "Rome, therefore, which came last in the succession, and swallowed up the three great powers that had seriatim cast the human race into one mold, and had brought them under the unity of a single will, entered by inheritance upon all that its predecessors in that career had appropriated, but in a condition of far ampler development. Estimated merely by longitude and latitude, the territory of the Roman Empire was the finest, by much, that has ever fallen under a single scepter. . . . Rome laid a belt about the Mediterranean of a thousand miles in breadth; and within that zone she comprehended not only all the great cities of the ancient world, but so perfectly did she lay the garden of the world in every climate, and for every mode of natural wealth, within her own ring-fence, that since that era no land, no part and parcel of the Roman Empire, has ever risen into strength and opulence, except where unusual artificial industry has availed to counteract the tendencies of nature. So entirely had Rome engrossed whatsoever was rich by the mere bounty of native endowment. Vast, therefore unexampled, immeasurable, was the basis of natural power upon which the Roman throne reposed."

9. "Its range, the compass of its extent, was appalling to the imagination. Coming last among what are called the great monarchies of prophecy, it was the only one which realized in perfection the idea of a monarchia, being (except for Parthia and the great fable of India beyond it) strictly coincident with the civilized world. Civilization and this empire were commensurate; they were interchangeable ideas and coextensive. . . . The vast power and domination of the Roman Empire, for the three centuries which followed the battle of Actium, have dazzled the historic eye. . . . The battle of Actium was followed by the final conquest of Egypt. That conquest rounded and integrated the glorious empire; it was now circular as a shield. . . . From that day forward, for three hundred years, there was silence in the world; no muttering was heard; no eye winked beneath the wing. Winds of hostility might still rave at intervals; but it was on the outside of the mighty empire; it was at a dream-like distance; and, like the storms that beat against some monumental castle, 'and at the doors and windows seem to call,'

they rather irritated and vivified the sense of security than at all disturbed its luxurious lull."

10. "The Caesar of Western Rome -- he only of all earthly potentates, past or to come, could be said to reign as a monarch; that is, as solitary king. He was not the greatest of princes, simply because there was no other but himself. There were, doubtless, a few outlying rulers, of unknown names and titles, upon the margins of his empire; there were tributary lieutenants, and barbarous reguli, the obscure vassals of his scepter, whose homage was offered on the lowest step of his throne, and scarcely known to him but as objects of disdain. But these feudatories could no more break the unity of his empire, which embraced the whole civilized world, -- the total habitable world as then known to geography or recognized by the muse of history, -- than at this day the British Empire on

the sea can be brought into question or made conditional, because some chief of Owyhee or Tongataboo should proclaim a momentary independence of the British trident, or should even offer a transient outrage to her sovereign flag. Parthia, it is true, might pretend to the dignity of an empire. But her sovereigns, though sitting in the seat of the great king, were no longer the rulers of a vast and polished nation. They were regarded as barbarians, potent only by their standing army, not upon the larger basis of civic strength; and even under this limitation, they were supposed to owe more to the circumstances of their position -- their climate, their remoteness, and their inaccessibility except through arid and sultry deserts -- than to intrinsic resources, such as could be permanently relied on in a serious trial of strength between the two powers. The kings of Parthia, therefore, were far enough from being regarded in the light of antagonistic forces to the majesty of Rome. And, these withdrawn from the comparison, what else was there -- what prince, what king, what potentate of any denomination -- to break the universal calm that through centuries continued to lave, as with the quiet undulations of summer lakes, the sacred footsteps of the Caesarian throne.

11. "As respected the hand of man, Rome slept for ages in absolute security. . . . The Roman power, in its centuries of grandeur, involved every mode of strength, with absolute immunity

316

from all kinds and degrees of weakness. It ought not, therefore, to surprise us that the emperor, as the depositary of this charmed power, should have been looked upon as a sacred person, and the imperial family considered as a 'divina domus.' . . . Much more may this be supposed of him to whose care was confided the weightier part of the human race; who had it in his power to promote or suspend the progress of human improvement; and of whom, and the motions of whose will, the very prophets of Judea took cognizance.

12. "No nation and no king was utterly divorced from the counsels of God. Palestine, as a central chamber of God's administration, stood in the same relation to all. It has been remarked, as a mysterious and significant fact, that the founders of the great empires all had some connection, more or less, with the temple at Jerusalem. . . . And we may be sure that, amongst them, the Roman emperor, as the great accountant for the happiness of more men, and men more cultivated, than ever before were entrusted to the motions of a single will, had a special, singular, and mysterious relation to the secret counsels of Heaven." -- De Quincey.⁶

13. "All the self-governing powers that had previously filled the world are seen to bend one after the other, and finally disappear. How suddenly did the earth become desolated of her free nations ! . . . However deeply we may sympathize with the fall of so many free States, we can not fail to perceive that a new life sprang immediately from their ruins. With the overthrow of independence fell the barriers of all exclusive nationalities; the nations were conquered; they were overwhelmed together; but by that very act were they blended and united; for, as the limits of the empire were held to comprise the whole earth, so did its subjects learn to consider themselves as one people." -- Von Ranke.⁷

14. The Roman conquests were almost entirely accomplished by the arms of the nation as a republic; and when Augustus succeeded in merging in himself all the authority of the empire, then, as shown

317

by the quotations already given, he became the master of the world; and the remote peoples that had not yet felt the terror of the actual presence of the Roman arms, hastened, as in the day of Alexander the Great, to send their ambassadors, with presents, to crave his friendship.

15. "The name of Augustus growing famous all over the world, the remotest nations of the North and East -- that is, the Scythians, the Samaritans [Sarmatians⁸], the Indians, and the Seres -- sent ambassadors with presents, to him to pray his friendship, the last of which, Florus tells us, were four years on their journey, which is to be supposed coming and going. The Seres were the farthest people of the East, the same whom we now call the Chinese. They being anciently famous for the making of silk, and silken manufactures; hence serica became the name of silk, and sericum of a silken garment, both among the Greeks and Latins." -- Prideaux.⁹

16. In the year 21 B. C., Augustus started on an official journey into the East. After spending some time in Sicily, he sailed into Greece, and wintered at Samos. "While Augustus lay at this place, there came thither to him ambassadors from Candace, queen of Ethiopia, . . . who, finding him at Samos, there obtained from him the peace which they desired, and then returned again into Ethiopia. . . . Early the next spring Augustus passed from Samos into Lesser Asia, and having settled all matters there, continued his progress through that country into Syria, and came to Antioch.

17. "Phraates, king of Parthia, on Augustus's coming into Syria, sent ambassadors to him to pray his friendship. For being then upon ill terms with his people, whom he had much alienated from him by his tyranny and cruelty, he dreaded a foreign war, and he had reason at that time to fear it from Augustus. For whereas Augustus had three years before released to him one of his sons (whom he had in captivity at Rome), upon promise that he would send back to him all the prisoners and ensigns which the Parthians had taken from the Romans in their wars with Crassus and Antony,

318

he had not yet discharged himself of that obligation. That, therefore, this might not be a cause of war against him, he now not only sent back all those captives and ensigns, but also yielded to all other terms of peace which were then required of him, and gave four of his sons, with their wives and children, in hostage for the performance of them."

18. "At the same time that Augustus made peace with Parthia, he settled also the affairs of Armenia. . . . Augustus, toward the end of summer, returning out of Syria, was

attended by Herod to the seashore, where he embarked, and from thence sailed back to Samos, and there resided all the ensuing winter in the same manner as he had the former. . . . While Augustus lay at Samos, there came thither to him a second embassy, from the king of India, to desire the establishment of a league of friendship with him, to which purpose he wrote to him a letter in the Greek language, telling him therein that though he reigned over six hundred kings, yet he had such value for the friendship of Augustus by reason of the great fame which he had heard of him, that he sent this embassy on so long a journey on purpose to desire it of him; to which letter he subscribed by the name of Porus, king of India. . . . Of the ambassadors that first set out from India on this embassy, three only reached the presence of Augustus; the others that were in commission died on the way. . . . Among the presents which they brought were several tigers, and these were the first of this sort of wild beasts that had been seen either by Greeks or Romans." -- Prideaux.¹⁰

19. At this time the Parthian hordes held dominion from the Tigris to the borders of China. The hordes of the Scythians and the Sarmatians were spread over all the north country above the Sea of Aral, the Caspian, and the Black Sea, and westward to the river Vistula and the Baltic Sea (the Baltic was then called the Sarmatian Ocean). From the Vistula, the Upper Danube, and the Rhine to the North Sea and the Baltic, was covered with the German tribes, as wild and savage as were the American Indians when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock, and even these had been chastised by Germanicus. When, therefore, it is seen that the Sarmatians,

319

the Scythians, the Parthians, the Chinese, and the Indians, came to the throne of Augustus, bringing present, asking his friendship, and praying for promises of peace, it stands as the literal truth that from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Arctic regions to the Indian Ocean, and from the German Sea and the Frith of Forth of Ethiopia, there was not a single organized people in the world that did not either feel or fear the power of Rome.¹¹

20. The boundaries of the actual conquests of the Roman armies -- the limits to which the Roman soldiers actually marched and conquered -- were marked by the Tigris, the Danube, the Rhine, the Frith of Forth, the Atlantic Ocean, the Desert of Sahara, the Desert of Arabia, and the Persian Gulf. And Gibbon's elegant lines alone, would mark in Rome the fulfilment of the prophecy of "the fourth kingdom:" "The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the IRON monarchy of Rome."¹²

1[Page 311] "Decline and Fall," chap. iii, pars. 17, 18.

2[Page 312] "Annals," book i, chap. iv.

3[Page 312] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Augustus.

4[Page 313] "History of Rome," chap. xxx, par. 2.

5[Page 313] Luke 2:1.

6[Page 316] Essays, "The Caesars," Introduction, par. 8; "Philosophy of Roman History," pars, 1,2: The Caesars," pars, 3, 9, 10.

7[Page 316] "History of the Popes," book i, chap i, sec, i, pars, 2, 5.

8[Page 317] The text says Samaritans, but it certainly should be Sarmatians. The justice of this will be seen by any one who will consult any map of the period, or read carefully the text itself; for at this time the Samaritans were not a nation at all.

9[Page 317] "Connexion," under An. 25, Herod 13.

10[Page 318] Id., under 21 and 19 B. C.

11[Page 319] See "Labberton's Historical Atlas," map 15; "Ginn's Classical Atlas," map 12.

12[Page 319] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxviii, par 43 (the first paragraph under "General observations," etc. at the close of the chapter).

24. ROME -- THE MONARCHY.

THE vast dominion of Rome had been won under the mild and peaceful professions of "liberty to the oppressed," the blessings of republicanism as against monarchy. But now the power which had won this dominion proved to be a despotism as vast as the dominion itself. To complete the picture, it will be necessary, as briefly as possible, to sketch the character of the Roman monarchy:

2. "The empire of the Romans filled the world, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. The slave of imperial despotism, whether he was condemned to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the Senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Seriphus, or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly. On every side he was encompassed with a vast extent of sea and land, which he could never hope to traverse without being discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers his anxious view could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable deserts, hostile tribes of barbarians, of fierce manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the emperor's protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. 'Wherever you are,' said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, 'remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror.'" -- Gibbon. 1

3. In illustration of the absolute power exerted by the emperor, Gibbon says: "Seriphus was a small and rocky island in the AEgean Sea, the inhabitants of which were despised for their ignorance and

321

obscurity. The place of Ovid's exile is well known, by his just but unmanly lamentations. It should seem that he only received an order to leave Rome in so many days, and to transport himself to Tomi. Guards and gaolers were unnecessary. Under Tiberius, a Roman knight attempted to fly to the Parthians. He was stopped in the straits of Sicily; but so little danger did there appear in the example that the most jealous of tyrants disdained to punish it."2

4. Ovid was banished by Caesar Augustus. Tomi was a "semi-Greek, semi-barbaric town," on the coast of the Black Sea, about ninety miles south of the mouth of the Danube. There, to "the very outskirts of civilization," he was ordered to go; there he went, and there he remained about eight years, even to the day of his death; and all that was required either to take or to keep him there was the word of the emperor of Rome. Thus far-reaching, and thus absolute, was the power of Rome.

5. "That imperial dignity . . . was undoubtedly the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which upon this planet has been suffered to appear." "But the same omnipresence of imperial anger and

retribution which withered the hopes of the poor, humble prisoner, met and confounded the emperor himself, when hurled from his giddy height by some fortunate rival. All the kingdoms of the earth, to one in that situation, became but so many wards of the same infinite prison. Flight, if it were even successful for the moment, did but little retard his inevitable doom. And so evident was this, that hardly in one instance did the fallen prince attempt to fly, but passively met the death which was inevitable, in the very spot where ruin had overtaken him." -- De Quineey.³

6. Augustus tyrannized over the nobles by his power, and held the affections of the populace by his munificence. "In the number, variety, and magnificence of his public spectacles, he surpassed all former example. Four and twenty times, he says, he treated the people with games upon his own account, and three and twenty times for such magistrates as were either absent, or not able to

322

afford the expense. . . . He entertained the people with wrestlers in the Campus Martius, where wooden seats were erected for the purpose; and also with a naval fight, for which he excavated the ground near the Tiber." In order that the people might all go to these special shows, he stationed guards through the streets to keep the houses from being robbed while the dwellers were absent. "He displayed his munificence to all ranks of the people on various occasions. Moreover, upon his bringing the treasure belonging to the kings of Egypt into the city, in his Alexandrian triumph, he made money so plentiful that interest fell, and the price of land rose considerably. And afterward, as often as large sums of money came into his possession by means of confiscations, he would lend it free of interest, for a fixed term, to such as could give security for the double of what was borrowed.

7. "The estate necessary to qualify a senator, instead of eight hundred thousand sesterces, the former standard, he ordered for the future to be twelve hundred thousand; and to those who had not so much, he made good the deficiency. He often made donations to the people, but generally of different sums, sometimes four hundred, sometimes three hundred, or two hundred and fifty sesterces; upon which occasions he extended his bounty even to young boys, who before were not used to receive anything until they arrived at eleven years of age. In a scarcity of corn he would frequently let them have it at a very low price, or none at all, and doubled the number of the money tickets." -- Suetonius.⁴

8. It occurred to him that he ought to abolish the distribution of grain at public expense, as he declared that it was "working unmitigated evil, retarding the advance of agriculture, and cutting the sinews of industry." But he was afraid to do it, lest some one would take advantage of the opportunity to ascend to power by restoring it. His own words are these: "I was much inclined to abolish forever the practice of allowing the people corn at the public expense, because they trust so much to it that they are too lazy to till their lands; but I did not persevere in my design, as I felt sure

that the practise would sometime or other be revived by some one ambitious of popular favor." -- Suetonius.⁵

9. In public and political life a confirmed and constant hypocrite, in private and domestic life he was no less. He was so absolutely calculating that he actually wrote out beforehand what he wished to say to his friends, and even to his wife. He married Clodia merely for political advantage, although at that time she was scarcely of marriageable age. He soon put her away, and married Scribonia. Her, too, he soon put away, "for resenting too freely the excessive influence which one of his mistresses had gained over him" (Suetonius⁶), and immediately took Livia Drusilla from her wedded husband. Her he kept all the rest of his days; for instead of resenting any of his lascivious excesses, she connived at them.

10. By Scribonia he had a daughter -- Julia. Her he gave first to his sister's son, who soon died; and then he gave her to her brother-in-law, Marcus Agrippa, who was already married to her cousin, by whom he had children. Nevertheless Agrippa was obliged to put away his wife and children, and take Julia. Agrippa likewise soon died; then Tiberius was obliged to put away his wife, by whom he already had a son, and who was soon to become a mother again, in order that he might be the son-in-law of the emperor by becoming Julia's third husband. By this time, however, Julia had copied so much of her father's wickedness that Tiberius could not live with her; and her daughter had copied so much of hers, that "the two Julias, his daughter and granddaughter, abandoned themselves to such courses of lewdness and debauchery, that he banished them both" (Suetonius⁷), and even had thoughts of putting to death the elder Julia.

11. Yet Augustus, setting such an example of wickedness as this, presumed to enact laws punishing in others the same things which were habitually practised by himself. But all these evil practises were so generally followed that laws would have done no good, by whomsoever enacted, much less would they avail when issued by such a person as he.

12. Augustus died at the age of seventy-six, August 19, 14 A. D., and was succeeded by Tiberius.

13. Forty-three years of the sole authority of Augustus had established the principle of absolutism in government, but "the critical moment for a government is that of its founder's death." It was now to be discovered whether that principle was firmly fixed; but Tiberius was fifty-six years old, and had been a careful student of Augustus, and though at his accession the new principle of government was put to its severest test, Tiberius made Augustus his model in all things; "continued his hypocritical moderation, and made it, so to speak, the rule of the imperial government." -- Duruy.⁸

14. Though he immediately assumed the imperial authority, like his model "he affected by a most impudent piece of acting to refuse it for a long time; one while sharply reprehending his friends who entreated him to accept it, as little knowing what a monster the government was; another while keeping in suspense the Senate when they implored him and threw themselves at his feet, by ambiguous answers and a crafty kind of dissimulation; insomuch that some were out of patience, and one cried out during the confusion, 'Either let him accept it or decline it at once;' and a second told him to his face: 'Others are slow to perform what they promise, but you are slow to promise what you actually perform.' At last, as if forced to it, and complaining of the miserable and burdensome service imposed upon him, he accepted the government." -- Suetonius.⁹

15. The purpose of all this was, as with Augustus, to cause the Senate, by fairly forcing imperial honors upon him, firmly to ally itself to the imperial authority by making itself the guardian of that power; so that when any danger should threaten the emperor, the Senate would thus stand pledged to defend him. And dangers were at this time so thick about Tiberius that he declared he had "a wolf by the ears."

16. The principal thing that had marked his accession was the murder of Agrippa Posthumus, the son of Agrippa the minister of

325

Augustus; and now a slave of Agrippa's had got together a considerable force to avenge his master's death. "Lucius Scribonius Libo, a senator of the first distinction, was secretly fomenting a rebellion, and the troops both in Illyricum and Germany were mutinous. Both armies insisted upon high demands, particularly that their pay should be made equal to that of the praetorian guards. The army in Germany absolutely refused to acknowledge a prince who was not their own choice, and urged with all possible importunity Germanicus, who commanded them, to take the government on himself, though he obstinately refused it." -- Suetonius.¹⁰

17. All these dangers were soon past, and Tiberius, pretending to be the servant of the Senate, "assumed the sovereignty by slow degrees," and the Senate allowed nothing to check its extravagance in bestowing titles, honors, and powers, for "such was the pestilential character of those times, so contaminated with adulation, that not only the first nobles, whose obnoxious splendor found protection only in obsequiousness, but all who had been consuls, a great part of such as had been praetors, and even many of the inferior senators, strove for priority in the fulsomeness and extravagance of their votes. There is a tradition that Tiberius, as often as he went out of the Senate, was wont to cry out in Greek, 'How fitted for slavery are these men !' Yes, even Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty, nauseated the crouching tameness of his slaves." -- Tacitus. ¹¹

18. This course of conduct he continued through nine years, and his reign was perhaps as mild during this time as that of any other Roman would have been; but when at last he felt himself secure in the position where he was placed above all law, there was no enormity that he did not commit.

19. One man being now the State, and that one man being "divine," high treason -- violated majesty -- became the most common crime, and the "universal resource in accusations." In former times, "if any one impaired the majesty of the Roman people by betraying an army, by exciting sedition among the commons, in short, by any maladministration of the public affairs, the actions were matter of trial, but words were free." -- Tacitus.¹² But

326

now the law embraced "not words only, but a gesture, an involuntary forgetfulness, an indiscreet curiosity." -- Duruy.¹³

20. More than this, as the emperor was the embodiment of the divinity of the Roman State, this divinity was likewise supposed to be reflected in the statues and images of him. Any disrespect, any slight, any indifference, any carelessness, intentional or otherwise, shown toward any such statue, or image, or picture, was considered as referring to him, was violative of his majesty, and was high treason. Any one who counted as sold a statue of the emperor with the field in which it stood, even though he had made and set up the statue himself; any one who should throw a stone at it; any one who should take away its head; any one who should melt the bronze or use for any profane purpose the stone, even of a broken or mutilated image or statue, -- all were alike guilty of high treason.

21. Yet more than this, in all cases of high treason when the accused was found guilty, one fourth of his estate was by law made sure to the informer. "Thus the informers, a description of men called into existence to prey upon the vitals of society, and never sufficiently restrained even by penalties, were now encouraged by rewards." -- Tacitus.¹⁴

22. Bearing these facts in mind, it is easy to understand the force of that political turn which the priests and Pharisees of Jerusalem took upon Pilate in their charges against Christ: "If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar." On account of the furious jealousy of Tiberius, and his readiness to welcome the reports of informers, the priests and Pharisees knew full well, and so did Pilate, that if a deputation should be sent to Rome accusing him of high treason in sanctioning the kingship of a Jew, Pilate would be called to Rome and beheaded.

23. Thus in Tiberius the government of Rome became "a furious and crushing despotism." The emperor being above all law, forgot all restraint, and "abandoned himself to every species of cruelty, never wanting occasions of one kind or another to serve as a pretext.

327

He first fell upon the friends and acquaintances of his mother, then those of his grandsons and his daughter-in-law, and lastly those of Sejanus, after whose death he became cruel in the extreme." Sejanus was his chief minister of State and his special friend and favorite -- a worthy favorite, too. Tiberius, at his particular solicitation, retired to the island of Capri, where he attempted to imitate the lascivious ways of all the gods and goddesses at once. Men were employed solely as "inventors of evil things," and of lascivious situations.

24. Sejanus, left in command of the empire, aspired to possess it in full. He had already put away his own wife, and poisoned the son of Tiberius that he might marry his widow. His scheme was discovered; he was strangled by the public executioner, and torn to pieces by the populace. Then, under the accusation of being friends of Sejanus, a great number of people were first imprisoned, and shortly afterward, without even the form of a trial, Tiberius "ordered all who were in prison under accusation of attachment to Sejanus, to be put to death. There lay the countless mass of slain, of every sex and age, the illustrious and the mean, -- some dispersed, others collected in heaps; nor was it permitted to their friends or kindred to be present, or to shed a tear over them, or any longer even to go and see them; but guards were placed around, who marked signs of sorrow in each, and attended the putrid bodies till they were dragged to the Tiber, where, floating in the stream, or driven upon the banks, none dared to burn them, none to touch them. Even the ordinary intercourse of humanity was intercepted by the violence of fear; and in proportion as cruelty prevailed, commiseration was stifled." -- Tacitus.15

25. After the example of Augustus, and to satisfy the clamors of the people, he lent money without interest for three years to all who wanted to borrow. He first compelled "all money lenders to advance two thirds of their capital on land, and the debtors to pay off at once the same proportion of their debts." This was found insufficient to meet all the demands, and he lent from the public treasury about five millions of dollars. In order to obtain money to

328

meet this and other drafts on the public treasury, "he turned his mind to sheer robbery. It is certain that Cneius Lentulus, the augur, a man of vast estate, was so terrified and worried by his threats and importunities that he was obliged to make him his heir. . . . Several persons, likewise of the first distinction in Gaul, Spain, Syria, and Greece, had their estates confiscated upon such despicably trifling and shameless pretenses, that against some of them no other charge was preferred than that they held large sums of ready money as part of their property. Old immunities, the rights of mining, and of levying tolls, were taken from several cities and private persons." -- Suetonius. 16

26. As for anything more about "this monster of his species," we shall only say in the words of Suetonius, "It would be tedious to relate all the numerous instances of his cruelty. . . . Not a day passed without the punishment of some person or other, not excepting holidays, or those appropriated to the worship of the gods. Some were tried even on New Year's Day. Of many who were condemned, their wives and children

shared the same fate; and for those who were sentenced to death, the relations were forbid to put on mourning.

27. "Considerable rewards were voted for the prosecutors, and sometimes for the witnesses also. The information of any person, without exception, was taken, and all offenses were capital, even speaking a few words, though without any ill intention. . . . Those who were desirous to die were forced to live. For he thought death so slight a punishment that upon hearing that Carnulius, one of the accused, who was under prosecution, had killed himself, he exclaimed, 'Carnulius has escaped me.' In calling over his prisoners, when one of them requested the favor of a speedy death, he replied, 'You are not yet restored to favor.' A man of consular rank writes in his annals that at table, where he himself was present with a large company, he was suddenly asked aloud by a dwarf who stood by amongst the buffoons, why Paconius, who was under a prosecution for treason, lived so long. Tiberius immediately reprimanded him for his pertness, but wrote to the Senate a few days

329

after to proceed without delay to the punishment of Paconius." -- Suetonius. 17 He was so strong that a fillip of his finger would draw blood; and he had eyes that could see in the dark.

28. Tiberius died March 16, 37 A. D., in the seventy-eighth year of his age and the twenty-third year of his reign, leaving "the subject peoples of the empire in a condition of prosperity such as they had never known before and never knew again," and was succeeded by Caligula.

29. Caligula was the son of Germanicus, who was the adopted son of Tiberius. He was born and brought up in the camp. When he grew large enough to run about, the soldiers made him a pair of boots -- caliga -- after the pattern of their own, and from that he got his name of "Caligula," that is, Little Boots. His real name was Caius. He was now twenty-five years old, and had been with Tiberius for the last five years. "Closely aping Tiberius, he put on the same dress as he did from day to day, and in his language differed little from him. Whence the shrewd observation of Passienus the orator, afterward so famous, that 'never was a better slave nor a worse master.'" -- Tacitus. 18 He imitated Tiberius in his savage disposition and the exercise of his vicious propensities as closely as he did in his dress and language. If he was not worse than Tiberius, it is only because it was impossible to be worse.

30. Like his pattern, he began his reign with such an appearance of gentleness and genuine ability that there was universal rejoicing among the people out of grateful remembrance of Germanicus, and among the soldiers and provincials who had known him in his childhood. As he followed the corpse of Tiberius to its burning, "he had to walk amidst altars, victims, and lighted torches, with prodigious crowds of people everywhere attending him, in transports of joy, and calling him, besides other auspicious

names, by those of 'their star,' 'their chick,' 'their pretty puppet,' and 'bantling'. . . Caligula himself inflamed this devotion by practising all the arts of popularity." -- Suetonius.¹⁹ This appearance of propriety he kept up

330

for eight months, and then, having become giddy with the height at which he stood, and drunken with the possession of absolute power, he ran wildly and greedily into all manner of excesses.

31. He gave himself the titles of "Dutiful," "The Pious," "The Child of the Camp, the Father of the Armies," "The Greatest and Best Caesar." -- Suetonius.²⁰ He caused himself to be worshiped, not only in his images, but in his own person. Among the gods, Castor and Pollux were twin brothers representing the sun, and were the sons of Jupiter. Caligula would place himself between the statues of the twin brothers, there to be worshiped by all votaries. And they worshiped him, too, some saluting him as Jupiter Latialis, that is, the Roman Jupiter, the guardian of the Roman people. He caused that all the images of the gods that were famous either for beauty or popularity should be brought from Greece, and that their heads should be taken off and his put on instead; and then he sent them back to be worshiped. He set up a temple and established a priesthood in honor of his own divinity; and in the temple he set up a statue of gold the exact image of himself, which he caused to be dressed every day exactly as he was. The sacrifices which were to be offered in the temple were flamingos, peacocks, bustards, guineas, turkeys, and pheasants, each kind offered on successive days. "The most opulent persons in the city offered themselves as candidates for the honor of being his priests, and purchased it successively at an immense price." -- Suetonius.²¹

32. Castor and Pollux had a sister who corresponded to the moon. Caligula therefore, on nights when the moon was full, would invite her to come and stay with him. This Jupiter Latialis placed himself on full and familiar equality with Jupiter Capitolinus. He would walk up to the other Jupiter and whisper in his ear, and then turn his own ear, as if listening for a reply. Not only had Augustus and Romulus taken other men's wives, but Castor and Pollux, in the myth, had gone to a double wedding, and after the marriage had carried off both the brides with them. Caligula did the same thing. He went to the wedding of Caius Piso, and from the wedding supper carried off the bride with himself, and the next

331

day issued a proclamation "that he had got a wife as Romulus and Augustus had done;" but in a few days he put her away, and two years afterward he banished her. He had several wives; but the only one whom he retained permanently was Caesonia, a perfect wanton who was neither handsome nor young.

33. He was so prodigal that in less than a year, besides the regular revenue of the empire, he spent the sum of about one hundred million dollars. He built a bridge of boats

across the Gulf of Baiae, from Baiae to Puteoli, a distance of three and a half miles. He twice distributed to the people nearly fifteen dollars apiece, and often gave splendid feasts to the Senate and to the knights with their families, at which he presented official garments to the men, and purple scarfs to the women and children. He exhibited a large number of games continuing all day. Sometimes he would throw large sums of money and other valuables to the crowd to be scrambled for. He likewise made public feasts at which, to every man, he would give a basket of bread with other victuals. He would exhibit stage plays in different parts of the city at night-time, and cause the whole city to be illuminated; he exhibited these games and plays not only in Rome, but in Sicily, Syracuse, and Gaul.

34. As for himself, in his feasts he exerted himself to set the grandest suppers and the strangest dishes, at which he would drink pearls of immense value, dissolved in vinegar, and serve up loaves of bread and other victuals modeled in gold. He built two ships, each of ten banks of oars, the poops of which were made to blaze with jewels, with sails of various party-colors, with baths, galleries, and saloons, in which he would sail along the coast feasting and reveling, with the accompaniments of dancing and concerts of music. At one of these revels he made a present of nearly one hundred thousand dollars to a favorite charioteer. His favorite horse he called Incitatus, -- Go-ahead, -- and on the day before the celebration of the games of the circus, he would set a guard of soldiers to keep perfect quiet in the neighborhood, that the repose of Go-ahead might not be disturbed. This horse he arrayed in purple and jewels, and built for him a marble stable with an ivory manger. He would occasionally have the horse eat at the imperial table, and at such

332

times would feed him on gilded grain in a golden basin of the finest workmanship. He proposed at last to make the horse a consul of the empire.

35. Having spent all the money, though an enormous sum, that had been laid up by Tiberius, it became necessary to raise funds sufficient for his extravagance, and to do so he employed "every mode of false accusation, confiscation, and taxation that could be invented." He commanded that the people should make their wills in his favor. He even caused this rule to date back as far as the beginning of the reign of Tiberius, and from that time forward any centurion of the first rank who had not made Tiberius or Caligula his heir, his will was annulled, and all his property was confiscated. The wills of all others were set aside if any person would say that the maker had intended to make the emperor his heir. This caused those who were yet living to make him joint heir with their friends or with their children. If he found that such wills had been made, and the makers did not die soon, he declared that they were only making game of him, and sent them poisoned cakes.

36. The remains of the paraphernalia of his spectacles, the furniture of the palace occupied by Augustus and Tiberius, and all the clothes, furniture, slaves, and even freedmen belonging to his sisters whom he banished, were put up at auction, and the

prices were run up so high as to ruin the purchasers. At one of these sales a certain Aponius Saturninus, sitting on a bench, became sleepy and fell to nodding; the emperor noticed it, and told the auctioneer not to overlook the bids of the man who was nodding so often. Every nod was taken as a new bid, and when the sale was over, the dozing bidder found himself in possession of thirteen gladiatorial slaves, for which he was in debt nearly half a million dollars. If the bidding was not prompt enough nor high enough to suit him, he would rail at the bidders for being stingy, and demand if they were not ashamed to be richer than he was.

37. He levied taxes of every kind that he could invent, and no kind of property or person was exempt from some sort of taxation. Much complaint was made that the law for imposing this taxation. had never been published, and that much grievance was caused from

333

want of sufficient knowledge of the law. He then published the law, but had it written in very small characters and posted up in a corner so that nobody could obtain a copy of it. His wife Caesonia gave birth to a daughter, upon which Caligula complained of his poverty, caused by the burdens to which he was subjected, not only as an emperor but as a father, and therefore made a general collection for the support of the child, and gave public notice that he would receive New Year's gifts the first of the following January. At the appointed time he took his station in the vestibule of his palace, and the people of all ranks came and threw to him their presents "by the handfuls and lapfuls. At last, being seized with an invincible desire of feeling money, taking off his slippers he repeatedly walked over great heaps of gold coin spread upon the spacious floor, and then laying himself down, rolled his whole body in gold over and over again." Suetonius. -- 22

38. His cruelty was as deadly as his lust and prodigality were extravagant. At the dedication of that bridge of boats which he built, he spent two days reveling and parading over the bridge. Before his departure, he invited a number of people to come to him on the bridge, all of whom, without distinction of age, or sex, or rank, or character, he caused to be thrown headlong into the sea, "thrusting down with poles and oars those who, to save themselves, had got hold of the rudders of the ship." At one time when meat had risen to very high prices, he commanded that the wild beasts that were kept for the arena, should be fed on criminals, who without distinction as to degrees of crime, were given to be devoured.

39. He seemed to gloat over the thought that the lives of mankind were in his hands, and that at a word he could do what he would. Once at a grand entertainment, at which both the consuls were seated next to him, he suddenly burst out into violent laughter, and when the consuls asked him what he was laughing about, he replied, "Nothing, but that upon a single word of mine you might both have your throats cut." Often, as he kissed or fondled the neck of his wife or mistress, he would exclaim, "So beautiful a throat must be cut whenever I please."

40. All these are but parts of his ways. At last, after indulging more than three years of his savage rage, he was killed by a company of conspirators, with the tribune of the praetorian guards at their head, having reigned three years, ten months, and eight days, and lived twenty-nine years. He was succeeded immediately by Claudius.

41. The soldiers not only killed an emperor, but they made another one. There was at that time living in the palace an uncle to Caligula named Claudius, now fifty years old. Though he seems to have had as much sense as any of them, he was slighted and counted as a fool by those around him. Even his mother, when she would remark upon any one's dulness, would use the comparison, "He is a greater fool than my son Claudius." About the palace he was made the butt of the jests and practical jokes of the courtiers and even of the buffoons. At supper he would cram himself full of victuals, and drink till he was drunk, and then go to sleep at the table. At this, the company would pelt him with olive stones or scraps of victuals; and the buffoons would prod him with a cane, or snip him with a whip to wake him. And when he had gone to sleep, while he lay snoring, they would put slippers on his hands, so that when he should wake and attempt to rub his eyes open, he would rub his face with the slippers.

42. The night that Caligula was killed, Claudius, fearing for his own life, crept into a balcony, and hid himself behind the curtains of the door. The soldiers, rushing through the palace, happened to see his feet sticking out, and one of them grabbed him by the heels, and demanding to know who owned them, dragged forth Claudius; and when he discovered who it was, exclaimed, "Why, this is Germanicus; let's make him emperor!" The other soldiers in the band immediately adopted the idea, saluted him as emperor, set him on a litter, and carried him on their shoulders to the camp of the praetorian guards. The next day, while the Senate deliberated, the people cried out that they would have one master, and that he should be Claudius. The soldiers assembled under arms, and took the oath of allegiance to him, upon which he promised them about seven hundred dollars apiece.

43. By the mildness and correctness of his administration, he soon secured the favor and affection of the whole people. Having once gone a short distance out of the city, a report was spread that he had been waylaid and killed. "The people never ceased cursing the soldiers for traitors, and the Senate as parricides, until one or two persons, and presently after several others, were brought by the magistrates upon the rostra, who assured them that he was alive, and not far from the city, on his way home." -- Suetonius.²³

44. As he sat to judge causes, the lawyers would openly reprove him and make fun of him. One of these one day, making excuses why a witness did not appear, stated that it was impossible for him to appear, but did not tell why. Claudius insisted upon knowing; and, after several questions had been evaded, the statement was brought forth that the man was dead, upon which Claudius replied, "I think that is a sufficient excuse." When

he would start away from the tribunal, they would call him back. If he insisted upon going, they would seize hold of his dress or take him by the heels, and make him stay until they were ready for him to go. A Greek once having a case before him, got into a dispute with him, and called out loud, "You are an old fool;" and a Roman knight once being prosecuted upon a false charge, being provoked at the character of the witnesses brought against him, upbraided Claudius with folly and cruelty, and threw some books and a writing pencil in his face. He pleased the populace with distributions of grain and money, and displays of magnificent games and spectacles.

45. This is the Claudius mentioned in Acts 18:2, who commanded all Jews to depart from Rome. This he did, says Suetonius, because they "were continually making disturbances at the instigation of one Chrestus." These disturbances arose from contentions of the Jews against the Christians about Christ. As the Christians were not yet distinguished from the Jews, the decree of banishment likewise made no distinction, and when he commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, Christians were among them. One of his principal favorites was that Felix, governor of Judea, mentioned in Acts 23:24, who "came with his wife Drusilla which

336

was a Jewess;" before whom Paul pleaded, and who trembled as the apostle "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come."

46. Claudius was not as bad as either Tiberius or Caligula, but what he himself lacked in this respect was amply made up by his wives. "In his marriage, as in all else, Claudius had been pre-eminent in misfortune. He lived in an age of which the most frightful sign of depravity was that its women were, if possible, a shade worse than its men, and it was the misery of Claudius, as it finally proved his ruin, to have been united by marriage to the very worst among them all. Princesses like the Bernice, and the Drusilla, and the Salome, and the Herodias of the sacred historians, were in this age a familiar spectacle; but none of them were so wicked as two at least of Claudius's wives.

47. "He was betrothed or married no less than five times. The lady first destined for his bride had been repudiated because her parents had offended Augustus; the next died on the very day intended for her nuptials. By his first actual wife, Urgulania, whom he had married in early youth, he had two children, Drusus and Claudia. Drusus was accidentally choked in boyhood while trying to swallow a pear which had been thrown up into the air. Very shortly after the birth of Claudia, discovering the unfaithfulness of Urgulania, Claudius divorced her, and ordered the child to be stripped naked and exposed to die. His second wife, Aelia Petina, seems to have been an unsuitable person, and her also he divorced. His third and fourth wives lived to earn a colossal infamy -- Valeria Messalina for her shameless character, Agrippina the younger for her unscrupulous ambition.

48. "Messalina, when she married, could scarcely have been fifteen years old, yet she at once assumed a dominant position, and secured it by means of the most unblushing

wickedness. But she did not reign so absolutely undisturbed as to be without her own jealousies and apprehensions; and these were mainly kindled by Julia and Agrippina, the two nieces of the emperor. They were, no less than herself, beautiful, brilliant, and evil-hearted women, quite ready to make their own coteries, and to dispute, as far as they dared, the

337

supremacy of a bold but reckless rival. They, too, used their arts, their wealth, their rank, their political influence, their personal fascinations, to secure for themselves a band of adherents, ready, when the proper moment arrived, for any conspiracy. . . .

49. "The life of this beautiful princess, short as it was, -- for she died at a very early age, -- was enough to make her name a proverb of everlasting infamy. For a time she appeared irresistible. Her personal fascination had won for her an unlimited sway over the facile mind of Claudius, and she had either won over by her intrigues, or terrified by her pitiless severity, the noblest of the Romans and the most powerful of the freedmen." -- Farrar.²⁴

50. Messalina finally, in the very extravagance of her wickedness, became "so vehemently enamored of Caius Silius, the handsomest of the Roman youth, that she obliged him to divorce his wife, Julia Silana, a lady of high quality," that she might have him to herself. And while Claudius was absent, she with royal ceremony, publicly celebrated her marriage with Silius. When Claudius learned of it and had returned, she was given the privilege of killing herself. She plied the dagger twice but failed, and then a tribune ran her through with his sword. Word was carried to Claudius while he was sitting at a feast, that Messalina was no more, to which he made neither reply nor inquiry, "but called for a cup of wine and proceeded in the usual ceremonies of the feast, nor did he, indeed, during the following days, manifest any symptom of disgust or joy, of resentment or sorrow, nor, in short, of any human affection; not when he beheld the accusers of his wife exulting at her death; not when he looked upon her mourning children." -- Tacitus.²⁵

51. Messalina was dead; but bad as she had been, a worse woman took her place. This was Agrippina, sister of Caligula, niece of Claudius, and the mother of Nero. "Whatever there was of possible affection in the tigress nature of Agrippina was now absorbed in the person of her child. For that child, from its cradle to her own death by his means, she toiled and sinned. The fury of

338

her own ambition, inextricably linked with the uncontrollable fierceness of her love for this only son, henceforth directed every action of her life. Destiny had made her the sister of one emperor; intrigue elevated her into the wife of another; her own crimes made her the mother of a third.

52. "And at first sight her career might have seemed unusually successful; for while still in the prime of life she was wielding, first in the name of her husband, and then in that of her son, no mean share in the absolute government of the Roman world. But mean while that same unerring retribution, whose stealthy footsteps in the rear of the triumphant criminal we can track through page after page of history, was stealing nearer and nearer to her with uplifted hand. When she had reached the dizzy pinnacle of gratified love and pride to which she had waded through so many a deed of sin and blood, she was struck down into terrible ruin and violent, shameful death by the hand of that very son for whose sake she had so often violated the laws of virtue and integrity, and spurned so often the pure and tender obligation which even the heathen had been taught by the voice of God within their conscience to recognize and to adore.

53. "Intending that her son should marry Octavia, the daughter of Claudius, her first step was to drive to death Silanus, a young nobleman to whom Octavia had already been betrothed. Her next care was to get rid of all rivals, possible or actual. Among the former were the beautiful Calpurnia and her own sister-in-law, Domitia Lepida. Among the latter was the wealthy Lollia Paulina, against whom she trumped up an accusation of sorcery and treason, upon which her wealth was confiscated, but her life spared by the emperor, who banished her from Italy.

54. "This half vengeance was not enough for the mother of Nero. Like the daughter of Herodias in sacred history, she despatched a tribune with orders to bring her the head of her enemy; and when it was brought to her, and she found a difficulty in recognizing those withered and ghastly features of a once celebrated beauty, she is said with her own hand to have lifted one of the lips, and to have satisfied herself that this was indeed the head of Lollia. . . . Well may Adolf Stahr observe that Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth

339

and husband-murdering Gertrude are mere children by the side of this awful giant-shape of steely feminine cruelty." -- Farrar.²⁶

55. By the horrible crimes and fearful sinning of Agrippina, Nero became emperor of Rome, A. D. 57, at the age of seventeen. As in the account already given there is enough to show what the Roman monarchy really was, and as that is the purpose of this chapter, it is not necessary any further to portray the frightful enormities of individual emperors. It is sufficient to say of Nero that in degrading vices, shameful licentiousness, and horrid cruelty, he transcended all who had been before him.

56. It is evident that for the production of such men as Antony and Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, Claudius and Nero, with such women as were their mothers and wives, -- to say nothing of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Domitian, who quickly followed, -- in direct succession and in so short a time, there must of necessity have been a condition of society in general which corresponded to the nature of the product. Such was in fact the case.

57. "An evil day is approaching when it becomes recognized in a community that the only standard of social distinction is wealth. That day was soon followed in Rome by its unavoidable consequence, a government founded upon two domestic elements, -- corruption and terrorism. No language can describe the state of that capital after the civil wars. The accumulation of power and wealth gave rise to a universal depravity. Law ceased to be of any value. A suitor must deposit a bribe before a trial could be had. The social fabric was a festering mass of rottenness. The people had become a populace; the aristocracy was demoniac; the city was a hell. No crime that the annals of human wickedness can show was left unperpetrated: remorseless murders; the betrayal of parents, husbands, wives, friends; poisoning reduced to a system; adultery degenerating into incests and crimes that can not be written.

58. "Women of the higher class were so lascivious, depraved, and dangerous, that men could not be compelled to contract matrimony with them; marriage was displaced by concubinage; even virgins were guilty of inconceivable immodesties; great officers of

340

State and ladies of the court, of promiscuous bathings and naked exhibitions. In the time of Caesar it had become necessary for the government to interfere and actually put a premium on marriage. He gave rewards to women who had many children; prohibited those who were under forty-five years of age, and who had no children, from wearing jewels and riding in litters, hoping by such social disabilities to correct the evil.

59. "It went on from bad to worse, so that Augustus, in view of the general avoidance of legal marriage and resort to concubinage with slaves, was compelled to impose penalties on the unmarried -- to enact that they should not inherit by will except from relations. Not that the Roman women refrained from the gratification of their desires; their depravity impelled them to such wicked practises as can not be named in a modern book. They actually reckoned the years, not by the consuls, but by the men they had lived with. To be childless, and therefore without the natural restraint of a family, was looked upon as a singular felicity. Plutarch correctly touched the point when he said that the Romans married to be heirs and not to have heirs.

60. "Of offenses that do not rise to the dignity of atrocity, but which excite our loathing, such as gluttony and the most debauched luxury, the annals of the times furnish disgusting proofs. It was said, 'They eat that they may vomit, and vomit that they may eat.' At the taking of Perusium, three hundred of the most distinguished citizens were solemnly sacrificed at the altar of Divus Julius by Octavian. Are these the deeds of civilized men, or the riotings of cannibals drunk with blood?

61. "The higher classes on all sides exhibited a total extinction of moral principle; the lower were practical atheists. Who can peruse the annals of the emperors without being shocked at the manner in which men died, meeting their fate with the obtuse tranquillity that characterizes beasts? A centurion with a private mandate appears, and forthwith the victim opens his veins, and dies in a warm bath. At the best, all that was done was to

strike at the tyrant. Men despairingly acknowledged that the system itself was utterly past cure.

341

62. "That in these statements I do not exaggerate, hear what Tacitus says: `The holy ceremonies of religion were violated, adultery reigning without control; the adjacent islands filled with exiles; rocks and desert places stained with clandestine murders, and Rome itself a theater of horrors, where nobility of descent and splendor of fortune marked men out for destruction; where the vigor of mind that aimed at civil dignities, and the modesty that declined them, were offenses without distinction; where virtue was a crime that led to certain ruin; where the guilt of informers and the wages of their iniquity were alike detestable; where the sacerdotal order, the consular dignity, the government of provinces, and even the cabinet of the prince, were seized by that execrable race as their lawful prey; where nothing was sacred, nothing safe from the hand of rapacity; where slaves were suborned, or by their own malevolence excited against their masters; where freemen betrayed their patrons, and he who had lived without an enemy died by the treachery of a friend.'" -- Draper.²⁷

63. To complete this dreadful picture requires but the touch of Inspiration: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

64. "For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

65. "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication,

342

wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death; not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."²⁸

66. When this scripture was read by the Christians at Rome, they knew from daily observation that it was but a faithful description of Roman society as it was. And Roman society as it was, was but the resultant of pagan civilization, and the logic, in its last analysis, of the pagan religion. Roman society as it was, was ULTIMATE PAGANISM.

1[Page 320] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. iii, par. 37.

2[Page 321] Id., notes.

3[Page 321] Essays, "The Caesars," chap. vi, last sentence; Introduction, par. 12.

4[Page 322] "Lives of the Caesars," chap. xii.

5[Page 323] Id., chap. xiii; Merivales' "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxii, par 4.

6[Page 323] Id., chap. lxix.

7[Page 323] "Lives of the Caesars," Augustus, chap. lxv.

8[Page 324] "History of Rome," chap. lxxii, sec. 1 par. 9.

9[Page 324] "Lives of the Caesars," Tiberius, chap. xxiv.

10[Page 325] Id., chap. xxv.

11[Page 325] "Annals," book iii, chap. lxv.

12[Page 325] Id., book i, chap. lxxii.

13[Page 326] "History of Rome," chap. lxxiii, par. 2.

14[Page 326] "Annals," book iv, chap. xxx.

15[Page 327] Id., book vi, chap. 19.

16[Page 328] "Lives of the Caesars," Tiberius, chaps. xlviii, xlix.

17[Page 329] "Lives of the Caesars," Tiberius, chaps. lxi, lxii.

18[Page 329] "Annals," book vi, chap. xx.

19[Page 329] "Lives of the Caesars," Caligula, chaps. xiii. xv.

20[Page 330] Id., chap. xxii.

21[Page 330] Id.

22[Page 333] Id., chap. xiii.

23[Page 335] "Lives of the Caesars," Claudius, chap. xii.

24[Page 337] "Seekers after God," chap. vi, pars. 28-32; chap.

25[Page 337] "Annals," book xi, chaps. xii, xxxviii.

26[Page 339] "Seekers after God," chap. x. par. 5.

27[Page 341] "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. viii, pars. 22-24.

28[Page 342] Rom. 1:22-32.

25. ROME -- AGAINST CHRISTIANITY.

THAT which Rome was in its supreme place, the other cities of the empire -- Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, etc. -- were in their narrower spheres; for it was the licentiousness of Greece and the East which had given to the corruption of Rome a deeper dye.

2. Into that world of iniquity, Jesus Christ sent, as sheep among wolves, a little band of disciples carrying hope to the despairing, joy to the sorrowing, comfort to the afflicted, relief to the distressed, peace to the perplexed, and to all a message of merciful forgiveness of sins, of the gift of the righteousness of God, and of a purity and power which would cleanse the soul from all unrighteousness of heart and life, and plant there instead the perfect purity of the life of the Son of God and the courage of an everlasting joy. This gospel of peace and of the power of God unto salvation they were commanded to go into all the world and preach to every creature.

3. The disciples went everywhere preaching the word, and before the death of men who were then in the prime of life this good news of the grace of God had actually been preached in all the then known world.¹ And by it many of all peoples, nations, and languages were brought to the knowledge of the peace and power of God, revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ. "In every congregation there were prayers to God that he would listen to the sighing of the prisoner and captive, and have mercy on those who were ready to die. For the slave and his master there was one law and one hope, one baptism, one Saviour, one Judge. In times of domestic bereavement the Christian slave doubtless often consoled his pagan mistress with the suggestion that our present separations

344

are only for a little while, and revealed to her willing ear that there is another world -- a land in which we rejoin our dead. How is it possible to arrest the spread of a faith which can make the broken heart leap with joy?" -- Draper.² Yet to arrest the spread of that faith there were many long, earnest, and persistent efforts by the Roman Empire.

4. So long as the Christians were confounded with the Jews, no persecution befell them from the Roman State, because the Roman Empire had recognized the Jewish religion as lawful; consequently when the Emperor Claudius commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, Christians were included among them, as for instance, Aquilina and Priscilla.³ And when in Corinth, under Gallio the Roman governor of the province of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection against Paul upon the charge that "this fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law," Gallio replied: "If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you: but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters." And with this, "he drave them from the judgment seat." Also when the centurion Lysias had rescued Paul from the murderous Jews in Jerusalem, and would send him for

protection to Felix the governor, he wrote to Felix thus: "When I would have known the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their council: whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds."

5. To please the Jews, Felix left Paul in prison. When Festus came in and had given him a hearing, and would bring his case before King Agrippa, he spoke thus of the matter: "There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix: about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and the elders of the Jews informed me, desiring to have judgment against him. To whom I answered, It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."

345

Therefore, when they were come hither, without any delay on the morrow I sat on the judgment seat, and commanded the man to be brought forth. Against whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these matters. But when Paul had appealed to be reserved unto the hearing of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept till I might send him to Caesar." And when Agrippa had heard him, the unanimous decision was, "This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds;" and Agrippa declared, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar."4

6. And even when he had been heard twice by Caesar, -- Nero, -- as it was still but a controversy between Jews concerning questions of their own, the Roman power refused to take cognizance of the case, and Paul, a Christian, was released. But when Christianity had spread among the Gentiles, and a clear distinction was made and recognized between the Christians and the Jews by all parties, and Christianity appeared as a new religion not recognized by the Roman law, then came the persecution of Christians by the Romans.

7. The controversy between the Christians and the Romans was not a dispute between individuals, nor a contention between sects or parties. It was a contest between antagonistic principles. It was, therefore, a contest between Christianity and Rome, rather than between Christians and Romans. On the part of Christianity it was the proclamation of the principle of genuine liberty; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of genuine despotism. On the part of Christianity it was the assertion of the principle of the rights of conscience and of the individual; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of the absolute absorption of the individual, and his total enslavement to the State in all things, divine as well as human, religious as well as civil.

346

8. Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free, and to plant in their souls the genuine principle of liberty, -- liberty actuated by love, liberty too honorable to allow itself to be used as an occasion to the flesh or for a cloak of maliciousness, liberty led by a conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God, liberty in which man may be free from all men, yet made so gentle by love that he would willingly become the servant of all, in order to bring them to the enjoyment of this same liberty. This is freedom indeed. This is the freedom which Christ gave to man; for "whom the Son makes free is free indeed."

9. In giving to men this freedom, such an infinite gift could have no other result than that which Christ intended; namely, to bind them in everlasting, unquestioning, unswerving allegiance to Him as the royal benefactor of the race. He thus reveals himself to men as the highest good, and brings them to himself as the manifestation of that highest good, and to obedience to His will as, the perfection of conduct.

10. Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh. Thus God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, that they might know Him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He sent. He gathered to himself disciples, instructed them in His heavenly doctrine, endued them with power from on high, sent them forth into all the world to preach this gospel of freedom to every creature, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them.

11. The Roman Empire then filled the world, -- "the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has upon this planet been suffered to appear." That empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine. In the Roman view, the State took precedence of everything. It was entirely out of respect to the State and wholly to preserve the State, that either the emperors or the laws ever forbade the exercise of the Christian religion. According to Roman principles, the State was the highest idea of good. "The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics, and within that was

347

included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity, was made dependent on this." -- Neander.⁵

12. Man with all that he had was subordinated to the State; he must have no higher aim than to be a servant of the State; he must seek no higher good than that which the State could bestow. Thus every Roman citizen has a subject, and every Roman subject was a slave. "The more distinguished a Roman became, the less was he a free man. The omnipotence of the law, the despotism of the rule, drove him into a narrow circle of thought and action, and his credit and influence depended on the sad austerity of his life. The whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of the Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be the obedient servant of the State." -- Mommsen.⁶

13. It will be seen at once that for any man to profess the principles and the name of Christ was virtually to set himself against the Roman Empire. For him to recognize God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the highest good, was but treason against the Roman State. It was not looked upon by Rome as anything else than high treason; because, as the Roman State represented to the Roman the highest idea of good, for any man to assert that there was a higher good, was to make Rome itself subordinate. And this would not be looked upon in any other light by Roman pride than as a direct blow at the dignity of Rome, and subversive of the Roman State. Consequently the Christians were not only called "atheists," because they denied the gods, but the accusation against them before the tribunals was of the crime of "high treason," because they denied the right of the State to interfere with men's relations to God. The common accusation against them was that they were "irreverent to the Caesars, and enemies of the Caesars and of the Roman people."

14. To the Christian, the word of God asserted with absolute authority: "Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."⁷ To him, obedience to this word through

348

faith in Christ was eternal life. This to him was the conduct which showed his allegiance to God as the highest good, -- a good as much higher than that of the Roman State as the government of God is greater than was the government of Rome.

15. This idea of the State was not merely the State as a civil institution, but as a divine institution, and the highest conception of divinity itself. The genius of Rome was the supreme deity. Thus the idea of the State as the highest good was the religious idea; consequently religion was inseparable from the State. All religious views were to be held subordinate to the State, and all religion was only the servant of the State.

16. The genius of the Roman State being to the Roman mind the chief deity, since Rome had conquered all nations, it was demonstrated to the Roman mind that Rome was superior to all the gods that were known. And though Rome allowed conquered nations to maintain the worship of their national gods, these as well as the conquered people were considered only as servants of the Rome, State. Every religion was held subordinate to the religion of Roman, and though "all forms of religion might come to Rome and take their places in its pantheon, they must come as the servants of the State."

17. The State being the Roman's conception of the highest good, Rome's own gods derived all their dignity from the fact that they were recognized as such by the State. It was counted by the Romans an act of the greatest condescension and an evidence of the greatest possible favor to bestow State recognition upon any foreign gods, or to allow any Roman subject to worship any other gods than those which were recognized as such by the Roman State. A fundamental maxim of Roman legislation was, --

"No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws." -- Cicero.⁸

18. Again: the Roman State being the supreme deity, "the Senate and people" were but the organs through which its ideas

349

were expressed; hence the maxim, *Vox populi, vox dei*, -- the voice of the people is the voice of God. As this voice gave expression to the will of the supreme deity, and consequently of the highest good, and as this will was expressed in the form of laws, hence again the Roman maxim, "What the law says is right."

19. It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The State was everything, and the majority was in fact the State. What the majority said should be, that was the voice of the State, that was the voice of God, that was the expression of the highest good, that was the expression of the highest conception of right; and everybody must assent to that or be considered a traitor to the State. The individual was but a part of the State. There was therefore no such thing as the rights of the people; the right of the State only was to be considered, and that was to be considered absolute. "The first principle of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen. Whether as head of a family, or as proprietor, he had no natural rights of his own; his privileges were created by the law as well as defined by it. The State in the plenitude of her power delegated a portion of her own irresponsibility to the citizen, who satisfied the conditions she required in order to become the parent of her children; but at the same time she demanded of him the sacrifice of his free agency to her own rude ideas of political expediency." -- Merivale.⁹

20. It is also evident that in such a system there was no such thing as the rights of conscience; because as the State was supreme also in the realm of religion, all things religious were to be subordinated to the will of the State, which was but the will of the majority. And where the majority presumes to decide in matters of religion, there is no such thing as rights of religion or conscience. Against this whole system Christianity was diametrically opposed, --

21. First, In its assertion of the supremacy of God; in the idea of God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the highest idea of good; in the will of God as expressed in His law as the highest conception of right; and in the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments as the whole duty of man.

350

22. Christ had set himself before His disciples as the one possessing all power in heaven and in earth. He had told them to go into all the world and teach to every creature all things whatsoever He had commanded them. Christ had said that the first of all the

commandments, that which inculcates the highest and first of all duties, is, "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." This put Jesus Christ above the State, and put allegiance to Him above allegiance to the State; this denied the supremacy of Rome, and likewise denied either that the Roman gods were gods at all or that the genius of Rome itself was in any sense a god.

23. Secondly, When the republic as represented by the Senate and people of Rome was merged in the imperial power, and the emperor became the embodiment of the State, he represented the dignity, the majesty, and the power of the State, and likewise, in that, represented the divinity of the State. Hence divinity attached to the Caesars.

24. Christianity was directly opposed to this, as shown by the word of Christ, who, when asked by the Pharisees and the Herodians whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not, answered: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." In this, Christ established a clear distinction between Caesar and God, and between religion and the State. He separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to the State. Only that which was Caesar's was to be rendered to Caesar, while that which is God's was to be rendered to God, and with no reference whatever to Caesar.

25. The State being divine, and the Caesar reflecting this divinity, whatever was God's was Caesar's. Therefore when Christ made this distinction between God and Caesar, separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to Caesar, and commanded men to render to God that which is God's, and to Caesar only that which is Caesar's, He at once stripped Caesar -- the State -- of every attribute of divinity. And in doing this He declared the supremacy of the individual conscience; because it rests with the individual to decide what things they are which pertain to God.

351

26. Thus Christianity proclaimed the right of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience; Rome asserted the duty of every man to worship according to the dictates of the State. Christianity asserted the supremacy of God; Rome asserted the supremacy of the State. Christianity set forth God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the chief good; Rome held the State to be the highest good. Christianity set forth the law of God as the expression of the highest conception of right; Rome held the law of the State to be the expression of the highest idea of right. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments is the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State is the whole duty of man. Christianity preached Christ as the sole possessor of power in heaven and in earth; Rome declared the State to be the highest power. Christianity separated that which is God's from that which is Caesar's; Rome maintained that that which is God's is Caesar's.

27. This was the contest, and these were the reasons of it, between Christianity and the Roman Empire.

28. Yet in all this, Christianity did not deny to Caesar a place; it did not propose to undo the State. It only taught to the State its proper place, and proposed to have the State take that place and keep it. Christianity did not dispute the right of the Roman State to be; it only denied the right of that State to be in the place of God. In the very words in which He separated between that which is Caesar's and that which is God's, Christ recognized the rightfulness of Caesar's existence; and that there were things that rightfully belong to Caesar, and which were to be rendered to him by Christians. He said, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." In these words He certainly recognized that Caesar had jurisdiction in certain things, and that within that jurisdiction he was to be respected. As Caesar represented the State, in this scripture the phrase represents the State, whether it be the State of Rome or any other State on earth. This is simply the statement of the right of civil government to be; that there are certain things over which civil government has jurisdiction; and that in these things the authority of civil government is to be respected.

352

29. This jurisdiction is more clearly defined in Paul's letter to the Romans, chap. 13:1-10. There it is commanded, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." In this is asserted the right of the higher powers -- that is, the right of the State -- to exercise authority, and that Christians must be subject to that authority. Further it is given as a reason for this, that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."

30. This asserts not only the right of the State to be and to exercise authority, it also asserts the truth that the State is an ordinance of God, and that the power which it exercises is ordained of God. Yet in this very assertion Christianity was held to be antagonistic to Rome, because it put the God of the Christians above the Roman State, and made the State to be only an ordinance of the God of the Christians. For the Roman Empire, or for any of the Roman emperors, to have recognized the truth of this statement, would have been at once to revolutionize the whole system of civil and religious economy of the Romans, and to deny at once the value of the accumulated wisdom of all the generations of the Roman ages. Yet that was the only proper alternative of the Roman State, and that is what ought to have been done. Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the right of God to "change the king's word" in behalf of the freedom of the conscience of the individual.

31. Civil government being thus declared to be of God, and its authority ordained of God, the instruction proceeds: "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Governments being of God, and their authority being ordained of God, Christians in respecting God will necessarily respect, in its place, the exercise of the authority ordained

by Him; but this authority, according to the words of Christ, is to be exercised only in those things which are Caesar's, and not in things which pertain to God. Accordingly, the letter to the Romans proceeds: "For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." This connects Paul's argument directly with that of Christ above referred to, and shows

353

that this is but a comment on that statement, and an extension of the argument therein contained.

32. The scripture proceeds: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

33. Let it be borne in mind that the apostle is here writing to Christians concerning the respect and duty which they are to render to the powers that be, that is, to the State in fact. He knew full well, and so did those to whom he wrote, that there are other commandments in the very law of which a part is here quoted. But he and they likewise knew that these other commandments do not in any way relate to any man's duty or respect to the powers that be. Those other commandments of the law which is here partly quoted, relate to God and to man's duty to Him. One of them is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" another, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc.; another, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" and another, "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," etc.; and these are briefly comprehended in that saying, namely, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." According to the words of the Christ, all these obligations, pertaining solely to God, are to be rendered to Him only, and with man in this realm, Caesar can never of right have anything to do in any way whatever.

34. As, therefore, the instruction in Rom. 13:1-10 is given to Christians concerning their duty and respect to the powers that be, and as this instruction is confined absolutely to man's relationship to his fellow men, it is evident that when Christians have paid their

354

taxes, and have shown proper respect to their fellow men, then their obligation, their duty, and their respect, to the powers that be, have been fully discharged, and those powers never can rightly have any further jurisdiction over their conduct. This is not to say that the State has jurisdiction of the last six commandments as such. It is only to say

that the jurisdiction of the State is confined solely to man's conduct toward man, and never can touch his relationship to God, even under the second table of the law.

35. This doctrine asserts the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, as he pleases, and when he pleases. Just this, however, was the subject of the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman Empire. There was never any honest charge made that the Christians did violence to any man, or refused to pay tribute. The direct and positive instruction was not only that they should do no evil, but that they should speak no evil of any man; and that they practised accordingly is shown by Pliny's letter to Trajan concerning the Christians, in which he says that when they met and partook of that harmless meal, before they separated they pledged one another not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to do violence to any man.

36. Pliny the Younger was governor of the province of Bithynia. In that province he found Christianity so prevalent that the worship of the gods was almost deserted. He undertook to correct this irregularity; but this being a new sort of business with him, he was soon involved in questions that he could not easily decide to his own satisfaction, and he concluded to address the emperor for the necessary instructions. He therefore wrote to Trajan as follows: --

"Sir: It is my constant method to apply myself to you for the resolution of all my doubts; for who can better govern my dilatory way of proceeding or instruct my ignorance? I have never been present at the examination of the Christians [by others], on which account I am unacquainted with what uses to be inquired into, and what and how far they used to be punished; nor are my doubts small, whether there be not a distinction to be made between the ages [of the accused], and whether tender youth ought to have the same punishment with strong men? Whether there be not room for pardon upon repentance? or whether it may not be an advantage to one that had been a Christian, that he has

355

forsaken Christianity? whether the bare name, without any crimes besides, or the crimes adhering to that name, be to be punished? In the meantime I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as Christians: I asked them whether they were Christians or not. If they confessed that they were Christians, I asked them again, and a third time, intermixing threatening with the questions. If they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed; for I did not doubt but, let their confessions be of any sort whatsoever, this positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished. There have been some of this mad sect whom I took notice of in particular as Roman citizens, that they might be sent to that city. After some time, as is usual in such examinations, the crime spread itself, and many more cases came before me. A libel was sent to me, though without an author, containing many names [of persons accused]. These denied that they were Christians now, or ever had been. They called upon the gods, and supplicated to your image, which I caused to be brought to me for that purpose, with frankincense and wine; they also cursed Christ; none of which things, it is said, can any

of those that are really Christians be compelled to do; so I thought fit to let them go. Others of them that were named in the libel, said they were Christians, but presently denied it again; that indeed they had been Christians, but had ceased to be so, some three years, some many more; and one there was that said he had not been so these twenty years. All these worshiped your image and the images of our gods; these also cursed Christ. However, they assured me that the main of their fault, or of their mistake, was this: That they were wont, on a stated day, to meet together before it was light, and to sing a hymn to Christ, as to a god, alternately; and to oblige themselves by a sacrament [or oath] not to do anything that was ill; but that they would commit no theft, or pilfering, or adultery; that they would not break their promises, or deny what was deposited with them, when it was required back again; after which it was their custom to depart, and to meet again at a common but innocent meal, which they had left off upon that edict which I published at your command, and wherein I had forbidden any such conventicles. These examinations made me think it necessary to inquire by torments what the truth was; which I did of two servant-maids, who were called "deaconesses;" but still I discovered no more than that they were addicted to a bad and to an extravagant superstition. Hereupon I have put off any further examinations, and have recourse to you; for the affair seems to be well worth consultation, especially on account of the number of those that are in danger; for there are many of every age, of every rank, and of both sexes, who are now and hereafter likely to be called to account, and to be in danger; for this superstition is spread like a contagion, not only into cities and towns, but into country villages also, which yet there is reason to hope may be stopped and corrected. To be sure, the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin already to be frequented; and the holy solemnities, which were long intermitted, begin to be revived.

356

The sacrifices begin to sell well everywhere, of which very few purchasers had of late appeared; whereby it is easy to suppose how great a multitude of men may be amended, if place for repentance be admitted."

37. To this letter Trajan replied: --

"My Pliny: You have taken the method which you ought, in examining the causes of those that had been accused as Christians; for indeed no certain and general form of judging can be ordained in this case. These people are not to be sought for; but if they be accused and convicted, they are to be punished, but with this caution: that he who denies himself to be a Christian, and makes it plain that he is not so, by supplicating to our gods, although he had been so formerly, may be allowed pardon, upon his repentance. As for libels sent without an author, they ought to have no place in any accusation whatsoever; for that would be a thing of very ill example, and not agreeable to my reign."¹⁰

38. The Roman State never had any just charge to bring against the Christians of doing any wrong to any man. The charge was "atheism," because they denied the gods, and "high treason," because they denied the right of the State to rule in things pertaining to God. Therefore, as a matter of fact, the whole controversy between Christianity and the

Roman Empire was upon the simple question of the rights of conscience, -- the question whether it is the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, or whether it is his duty to worship according to the dictates of the State.

39. This question was then, as it has always been, very far-reaching. When the right was claimed to worship according to the dictates of conscience, in that was claimed the right to disregard all the Roman laws on the subject of religion, and to deny the right of the State to have anything whatever to do with the question of religion. But this, according to the Roman estimate, was only to bid defiance to the State and to the interests of society altogether. The Roman State, so intimately and intricately connected with religion, was but the reflection of the character of the Roman people, who prided themselves upon being the most religious of all nations, and Cicero commended them for this, because their religion was carried into all the details of life.

357

40. "The Roman ceremonial worship was very elaborate and minute, applying to every part of daily life. It consisted in sacrifices, prayers, festivals, and the investigations by auguries and haruspices, of the will of the gods and the course of future events. The Romans accounted themselves an exceedingly religious people, because their religion was so intimately connected with the affairs of home and State Thus religion everywhere met the public life of the Roman by its festivals, and laid an equal yoke on his private life by its requisition of sacrifices, prayers, and auguries. All pursuits must be conducted according to a system carefully laid down by the College Pontiffs If a man went out to walk, there was a form to be recited; if he mounted his chariot, another." -- James Freeman Clarke.¹¹

41. But this whole system of religion was false. The gods which they worshiped were false gods. Their gods, in short, were but reflections of themselves; and the ceremonies of worship were but the exercise of their own passions and lusts. Neither in their gods nor their worship was there a single element of good. Therefore upon it all Christianity taught the people to turn their backs. The Christian doctrine declared all these gods to be no gods; and all the forms of worship of the gods to be only idolatry and a denial of the only true God -- the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

42. The games and all the festival days were affairs of State, and "were an essential part of the cheerful devotion of the pagans, and the gods were supposed to accept, as the most grateful offering, the games that the prince and people celebrated in honor of their peculiar festivals." -- Gibbon.¹²

43. The festivities of the wedding and the ceremonies of the funeral were all conducted under the protection of the gods. More than this, "the number of the gods was as great as the number of the incidents in earthly life." -- Mommsen.¹³ The "pagan's domestic hearth was guarded by the penates, or by the ancestral gods of his family or tribe. By land he traveled under the protection

of one tutelar divinity, by sea another; the birth, the bridal, the funeral, had each its presiding deity; the very commonest household utensils were cast in mythological forms; he could scarcely drink without being reminded of making a libation to the gods." -- Milman.¹⁴ All this heathen ceremony, Christianity taught the people to renounce. And every one did renounce it who became a Christian. He had to renounce it to become a Christian. But so intricately were idolatrous forms interwoven into all the associations of both public and private life, of both State and social action, that "it seemed impossible to escape the observance of them without at the same time renouncing the commerce of mankind and all the offices and amusements of society." Yet with any of it true Christianity did not compromise.

44. Every Christian, merely by the profession of Christianity, severed himself from all the gods of Rome and everything that was done in their honor. He could not attend a wedding or a funeral of his nearest relatives, because every ceremony was performed with reference to the gods. He could not attend the public festival, for the same reason. Nor could he escape by absenting himself on such occasions; because on days of public festivity, the doors of the houses, and the lamps about them, and the heads of the dwellers therein, must all be adorned with laurel and garlands of flowers in honor of the licentious gods and goddesses of Rome. If the Christian took part in these services, he paid honor to the gods as did the other heathen. If he refused to do so, which he must do if he would obey God and honor Christ, he made himself conspicuous before the eyes of the people, all of whom were intensely jealous of the respect they thought due to the gods. Also, in so refusing, the Christians disobeyed the Roman law, which commanded these things to be done.

45. All this subjected the Christians to universal hatred, and as the laws positively forbade everything that the Christians taught, both with reference to the gods and to the State, the forms of law furnished a ready channel through which this hatred found vent. This was the open way for the fury of the populace to spend itself

upon the "deniers of the gods, and enemies of the Caesars and of the Roman people." And this was the source of the persecution of Christianity by pagan Rome.

46. Before Christ was born into the world, Maecenas, one of the two chief ministers of Augustus, had given to that first of Roman emperors the following counsel, as embodying the principle which should characterize the imperial government: --

"Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same; but hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular; not alone for the sake of the gods, because whoever despises them is incapable of reverence for anything else; but because such persons, by introducing new divinities, mislead many to adopt also foreign laws."¹⁵

47. The Christians did refuse to worship the gods according to the laws, or in any other way; they did introduce that which was pre-eminently alien to all the Roman customs in this particular; they did despise the gods. In the presence of the purity, the goodness, and the inherent holiness of Jesus Christ, the Christians could have no other feeling than that of abhorrence for the wicked, cruel, and licentious gods of the heathen. Yet when from love for Christ they shrank in abhorrence from this idolatry, it only excited to bitter hatred the lovers of the licentious worship of the insensate gods; and as above stated, there was the law, and there the machinery of the State, ready to be used in giving force to the religious enmity thus excited.

48. One of the ruling principles of law in the Roman State was this: --

"Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death."¹⁶

49. Nothing could be more directly condemned by this law than was Christianity.

360

50. (1) It was wholly a new religion, one never before heard of; it was not in any sense a national religion; but was ever announced as that which should be universal. Being so entirely new, in the nature of the case its tendency and character were unknown to the Roman laws.

51. (2) Of all religions the world has ever known, Christianity appeals most directly to the minds of men. The first of all the commandments demanding the obedience of men declares, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind." The law of God was set forth as the highest conception of right, and the letter to all the Christians in Rome said, "With the mind. I myself serve the law of God." Again that same letter said, "Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind."¹⁷ Again and again in the Christian writings this same-idea was set forth, and it was all summed up in the saying of Christ to the woman of Samaria, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit;" thus setting God before the mind to be discerned only by the mind, and worshiped in a mental and spiritual conception only.

52. (3) The Christians were almost wholly from the lower ranks. The common people heard Christ gladly; so also did they hear His gracious gospel from His disciples. There was yet a further disadvantage, however, in the position of the Christians. Christianity had sprung from among the Jews. It had been despised by the Jews. The Jews were viewed by the Romans as the most despicable of all people. Therefore, as the Christians were despised by the Jews, who were despised by the Romans, it followed that to the Romans the Christians were the despised of the despised. It was but the record of a literal fact which Paul wrote: "We are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of

all things unto this day."18 The law declared that if those who did what the statute forbade belonged to the lower ranks, they were to be punished with death; and as the Christians were mostly from the lower ranks, death became the most common penalty incurred by the profession of Christianity.

361

53. There was yet another consideration: These laws had all been framed, and the system had been established, long before there were any Christians in the world. Therefore the teaching of the Christians, their practise, and their disregard of the Roman laws, appeared to the Romans in no other light than as an open insurrection against the government, and an attempt at the dissolution of society itself.

54. The persecution of the Christians, having its foundation principle in the system of laws and government of Rome, proceeded from four distinct causes and from four distinct sources.

55. First, from the populace. The Christians refused. to pay any respect or honor whatever to the gods to whom the people were devoted in every act and relationship of life. They were charged at once with being atheists and enemies of the gods, and therefore with being the direct cause of all the calamities and misfortunes that might befall anybody from any source. Everything in nature, as well as in the life of the individual, was presided over by some particular deity, and therefore whatever, out of the natural order, might happen in the course of the seasons or in the life of the individual, was held to be a token of the anger of the insulted gods, which was only to be appeased by the punishment of the Christians.

56. If the fall of rain was long delayed, so that crops and pastures suffered, it was laid to the charge of the Christians. If when rain did come, there was too much, so that the rivers overflowed and did damage, they charged this likewise to the Christians. If there was an earthquake or a famine, the Christians' disrespect to the gods was held to be the cause of it. If an epidemic broke out, if there was an invasion by the barbarians, or if any public calamity occurred, it was all attributed to the anger of the gods, which was visited upon the State and the people on account of the spread of Christianity.

57. For instance, Esculapius was the god of healing, and as late as the time of Diocletian, when a plague had spread far through the empire and continued a long time, Porphyry, who made strong pretensions to being a philosopher, actually argued that the reason why the plague could not be checked was that the spread of Christianity

362

had destroyed the influence of Esculapius. When such things as this were soberly announced as the opinion of the wise, it can readily be understood how strong a hold the same superstition had upon the minds of the common heathen.

58. The turning away of individuals from the worship of the gods, and their renouncing all respect for them, and holding as idolaters only, those who would show respect to them, excited the most bitter feelings in the great mass of the people. When there was added to the calamities and misfortunes that might befall, which were held to be but a manifestation of the anger of the gods, and their sympathy with the people in their antagonism to Christianity, -- all these things tended only to deepen that feeling of bitterness, and to inspire the populace with the idea that they were doing the will of the gods, and performing the most acceptable service, when they executed vengeance upon the offending Christians. And "when superstition has once found out victims, to whose guilt or impiety it may ascribe the divine anger, human revenge mingles itself with the relentless determination to propitiate offended heaven, and contributes still more to blind the judgment and exasperate the passions." -- Milman.¹⁹

59. Nor was this resentment always confined to respect for the gods; often private spite and personal animosities were indulged under cover of allegiance to the gods and respect for the laws. This was shown not only by prosecution before the magistrates, but by open riot and mob violence; and there was no lack of individuals to work upon the riotous propensities of the superstitiously enraged people.

60. For instance, one Alexander of Abonoteichus, a magician, when he found that his tricks failed to excite the wonder that he desired, declared that the Pontus was filled with atheists and Christians; and called on the people to stone them if they did not want to draw down on themselves the anger of the gods. He went so far at last as never to attempt to give an exhibition until he had first proclaimed, "If any atheist, Christian, or Epicurean has slipped in here as a spy, let him be gone."

363

61. The second source from which proceeded the persecution of the Christians was the priests and artisans. The priests had charge of the temples and sacrifices, by which they received their living and considerable profit besides. Pliny's testimony plainly says that in his province "the temples were almost forsaken," and of the sacrifices "very few purchasers had of late appeared." The influence of Christianity reached much further than to those who openly professed it. Many, seeing the Christians openly forsaking the gods and refusing to offer sacrifices, would likewise, merely upon economical principles, stop making sacrifices in the temples. The priests and the traffickers in sacrificial offerings, seeing their gains falling off, were not slow in charging to the Christians the delinquency, were prompt to prosecute them before the tribunals, and were very diligent to secure the most rigid enforcement of the laws commanding sacrifice to the gods. From the same cause the artisans found their gains vanishing, through the diminished sale of carved and engraved images, amulets, etc. Upon which, like that Demetrius of the Scriptures who made silver shrines for Diana,²⁰ they became very zealous for the honor of the gods, and raised persecution against the disciples, in order to restore the worship of the gods -- and their own accustomed income.

62. A third source from which persecution arose was the governors of provinces. Some of these were of cruel and splenetic disposition, and, holding a personal animosity against the Christians, were glad of the opportunity to be the ministers of such laws as were of force against them. Others who were totally indifferent to the merits of the question, yet who earnestly desired to be popular, were ready to take part with the people in their fanatical rage, and to lend their power and use their official influence against the Christians. Yet others who had no particular care for the worship of the gods, could not understand the Christians' refusal to obey the laws.

63. The governors could see nothing in such a refusal to obey the law and perform the ceremonies therein prescribed but what appeared to them to be blind, wilful obstinacy and downright stubbornness.

364

They regarded such wilful disobedience to the law to be much more worthy of condemnation than even the disrespect to the gods. Such a one was Pliny, who said, "Let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished." Many of the governors "would sooner pardon in the Christians their defection from the worship of the gods, than their want of reverence for the emperors in declining to take any part in those idolatrous demonstrations of homage which pagan flattery had invented, such as sprinkling their images with incense, and swearing by their genius." -- Neander.²¹

64. Still others were disposed to be favorable to the Christians, to sympathize with them in their difficult position, and to temper as far as possible the severity of the laws against them. And when the Christians were prosecuted before their tribunals, they would make personal appeals to induce them to make some concession, however slight, that would justify the governor in certifying that they had conformed to the law, so that he might release them, -- not only from that particular accusation, but from any other that might be made.

65. Such governors would plead with the Christians to this effect: "I do not wish to see you suffer; I know you have done no real harm; but there stands the law. I am here as the representative of the empire to see that the laws are enforced. I have no personal interest whatever in this matter; therefore I ask you for my own sake that you will do some honor to the gods, however slight, whereby I may be relieved from executing this penalty and causing you to suffer. All that is required is that you shall worship the gods. Now your God is One of the gods; therefore what harm is there in obeying the law which commands to worship the gods without reference to any particular one? Why not say, 'The Emperor our lord,' and sprinkle a bit of incense toward his image? Merely do either of these two simple things, then I can certify that you have conformed to the law, and release you from this and all future prosecutions of the kind."

66. When the Christian replied that he could not under any form or pretense whatever worship any other god than the Father of the

Lord Jesus Christ; nor honor any other by any manner of offering; nor call the emperor lord in the meaning of the statute; then the governor, understanding nothing of what the Christian called conscience, and seeing all of what he considered the kindest possible offers counted not only as of no worth, but even as a reproach, his proffered mercy was often turned into wrath. He considered such a refusal only an evidence of open ingratitude and obstinacy, and that therefore such a person was unworthy of the slightest consideration. He held it then to be only a proper regard for both the gods and the State to execute to the utmost the penalty which the law prescribed.

67. Another thing that made the action of the Christians more obnoxious to the Roman magistrates, was not only their persistent disregard for the laws touching religion, but their assertion of the right to disregard them. And this plea seemed the more impertinent from the fact that it was made by the despised of the despised.

68. The fourth source from which persecution came to the Christians was the emperors. Yet until Christianity had become so widespread as to attract the attention of the emperor, there was no general persecution from this source. The first persecution by the direct instigation of the emperors was that inflicted by Nero. With this exception, the persecution of the Christians by the emperors was solely as the representatives of the State, to maintain the authority of the State and the dignity of her laws, and to preserve the State from the certain ruin which they supposed to be threatened from Christianity. This explains why it was that only the best of the emperors persecuted the Christians, as such.

69. In the emperor was merged the State. He alone represented the divinity of the Roman State. The Christians' refusal to recognize in him that divinity or to pay respect to it in any way, was held to be open disrespect to the State. The Christians' denial of the right of the State to make or enforce any laws touching religion or men's relationship to God, was counted as an undermining of the authority of government. As it was held that religion was essential to the very existence of the State, and that the State for its own sake, for its own self-preservation, must maintain proper respect for

religion; when Christianity denied the right of the State to exercise any authority or jurisdiction whatever in religious things, it was held to be but a denial of the right of the State to preserve itself.

70. Therefore when Christianity had become quite generally spread throughout the empire, it seemed to such emperors as Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian -- emperors who most respected Roman institutions -- that the very existence of the empire was at stake. Consequently their opposition to Christianity was but an effort to save the State, and was considered by them as the most reasonable and laudable thing in

the world. It was only as a matter of State policy that they issued edicts or emphasized those already issued for the suppression of Christianity. In making or enforcing laws against the Christians it was invariably the purpose of these emperors to restore and to preserve the ancient dignity and glory of the Roman State. In an inscription by Diocletian, it is distinctly charged that by Christianity the State was being overturned. His views on this subject are seen in the following extract from one of his edicts:-

"The immortal gods have, by their providence, arranged and established what is right. Many wise and good men are agreed that this should be maintained unaltered. They ought not to be opposed. No new religion must presume to censure the old, since it is the greatest of crimes to overturn what has been once established by our ancestors, and what has supremacy in the State."²²

71. This is further shown by the following words from the edict of Galerius putting a stop to the persecution of Christianity: --

"Among other matters which we have devised for the benefit and common advantage of our people, we have first determined to restore all things according to the ancient laws and the public institutions of the Romans. And to make provision for this, that also the Christians, who have left the religion of their fathers, should return again to a good purpose and resolution."²³

72. With persecution proceeding from these four sources, it is evident that from the day that Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel, the Christians were not certain of a moment's

367

peace. It might be that they could live a considerable length of time unmolested; yet they were at no time sure that it would be so, because they were subject at all times to the spites and caprices of individuals and the populace. At any hour of the day or night any Christian was liable to be arrested and prosecuted before the tribunals, or to be made the butt of the capricious and violent temper of the heathen populace.

73. Yet to no one of these sources more than another, could be attributed the guilt or the dishonor of the persecution; because each one was but the inevitable fruit of that system from which persecution is inseparable.

74. The theory which attaches blame to the emperors as the persecutors of the Christians is a mistaken one; because the emperor was but the representative, the embodiment, of the State itself. The State of Rome was a system built up by the accumulated wisdom of all the Roman ages; and to expect him whose chief pride was that he was a Roman, and who was conscious that it was the highest possible honor to be a Roman emperor, -- to expect such a one to defer to the views of a new and despised sect of religionists whose doctrines were entirely antagonistic to the entire system of which he was a representative, would be to expect more than Roman pride would bear. As the case stood, to have done

such a thing would have been to make himself one of the despised sect, or else the originator of another one, worthy only, in the eyes of the populace, of the same contempt as these. Of course we know now that the emperors should have done just that thing, and they were told then that they ought to do it; but the fact is nevertheless that Roman pride would not yield. Nor is this the only case of the kind in the history of Christianity.

75. The theory that would make the governors responsible, is likewise a mistaken one; because the governors were simply the officers of the State, set over a particular province to conduct the affairs of the government and to maintain the laws. It was not in their power to set aside the laws, although, as we have seen, some of them even went as far as possible in that direction rather than cause the Christians to suffer by enforcing the law.

368

76. The only theory that will stand the test at all is that which places upon the priests and the people the guilt of the persecutions. They were the ones who did it from real bitterness of the persecuting spirit. And yet to attach all the blame to these, would be a mistake; because it would have been impossible for them to persecute had it not been for the system of government of which they were a part.

77. Had the State been totally separated from religion, taking no cognizance of it in any way whatever; had the State confined itself to its proper jurisdiction, and used its power and authority to compel people to be civil and to maintain the public peace, it would have been impossible for either people, priests, governors, or emperors, to be persecutors. Had there been no laws on the subject of religion, no laws enforcing respect for the gods nor prohibiting the introduction of new religions, -- even though religious controversies might have arisen, and having arisen, even had they engendered bitter controversies and stirred up spiteful spirits, -- it would have been impossible for any party to do any manner of wrong to another.

78. Instead of this, however, the Roman government was a system in which religion was inseparable from the State -- a system in which the religion recognized was held as essential to the very existence of the State; and the laws which compelled respect to this religion were but the efforts of the State at self-preservation. Therefore there was a system permanently established, and an instrument formed, ready to be wielded by every one of these agencies to persecute the professors of that religion.

79. Except in cases of the open violence of the mob, all that was done in any instance by any of the agencies mentioned, was to enforce the law. If the Christians had obeyed the laws, they never would have been persecuted. But that was the very point at issue. It was not right to obey the laws. The laws were wrong. To obey the laws was to cease to be a Christian. To obey the laws was to dishonor God and to deny Christ. To obey the laws was to consent that mankind should be deprived of the blessing of both civil and religious liberty, as well as to forfeit for themselves eternal life.

369

80. If religion be properly a matter of State, and rightfully a subject of legislation, then there never was any such thing as persecution of the Christians by the Roman State. And what is more, that being so, there never has been in all history any governmental persecution on account of religion. If religion be properly a subject of legislation and of law, then it is the right of the State to make any laws it may choose on the subject of religion; and it is its right to attach to these laws whatever penalty will most surely secure proper respect for the religion chosen. And if the legislation be right, if the law be right, the enforcement of the law, under whatever penalty, can not be wrong. Consequently if religion be properly a matter of the State, of legislation, and of law, there never was and there never can be any such thing as persecution by any State or kingdom on account of religion, or for conscience' sake.

81. From all these evidences it is certain that the real blame and the real guilt of the persecution of the Christians by the Roman Empire lay in the pagan theory of State and government -- the union of religion and the State. This was the theory of the State, and the only theory that then held sway, and this necessarily embodied both a civil and a religious despotism. And as Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free and to plant in their hearts and minds the genuine principles of liberty, it was proper that He should command that this message of freedom and this principle of liberty should be proclaimed in all the world to every creature, even though it should meet with the open hostility of earth's mightiest power. And proclaim it His disciples did, at the expense of heavy privations and untold sufferings.

82. "Among the authentic records of pagan persecutions, there are histories which display, perhaps more vividly than any other, both the depth of cruelty to which human nature may sink and the heroism of resistance it may attain. . . . The most horrible recorded instances torture were usually inflicted either by the populace or in their presence in the arena. We read of Christians bound in chairs of red-hot iron, while the stench of their half-consumed flesh rose in a suffocating cloud to heaven; of others who were torn to the very bone by shells or hooks of iron; of holy virgins given

370

over to the lust of the gladiator, or to the mercies of the pander; of two hundred and twenty-seven converts sent on one occasion to the mines, each with the sinews of one leg severed by a red-hot iron, and with an eye scooped from its socket; of fires so slow that the victims writhed for hours in their agonies; of bodies torn limb from limb, or sprinkled with burning lead; of mingled salt and vinegar poured over the flesh that was bleeding from the rack; of tortures prolonged and varied through entire days. For the love of their divine Master, for the cause they believed to be true, men, and even weak girls, endured these things without flinching, when one word would have freed them from their sufferings. No opinion we may form of the proceedings of priests in a later age, should impair the reverence with which we bend before the martyr's tomb." -- Lecky.24

83. All this was endured by men and women, and even weak girls, that people in future ages might be free -- free to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences -- free both civilly and religiously. All this was endured in support of the principle, announced to Israel before they entered Canaan; to Nebuchadnezzar and all his officers and people; to Darius the Mede and all his presidents, princes, and people; and now to all the world for all time; -- the divine principle that with religion civil government can of right have nothing to do.

84. Yet for two hundred and fifty years this contest continued. On one side were the poor and despised; on the other the rich and the honored. On one side was the apparently weak, yet really strong; on the other the apparently powerful, yet really weak. On one side was a new doctrine sustained by no earthly power, and without recognition; on the other side was a system which was the outgrowth of ages, and supported by all the resources of the mightiest empire that the world had ever known. Yet it was the conflict of truth and right against error and wrong, of the power of God against the power of the Roman State; and it was bound to conquer.

85. Two hundred and fifty years this contest continued, and then, as the outcome of the longest, the most wide-spread, and the most terrible persecution that ever was inflicted by the Roman

371

State, that empire was forced officially recognize the right of every man to worship as he pleased. Thus was Christianity acknowledged to be victorious over all the power of Rome. The rights of conscience were established, and the separation of religion and the State was virtually complete.

86. Whatever men may hold Christianity to be, however they may view it, -- whether as the glorious reality that it is, or only a myth; whether as the manifestation of the truth of God, or only an invention of men, -- it never can be denied that from Christianity alone the world received that inestimable boon, the rights of conscience, and the principle -- invaluable alike to religion, the State, and the individual -- of the absolute, complete, and total separation between the civil and the religious powers.

87. It never can be denied that Christianity was in the Roman Empire in the first and second centuries as really as it ever was at any time afterward. Marcus Aurelius, Suetonius, Hadrian, Tacitus, Trajan, and Pliny, all give the most unexceptionable testimony that it was there. And just as certainly as it was there, so certainly did it proclaim the right of men to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences; and that the State has not of right anything to do with religion. And so certainly was there a prolonged and terrible contest upon this issue. Therefore those who object to Christianity, while advocating the rights of conscience and opposing a union of religion and the State, contradict themselves, and undermine the foundation upon which they stand.

88. Christianity is the glorious original of the rights of conscience and of the individual. Jesus Christ was the first to announce it to the world; and his disciples were the first to proclaim it to all men, and to maintain it in behalf of all men in all future ages. George Bancroft states the literal truth when he says:-

"No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men."25

372

89. Yet this victory of Christianity over pagan Rome was no sooner won, and the assured triumph Christianity was no sooner at hand, than ambitious bishops and political priests perverted it and destroyed the prospect of all its splendid fruit. They seized upon the civil power, and by making the State the servant of the church, established a despotism as much more cruel than the one which had just been conquered, as the truth that was thus perverted was higher, nobler, and more glorious than the evil system which had been established in the blindness and error of paganism.

90. The system which had been conquered was that in which the State recognizes and makes use of religion only for its political value, and only as the servant of the State. This was paganism, and such a system is pagan wherever found. The system which was established by the perversion of Christianity and the splendid victory that it had won, was a system in which the State is made the servant of the church, and in which the power of the State is exercised to promote the interests of the church. This was the papacy.

NOTE ON THE "TEN PERSECUTIONS." -- In the church and State scheme of the fourth century, the theory of the bishops was that the kingdom of God was come; and to maintain the theory it became necessary to pervert the meaning of both Scripture history and Scripture prophecy. Accordingly, as the antitype of the ten plagues of Egypt, and as the fulfilment of the prophecy of the ten horns which made war with the Lamb (Rev. 18:12-14), there was invented the theory of ten persecutions of the Christians inflicted by the ten emperors, Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Maximin, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, and Diocletian.

Some of these persecuted the Christians, as Nero, Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian; others were as gentle toward the Christians as toward anybody else; and yet others not named in the list, persecuted everybody but the Christians. The truth is that so far as the emperors were concerned, taken one with another, from Nero to Diocletian, the Christians fared as well as anybody else. That both events and names have been forced into service to make up the list of ten persecutions and to find among the Roman emperors ten persecutors, the history plainly shows.

The history shows that only five of the so-called ten persecutors can be any fair construction be counted such. These five were Nero, Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian.

Of the other five, Trajan not only added nothing to the laws already existing, but gave very mild directions for the enforcement of these, which abated rather than intensified the troubles of the Christians. It would be difficult to see how

373

any directions could have been more mild without abrogating the laws altogether, which to Trajan would have been only equivalent to subverting the empire itself.

Domitian was not a persecutor of the Christians as such, but was cruel to all people. In common with others, some Christians suffered, and suffered only as did many others who were not Christians.

Septimius Severus only forbade any more people to become Christians, without particularly interfering with such as were already Christians.

The cruelty of Maximin, more bitter even than that of Domitian, involved all classes, and where it overtook Christians, that which befell them was but the common lot of thousands and thousands of people who were not Christians.

Aurelian was not in any sense a persecutor of the Christians in fact. At the utmost stretch, he only contemplated it. Had he lived longer, he might have been a persecutor; but it is not honest to count a man a persecutor who at the most only intended to persecute. It is not fair in such a case to turn an intention into a fact.

Looking again at the record of the five really were persecutors, it is found that from Nero to Marcus Aurelius was ninety-three years; that from Marcus Aurelius to Decius was eighty years; that from Decius to Valerian's edict was six years; and that from Gallienus's edict of toleration to Diocletian's edict of persecution was forty-three years.

From the record of this period, on the other hand, it is found that between Nero and Marcus Aurelius, Domitian and Vitellius raged; that between Marcus Aurelius and Decius, the savage Commodus and Caracalla, and Elagabalus and Maximin, all ravaged the empire as wild boars a forest; and that next after Valerian came Gallienus.

From these facts it must be admitted that if the persecution of the Christians by pagan Rome depended upon the action of the emperors, and if it is to be attributed to them, Christians had not much more to bear than had the generality of people throughout the empire. In short, the story of the "Ten Persecutions" is a myth.

- 1[Page 343] Rom. 1:8, 10:18; Col. 1:6, 23.
- 2[Page 344] "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. ix, par. 8.
- 3[Page 344] Acts 18: 1, 2.
- 4[Page 345] Acts 18:12-16; 23:28, 29; 25: 14-21; 26:31, 32.
- 5[Page 347] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. i, part i, sec. i, div. iii, par. 1.
- 6[Page 347] Quoted by James Freeman Clarke in "Ten Great Religions," chap. viii, sec. iv, par. 1.
- 7[Page 347] Eccl. 12:13.
- 8[Page 348] Quoted in Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," sec. i, div.iii, par. 2.
- 9[Page 349] "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxii, par.21.
- 10[Page 356] These two letters are found in English in Dissertation iii, at the close of Whiston's"Josephus."
- 11[Page 357] "Ten Great Religions," chap. vii, sec. iii, pars. 1, 4.
- 12[Page 357] "Decline and Fall," chap. xv, par. 15.
- 13[Page 357] "History of Rome." book i, chap. xii, par. 22.
- 14[Page 358] "History of Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 2.
- 15[Page 359] Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and church." Vol. i sec.i, part i,div. iii, par.2.
- 16[Page 359] Id.
- 17[Page 360] Rom 8:25; 12:2.
- 18[Page 360] 1 Cor. 4:13.
- 19[Page 362] "History of Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 27.
- 20[Page 363] Acts 19:21-29.
- 21[Page 364] Id., par 5.

22[Page 366] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," sec. i, div. iii, under Diocletian.

23[Page 366] Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book viii, chap. xvii.

24[Page 370] "History of European Morals," end of chap iii.

25[Page 371] Formation of the Constitution of the United States," book v, chap. i, par. 10.

26. ROME -- THE GREAT APOSTASY.

WHEN Paul was at Thessalonica, he preached to the people about the second coming of the Lord. After he had gone away, he wrote to them a letter in which he said more about this same event; and in his writing he made it so much of a reality, and his hope was so centered in the event, that apparently he put himself among those who would see the Saviour come, and wrote as though he and others would be alive at that time. He wrote: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."¹

2. The Thessalonians, not bearing in mind what he had told them when he was there, misinterpreted these strong and apparently personal statements, and therefore put into the apostle's words a meaning that he did not intend should be there. Upon this they fell into the mistake of supposing that the second coming of Christ was immediately at hand, and was so near that they could even live without working until He should come. This idea had been worked up quite fully among them by persons pretending to have received revelations by the Spirit; by others pretending that they had received word from Paul to that effect; and yet others went so far as to write letters to that effect, and forge Paul's name to them. These facts coming to the apostle's knowledge, he wrote a second letter to correct the mistakes which, in view of the teaching he had given when he was present with them, they were wholly unwarranted in making.

375

3. In this second letter Paul did not modify in the least the doctrine that Christ is coming, nor that He will then certainly gather His people to himself. There was no mistake in the doctrine concerning the fact of His coming. The mistake was in the time when they expected Him to come. This is the point which the apostle corrects in his second letter, and writes thus: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming."²

4. All this he had taught them when he was there with them, and therefore reminded them, in the fifth verse, "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" Then, having recalled to their minds the fact, he simply appeals to their knowledge, and says: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the son of perdition] might be revealed in his time." This plainly sets forth the prophecy of a great falling away or apostasy from the truth of the gospel. The purity of the gospel of Christ would be corrupted, and its intent perverted.

5. The falling away of which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians is referred to in his counsel to the elders of the church at Ephesus, whom he called to meet him at Miletus. To them he said: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall

376

men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."³

6. This warning was not alone to the people of Ephesus in the three years that he was there. It is seen through all his epistles. Because of this readiness of individuals to assert themselves, to get wrong views of the truth, and to speak perverse things, the churches had constantly to be checked, guided, trained, reproved, and rebuked. There were men even in the church who were ever ready to question the authority of the apostles. There were those who made it a business to follow up Paul, and by every possible means to counteract his teaching and destroy his influence. They declared that he was not an apostle of the Lord at all, but of men; that he had never seen the Lord; that he was simply a tent-maker going about over the country working at his trade, and passing himself off as an apostle. Others charged him with teaching the doctrine that it is right to do evil that good may come.

7. But it was not alone nor chiefly from these characters that the danger threatened. It was those who from among the disciples would arise speaking perverse things, of which an instance and a warning are given in the letter to Timothy: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."⁴

8. Nor yet was it with such as these that the greatest danger lay. It was from those who would arise not only speaking perverse things, but "speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Through error of judgment, a man might speak perverse things with no bad intention; but the ones here mentioned would speak perverse things purposely and with the intention of making disciples for themselves -- to draw away

disciples after them instead of to draw disciples to Christ. These would pervert the truth, and would have to

377

pervert the truth, in order to accomplish their purpose. He who always speaks the truth as it is in Jesus, will draw disciples to Jesus and not to himself. To draw to Christ will be his only wish. But when one seeks to draw disciples to himself, and puts himself in the place of Christ, then he must pervert the truth, and accommodate it to the wishes of those whom he hopes to make his own disciples. This is wickedness; this is apostasy.

9. There was another consideration which made the danger the more imminent. These words were spoken to the bishops. It was a company of bishops to whom the apostle was speaking when he said: "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." From that order of men who were chosen to guide and to care for the church of Christ, from those who were set to protect the church -- from this order of men there would be those who would pervert their calling, their office, and the purpose of it, to build up themselves, and gather disciples to themselves in the place of Christ. To watch this spirit, to check its influence, and to guard against its workings, was the constant effort of the apostle, and for the reason, as stated to the Thessalonians, that the mystery of iniquity was already working. There were at that time elements abroad which the apostle could plainly see would develop into all that the Scriptures had announced. And scarcely were the last of the apostles dead when the evil appeared in its practical workings.

10. No sooner were the apostles removed from the stage of action, no sooner was their watchful attention gone and their apostolic authority removed, than this very thing appeared of which the apostle had spoken. Certain bishops, in order to make easier the conversion of the heathen, to multiply disciples, and by this increase their own influence and authority, began to adopt heathen customs and forms.

11. When the canon of Scripture was closed, and the last of the apostles was dead, the first century was gone; and within twenty years of that time the perversion of the truth of Christ had become wide-spread. In the history of this century and of this subject the record is, --

378

"It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offense of sober and good men." -- Mosheim.⁵

12. And the reason of this is stated to be that --

"The Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what

meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people, so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms." Mosheim.⁶

13. This was at once to accommodate the Christian worship and its forms to that of the heathen, and was almost at one step to heathenize Christianity. No heathen element or form can be connected with Christianity or its worship, and Christianity remain pure.

14. Of all the ceremonies of the heathen, the mysteries were the most sacred and most universally practised. Some mysteries were in honor of Bacchus, some of Cybele, but the greatest of all, those considered the most sacred of all and the most widely practised, were the Eleusinian, so called because celebrated at Eleusis in Greece. But whatever was the mystery that was celebrated, there was always in it, as an essential part of it, the elements of abomination that characterized sun-worship everywhere, because the mysteries were simply forms of the wide-spread and multiform worship of the sun.

15. Among the first of the perversions of the Christian worship was to give to its forms the title and air of the mysteries. For says the record: --

"Among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the terms used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they gradually introduced also the rites which were designated by these terms." -- Mosheim.⁷

379

16. That this point may be more fully understood, we shall give a sketch of the Eleusinian mysteries. As we have stated, although there were others, these were of such pre-eminence that they acquired the specific name, by way of pre-eminence, of "the mysteries." The festival was sacred to Ceres and Proserpine. Everything about it contained a mystery, and was to be kept secret by the initiated. "This mysterious secrecy was solemnly observed and enjoined on all the votaries of the goddess; and if any one ever appeared at the celebration, either intentionally or through ignorance, without proper introduction, he was immediately punished with death. Persons of both sexes and all ages were initiated at this solemnity; and it was looked upon as so heinous a crime to neglect this sacred part of religion that it was one of the heaviest accusations which contributed to the condemnation of Socrates. The initiated were under the more particular care of the deities, and therefore their lives were supposed to be attended with more happiness and real security than those of other men. This benefit was not only granted during life, but it extended beyond the grave; and they were honored with the first places in the Elysian fields, while others were left to wallow in perpetual filth and ignominy." -- Anthon.⁸

17. There were the greater and the lesser mysteries. The greater were the Eleusinian in fact, and the lesser were invented, according to the mythological story, because Hercules passed near Eleusis, where the greater mysteries were celebrated, and desired to be initiated; but as he was a stranger, and therefore could not lawfully be admitted, a form of mysteries was adopted into which he could be initiated. These were ever afterward celebrated as the lesser, and were observed at Agrae. In the course of time the lesser were made preparatory to the greater, and the candidate must be initiated into these before he could be initiated into the greater.

18. "No person could be initiated at Eleusis without a previous purification at Agrae. This purification they performed by keeping themselves pure, chaste, and unpolluted during nine days, after which they came and offered sacrifices and prayers, wearing garlands of flowers, and having under their feet Jupiter's skin, which was the

380

skin of a victim offered to that god. The person who assisted was called Hudranos from hudor, water, which was used at the purification; and they themselves were called the initiated. A year after the initiation at the lesser mysteries they sacrificed a sow to Ceres, and were admitted into the greater, and the secrets of the festivals were solemnly revealed to them, from which they were called inspectors.

19. "The initiation was performed in the following manner: The candidates, crowned with myrtle, were admitted by night into a place called the mystical temple, a vast and stupendous building. As they entered the temple, they purified themselves by washing their hands in holy water, and received for admonition that they were to come with a mind pure and undefiled, without which the cleanliness of the body would be unacceptable. After this the holy mysteries were read to them from a large book called petroma, because made of two stones, petrai, fitly cemented together; and then the priest proposed to them certain questions, to which they readily answered. After this, strange and fearful objects presented themselves to their sight; the place often seemed to quake, and to appear suddenly resplendent with fire, and immediately covered with gloomy darkness and horror." -- Anthon.⁹ After initiation, the celebration lasted nine days.

20. These mysteries, as well as those of Bacchus and others, were directly related to the sun, for "the most holy and perfect rite in the Eleusinian Mysteries was to show an ear of corn mowed down in silence, and this was a symbol of the Phrygian Atys."¹⁰

21. The Phrygian Atys was simply the incarnation of the sun, and the mysteries being a form of sun-worship, the "sacred" symbols can not be described with decency. Therefore, it is not necessary to describe the actions that were performed in the celebration of the mysteries after the initiation, any further than is spoken by the apostle with direct reference to this subject. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret."¹¹

22. It was to accommodate the Christian worship to the minds of a people who practised these things that the bishops gave to the Christian ordinances the name of mysteries. The Lord's Supper was made the greater mystery, baptism the lesser and the initiatory rite to the celebration of the former. After the heathen manner also a white garment was used as the initiatory robe, and the candidate, having been baptized, and thus initiated into the lesser mysteries, was admitted into what was called in the church the order of catechumens, in which order they remained a certain length of time, as in the heathen celebration, before they were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the greater mystery.

23. "This practise originated in the Eastern provinces, and then after the time of Hadrian (who first introduced the pagan mysteries among the Latins) it spread among the Christians of the West." The reign of Hadrian was from 117-138. Therefore, before the second century was half gone, before the last of the apostles had been dead forty years, this apostasy, this working of the mystery of iniquity, had so largely spread over both the East and the West, that it is literally true that "a large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries." -- Mosheim.12

24. Nor is this all. These apostates, not being content with so much of the sun-worship as appeared in the celebration of the mysteries, adopted the heathen custom of worshiping toward the east. So says the history: --

"Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose essence they looked upon to be light, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwell in that part of the firmament from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament]; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshiping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is this custom abolished even in our times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches." -- Mosheim.13

25. The next step in addition to this was the adoption of the day of the sun as a festival day. To such an extent were the forms of sun-worship practised in this apostasy, that before the close of the second century the heathen themselves charged these so-called Christians with worshiping the sun. A presbyter of the church of Carthage, then and now one of the "church fathers," who wrote about A. D. 200, considered it necessary to make a defense of the practise, which he did to the following effect in an address to the rulers and magistrates of the Roman Empire: --

"Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god. We shall be counted Persians perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disk. The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also under pretense sometimes of worshiping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sunday 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." -- Tertullian.¹⁴

26. And again in an address to all the heathen he justifies this practise by the argument, in effect, You do the same thing, you originated it too, therefore you have no right to blame us. In his own words his defense is as follows: --

"Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray toward 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 worshiping the heavenly bodies, likewise move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have 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 banqueting." -- Tertullian.¹⁵

27. This accommodation was easily made, and all this practise was easily justified, by the perverse-minded teachers, in the perversion

383

of such scriptures as, "The Lord God is a sun and shield," and, "Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings."¹⁶

28. As this custom spread, and through it such disciples were multiplied, the ambition of the bishop of Rome grew apace. It was in honor of the day of the sun that there was manifested the first attempt of the bishop of Rome to compel the obedience of all other bishops, and the fact that this attempt was made in such a cause, at the very time when these pretended Christians were openly accused by the heathen of worshiping the sun, is strongly suggestive.

29. From Rome there came now another addition to the sun-worshiping apostasy. The first Christians being mostly Jews, continued to celebrate the Passover in remembrance of the death of Christ, the true Passover; and this was continued among those who from among the Gentiles had turned to Christ. Accordingly, the celebration was always on the Passover day, -- the fourteenth of the first month. Rome, however, and from her all the West, adopted the day of the sun as the day of this celebration. According to the Eastern custom, the celebration, being on the fourteenth day of the month, would of course fall on

different days of the week as the years revolved. The rule of Rome was that the celebration must always be on a Sunday -- the Sunday nearest to the fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year. And if the fourteenth day of that month should itself be a Sunday, then the celebration was not to be held on that day, but upon the next Sunday. One reason of this was not only to be as like the heathen as possible, but to be as unlike the Jews as possible; this, in order not only to facilitate the "conversion" of the heathen by conforming to their customs, but also by pandering to their spirit of contempt and hatred of the Jews. It was upon this point that the bishop of Rome made his first open attempt at absolutism.

30. We know not precisely when this began, but it was practised in Rome as early as the time of Sixtus I, who was bishop of Rome A. D. 119-128. The practise was promoted by his successors, and Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome A. D. 157-168, "would neither

384

conform to that [Eastern] custom himself nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging `them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the fourteenth of the moon." -- Bower.¹⁷ In A. D. 160, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, made a journey to Rome to consult with Anicetus about this question, though nothing special came of the consultation. Victor, who was bishop of Rome A. D. 192-202, likewise proposed to oblige only those under his jurisdiction to conform to the practise of Rome; but he asserted jurisdiction over all, and therefore presumed to command all.

31. "Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome." -- Mosheim.¹⁸

32. In view of these things it will readily be seen that between paganism and this kind of Christianity it soon became difficult to distinguish, and the third century only went to make any distinction still more difficult to be discerned.

33. In the latter part of the second century, there sprang up in Egypt a school of pagan philosophy called the "Eclectic." The patrons of this school called themselves "Eclectics," because they professed to be in search of truth alone, and to be ready to adopt any tenet of any system in existence which seemed to them to be agreeable to their ideas of truth. They regarded Plato as the one person above all others who had attained the nearest to truth in

the greatest number of points. Hence they were also called "Platonists."

34. "This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria, -- Athenagoras, Pantaenus, and Clemens Alexandrinus, -- are said to have approved of it. These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers, and therefore that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defense of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent them from regarding Plato as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the Deity, the soul, and things remote from sense, so as to suit the Christian scheme." -- Mosheim.¹⁹

35. In the end of the second century, and especially in the first forty-one years of the third, there flourished in Alexandria one of these would-be philosophers -- Ammonius Saccas by name -- who gave a turn to the philosophy of the Eclectics, which caused his sect to be called the New Platonists. The difference between the Eclectic and the system founded by Ammonius was this: The Eclectics held, as above stated, that in every system of thought in the world there was some truth, but mixed with error, their task being to select from all systems that portion of truth which was in each, and from all these to form one harmonious system. Ammonius held that when the truth was known, all sects had the same identical system of truth; that the differences among them were caused simply by the different ways of stating that truth; and that the proper task of the philosopher was to find such a means of stating the truth that all should be able to understand it, and so each one understand all the others. This was to be accomplished by a system of allegorizing and mystification, by which anybody could get whatever he wanted out of any writing that might come to his notice.

36. "The grand object of Ammonius, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, -- philosophers, priests, and Christians, -- and particularly by allegorical interpretations to remove all impediments out of his way. . . . To make the arduous task more easy, he assumed that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians by Hermes, and thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still that by Plato, the best interpreter of the principles of Hermes and of the ancient Oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied. . . .

37. "To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians (among whom he was born and educated) concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting

one great whole [Pantheism]; concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, and the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines; all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. For it is most evident that the ancient philosophy of the Egyptians, which they pretended to have learned from Hermes, was the basis of the New Platonic, or Ammonian; and the book of Jamblichus, *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, in particular, shows this to be the case. . . .

38. "To this AEgyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, this ingenious man and fanatic joined a system of moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. . . . And these precepts Ammonius, like one born and educated among Christians, was accustomed to embellish and express by forms of expression borrowed from the sacred Scriptures, which has caused such language to occur abundantly in the writings of his followers."20

39. One of the earliest to espouse this philosophy from among those who professed to be Christians, was Clement of Alexandria, who became the head of that kind of school at Alexandria. These philosophers "believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings; the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import

387

of the words; the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter; in other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meanings. Some also, and this is stated especially of Clement, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy." -- Mosheim.21

40. The close resemblance between the pagan philosophy and that of the New Platonists is illustrated by the fact that but one of the classes concerned could tell to which of them Ammonius Saccas belonged. The pagans generally regarded him as a pagan. His own kind of Christians counted him a good Christian all his life. The genuine Christians all knew that he was a pagan, and that the truth of the whole matter was that he was a pretended Christian "who adopted with such dexterity the doctrines of the pagan philosophy, as to appear a Christian to the Christians, and a pagan to the pagans."22 He died A. D. 241.

41. Clement is supposed to have died about A. D. 220, and the fame and influence which he had acquired -- and it was considerable -- was far outshone by Origen, who had been taught by both Clement and Ammonius. Origen imbibed all the allegorical and mystifying processes of both Ammonius and Clement, and multiplied upon them from his own wild imagination. He was not content with finding two meanings in the Scriptures as those before him, but took the secondary sense, the hidden meaning, and added to it four additional meanings of his own. His system then stood thus: (1) All Scripture contains two meanings, the literal and the hidden. (2) This hidden sense has within itself two meanings, the moral and the mystical. (3) The mystical has within it yet two other meanings, the allegorical and the anagogical. According to this method of mysticism,

therefore, in every passage of Scripture there are at least three meanings, and there may be any number from three to six.

388

42. His explanation of it is this: (1) Man is composed of three parts, -- a rational mind, a sensitive soul, and a visible body. The Scriptures resemble man, and therefore have a threefold sense: (a) a literal sense which corresponds to the body; (b) a moral sense corresponding to the soul; and (c) a mystical sense which corresponds to the mind. (2) As the body is the baser part of man, so the literal is the baser sense of Scripture; and as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the literal sense of Scripture often leads into error. Therefore, those who would see more in the Scripture than common people could see, must search out this hidden meaning, and yet further must search in that hidden meaning for the moral sense. And those who would be perfect must carry their search yet further, and beyond this moral sense which they found in the hidden meaning, they must find the mystical sense, with its additional train of allegorical and anagogical senses.

43. As in this system of philosophy the body of man was a clog to the soul and hindered it in its heavenly aspirations, and was therefore to be despised, and by punishment and starvation was to be separated as far as possible from the soul, it followed that the literal sense of Scripture, which corresponded to man's body likewise, was a hindrance to the proper understanding of all the hidden meanings of the Scripture, and was to be despised and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense, and counted of the least possible worth. Accordingly, one of the first principles of this teaching was the following: --

"The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so will not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us therefore seek after the spirit and substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious." -- Origen.²³

44. And the next step was but the logical result of this; namely: --

"The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." -- Origen.²⁴

389

45. By such a system as this it is evident that any one could find whatever he pleased in any passage of Scripture, and that the Scripture could be made to support any doctrine that was ever invented by the wildest fancy of the veriest fanatic. Even though the doctrine might be flatly contradictory to the Scripture, the Scripture could be made fully to agree with and teach the doctrine.

46. Two of the chief disciples of Ammonius were Origen and Plotinus. Origen professed to be a Christian, and perpetuated the philosophy of Ammonius under the name of Christianity. Plotinus made no profession of anything but paganism, and perpetuated the philosophy of Ammonius under the name of Neoplatonism. Plotinus succeeded

Ammonius in the Neoplatonic school; and Origen succeeded Clement in the so-called, but apostate, Christian school. There was great rivalry between these schools; and each became supreme in its respective sphere.

47. Among the pagans, the school of Ammonius and of his successor Plotinus "gradually cast all others into the background. From Egypt it spread in a short time over the whole Roman Empire, and drew after it almost all persons who took any interest in things remote from sense."

48. On the other hand, "the estimation in which human learning should be held was a question on which the Christians were about equally divided. Many recommended the study of philosophy, and an acquaintance with the Greek and Roman literature; while others maintained that these were pernicious to the interests of genuine Christianity and the progress of true piety. The cause of letters and philosophy triumphed, however, by degrees; and those who wished well to them continued to gain ground till at length the superiority was manifestly decided in their favor. This victory was principally due to the influence of Origen, who, having been early instructed in the new kind of Platonism already mentioned, blended it, though unhappily, with the purer and more sublime tenets of a celestial doctrine, and recommended it in the warmest manner to the youth who attended his public lessons. The fame of this philosopher increased daily among the Christians; and in proportion to his rising credit, his method of proposing and explaining the doctrines of Christianity gained authority till it became almost universal."

390

49. The principles of these two schools were so evenly balanced that "some of the disciples of Plotinus embraced Christianity on condition that they should be allowed to retain such of the opinions of their master as they thought of superior excellence and merit. This must also have contributed, in some measure, to turn the balance in favor of the sciences. These Christian philosophers, preserving still a fervent zeal for the doctrines of their heathen chief, would naturally embrace every opportunity of spreading them abroad, and instilling them into the minds of the ignorant and the unwary.

50. "This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few things, of which not a word can be found in the Holy Scriptures. . . . It recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined. And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious changes which arose from this new philosophy -- or, if you please, from this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other?

51. "The same Origen, unquestionably, stands at the head of the interpreters of the Bible in this century. But with pain it must be added that he was the first among those who have found in the Scriptures a secure retreat for errors and idle fancies of all sorts. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that Scripture says, against the cavils of heretics and enemies of Christianity, if its language were interpreted literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume upon the principles which the Platonists used in explaining the history of the gods. He therefore taught that the words in many parts of the Bible convey no meaning at all; and in places where he admitted certain ideas

391

lie under the terms used, he contended for a hidden and recondite sense of them, altogether different from their natural import, but far preferable to it. . . . Innumerable expositors in this and the following centuries pursued the method of Origen, though with some diversity; nor could the few who pursued a better method make much head against them." -- Mosheim.²⁵

52. "The doctrine of the incarnation, the resurrection of the flesh, and the creation of the world in time, marked the boundary line between the church's dogmatic and Neoplatonism. In every other respect theologians and Neoplatonists drew so close together that many of them are completely at one. . . . If a book does not happen to touch on any of the above-mentioned doctrines, it may often be doubted whether the writer is a Christian or a Neoplatonist. In ethical principles, in directions for right living, the two systems approximate more and more closely. . . . It indoctrinated the church with all its mysticism."²⁶

53. While this effort was being made on the side of philosophy to unite all religions, there was at the same time a like effort on the side of politics. It was the ambition of Elagabalus (A. D. 218-222) to make the worship of the sun supersede all other worship in Rome. It is further related of him that a more ambitious scheme even than this was in the emperor's mind; which was nothing less than the blending of all religions into one, of which "the sun was to be the central object of adoration." -- Milman.²⁷ But the elements were not yet fully prepared for such a fusion. Also the shortness of the reign of Elagabalus prevented any decided advancement toward success.

54. Alexander Severus (A. D. 222-225) held to the same idea, and carried it into effect so far as his individual practise was concerned. "The mother of Alexander Severus, the able, perhaps crafty and rapacious, Mammaea, had at least held intercourse with the Christians of Syria. She had conversed with the celebrated Origen, and listened to his exhortations, if without conversion, still not without

392

respect. Alexander, though he had neither the religious education, the pontifical character, nor the dissolute manners of his predecessor, was a Syrian, with no hereditary

attachment to the Roman form of paganism. He seems to have affected a kind of universalism: he paid decent respect to the gods of the Capitol; he held in honor the Egyptian worship, and enlarged the temples of Isis and Serapis. In his own palace, with respectful indifference, he enshrined, as it were, as his household deities, the representatives of the different religions or theo-philosophic systems which were prevalent in the Roman Empire, -- Orpheus, Abraham, Christ, and Apollonius of Tyana. . . The homage of Alexander Severus may be a fair test of the general sentiment of the more intelligent heathen of his time." -- Milman.²⁸ His reign also was too short to accomplish anything beyond his own individual example. But the same tendency went rapidly forward.

55. On the side of philosophy and the apostasy, the progress was continuous and rapid. "Heathenism, as interpreted by philosophy, almost found favor with some of the more moderate Christian apologists. . . . The Christians endeavored to enlist the earlier philosophers in their cause; they were scarcely content with asserting that the nobler Grecian philosophy might be designed to prepare the human mind for the reception of Christianity; they were almost inclined to endow these sages with a kind of prophetic foreknowledge of its more mysterious doctrines. 'I have explained,' says the Christian in Minucius Felix, 'the opinions of almost all the philosophers, whose most illustrious glory it is that they have worshiped one God, though under various names; so that one might suppose either that the Christians of the present day are philosophers, or that the philosophers of old were already Christians.'

56. "These advances on the part of Christianity were more than met by paganism. The heathen religion, which prevailed at least among the more enlightened pagans during this period, . . . was almost as different from that of the older Greeks and Romans, or even that which prevailed at the commencement of the empire, as it was from Christianity. . . . On the great elementary principle of

393

Christianity, the unity of the supreme God, this approximation had long been silently made. Celsus, in his celebrated controversy with Origen, asserts that this philosophical notion of the Deity is perfectly reconcilable with paganism." -- Milman.²⁹

57. The emperor Decius, having no sympathy with any religion, philosophy, or morality, but that of the old original Roman, did his best to restore it throughout the empire. Hence the persecution raised by him. Valerian followed closely the course marked out by Decius; but in the forty years of peace to religion, from the edict of toleration by Gallienus to the edict of persecution by Diocletian, all these elements worked steadily forward in the same general direction. Of the progress of the apostasy during this time, we have a powerful illustration in the practise of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the "wonder-worker."

58. Gregory was a pupil and a convert of Origen's. Origen strongly urged him "to devote his acquirements in heathen science and learning to the elucidation of the Scriptures."

When he left Origen's school at Alexandria, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of Neo Caesarea, A. D. 240-270, and how fully he followed the advice of Origen is shown by the following: --

"When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications which they enjoyed at the pagan festivals, he granted them a permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping that, in process of time, they would return of their own accord to a more virtuous and regular course of life.' There is no sort of doubt that, by this permission, Gregory allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their respective festivals, and to do everything which the pagans were accustomed to in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honor of their gods." -- Mosheim.³⁰

59. Neo Caesarea was one of the most important cities in Pontus. Yet so diligently did Gregory thus employ the talents committed to him by Origen, that it is related of him that whereas "there were said to be only seventeen Christians in the whole city when he first

394

entered it as bishop, there were said to be only seventeen pagans in it at the time of his death."³¹ It is manifest, however, that those who were by him brought to the Christian name were as much pagan as before except in the mere matter of the name.

60. In the time of Diocletian, that which was known as paganism was so far different from the original paganism of Rome, that Milman plainly designates it as the "new paganism." This new paganism was so little removed from the apostate form of Christianity which we have traced, as really to differ from it only in name. "In paganism itself, that silent but manifest change of which we have already noticed the commencement, had been creeping on. . . . This new paganism, as has been observed, arose out of the alliance of the philosophy and the religion of the old world. . . . From Christianity, the new paganism had adopted the unity of the Deity, and scrupled not to degrade all the gods of the older world into subordinate demons or ministers. The Christians had incautiously held the same language; both concurred in the name of demons; but the pagans used the term in the Platonic sense, as good but subordinate spirits, while the same term spoke to the Christian ear as expressive of malignant and diabolic agency.

61. "But the Jupiter Optimus Maximus was not the great Supreme of the new system. The universal deity of the East, the sun, to the philosophic was the emblem or representative; to the vulgar, the Deity. Diocletian himself, though he paid so much deference to the older faith as to assume the title of Jovius, as belonging to the lord of the world, yet on his accession, when he would exculpate himself from all concern in the murder of his predecessor, Numerian, appealed in the face of the army to the all-seeing deity of the sun. It is the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, consulted by the hesitating emperor, which is to decide the fate of Christianity. The metaphorical language of Christianity had

unconsciously lent strength to this new adversary; and in adoring the visible orb, some, no doubt, supposed that they were not departing far from the worship of the 'Sun of Righteousness,'" -- Milman.³²

395

62. Diocletian himself really contemplated the same fusion of all religions into one, with the sun as the one great universal deity, which Elagabalus had contemplated in his day; but by Galerius and the leading philosopher of the new paganism, he was persuaded to use all the power of the State in the effort to make paganism alone supreme over and against every form and every profession of the Christian name. The result, however, was that Galerius was compelled to issue a public edict confessing his failure.

63. Then came Constantine, the best imperial representative of the new paganism, and the most devout worshiper of the sun as the supreme and universal deity, with the avowed purpose, as expressed in his own words, "First to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity." In Constantine the new paganism met its ideal, and the New Platonism -- the apostate, paganized, sun-worshipping form of Christianity -- met its long-wished-for instrument. In him the two streams met. In him the aspiration of Elagabalus, the hope of Ammonius Saccas and Clement, of Plotinus and Origen, and the ambition of the perverse-minded, self-exalted bishops, were all realized and accomplished -- a new, imperial, and universal religion was created.

64. Therefore, "the reign of Constantine the Great forms one of the epochs in the history of the world. It is the era of the dissolution of the Roman Empire; the commencement, or rather consolidation, of a kind of Eastern despotism, with a new capital, a new patriciate, a new constitution, a new financial system, a new, though as yet imperfect, jurisprudence, and, finally, a new religion." -- Milman.³³

65. The epoch thus formed was the epoch of the papacy; and the new religion thus created was the PAPAL RELIGION.

1 [Page 374] *Thess.* 4: 15-17.

2 [Page 375] *Thess.* 2: 1-8.

3 [Page 376] *Acts* 20: 29-31.

4 [Page 376] *2 Tim* 2: 15-18.

5 [Page 378] "*Ecclesiastical History*," Murdock's translation, century ii, part ii, chap. iv, par. 1.

- 6 [Page 378] Id., par. 3.
- 7 [Page 379] Id., par. 5.
- 8 [Page 379] "Classical Dictionary," Eleusinia.
- 9 [Page 380] Id.
- 10 [Page 380] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Mysteries.
- 11 [Page 380] Eph. 5: 11, 12.
- 12 [Page 381] "Ecclesiastical History," century ii, part ii, chap. iv, par. 5.
- 13 [Page 381] Id., par. 7, Maclaine's translation.
- 14 [Page 382] "Apology," chap. xvi.
- 15 [Page 382] "Ad Nationes," book i, chap. xiii.
- 16 [Page 383] Ps. 84: 11; Mal. 4: 2.
- 17 [Page 384] "History of the Popes," under Pius and Anicetus.
- 18 [Page 384] "Ecclesiastical History," century ii, part ii, chap. iv, par. 11. Maclaine's translation.
- 19 [Page 385] Id., chap. i, par. 6, Murdock's translation.
- 20 [Page 386] Id., pars. 8-10.
- 21 [Page 387] Id., chap. iii, par. 5.
- 22 [Page 387] Note to Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," century ii, part ii, chap. i, par. 7. Maclaine's translation.
- 23 [Page 388] Quoted in Maclaine's Mosheim, century iii, part ii, chap. iii, par. 5, note.
- 24 [Page 388] Id. With such a system as this for a basis, it is logical enough that the Catholic church should forbid the common people to read the Scriptures. For Origen is one of the chiefest Fathers of the Catholic Church; and "from the days of Origen to those of Chrysostom there was not a single eminent commentator who did not borrow largely from the words of" Origen. "He was the chief teacher of even the most orthodox of the Western Fathers." -- Farrar's "History of Interpretation," last paragraph under Origen.
- 25 [Page 391] Id., century iii, part ii, chap. i, pars. 2-5, 12; chap. iii, pars. 5, 6.

26 [Page 391] Encyclopedia Britannica," art. Neoplatonism.

27 [Page 391] "History of Christianity" book ii, chap. viii, par. 22.

28 [Page 392] Id., book ii, chap. viii, par. 24.

29 [Page 393] Id., par. 28.

30 [Page 393] "Ecclesiastical History," century ii, part ii, chap. iv, par. 2, note, Maclaine's translation.

31 [Page 394] "Ante-Nicene Library," Gregory Thaumaturgus, Introduction, par. 1.

32 [Page 394] "History of Christianity," book ii, chap. ix, par. 7.

33 [Page 395] Id., book iii, chap. i, par. 1.

27. ROME -- EXALTATION OF THE BISHOPRIC.

THE Scripture was fulfilled; there had come a falling away. But that there should come a falling away, was not all of the story; through that falling away there was to be revealed "that man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "that wicked," who would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; and who when he should appear, would continue even till that great and notable event -- the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

2. Referring again to the scripture quoted from 2 Thess. 2: 2, at the beginning of the previous chapter, it is seen that self-exaltation is the spring of the development of this power. As that scripture expresses it, "He opposeth and exalteth himself." As another scripture gives it, "He shall magnify himself in his heart." And another, "He magnified himself even to the prince of the host" -- the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet another, "He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." That is, he shall reign, or assert authority above, and in opposition to, the authority of Christ; or, as the thought is developed by Paul, this power would oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple -- the place of worship -- of God, showing himself that he is God.

3. Referring also again to the instruction of Paul to the elders who met him at Miletus, there is seen a prophecy of this same spirit of self-exaltation, -- a wish to gain disciples to themselves instead of to Christ. They would prefer themselves to Christ, thus at once putting themselves above him, in opposition to him. And this would be developed from among the bishops. "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

397

4. This spirit was actively manifested in opposition to the apostle John while he was yet alive, for he says: "I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not."¹ This assertion of pre-eminence was shown in prating against the apostle with malicious words, and not only rejecting him, but casting out of the church those members who would receive him. It was but a little while after the death of the apostles until this was carried to yet further extremes.

5. According to the word of Christ, there is no such thing as pre-eminence, or mastership, or sovereignty of position, among men in the church. There was once an argument among his disciples as to who should be counted the greatest, and Jesus called them unto him, and said: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the

Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."2

6. And in warning his disciples of all times against the practise of the scribes and Pharisees of that time, who were but the popes of their day, he says they "love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. . . . Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."3

7. With these instructions the apostles went forth under the great commission of Christ, preaching everywhere that with the Lord there is no respect of persons, but that all are equal before God. There is neither lordship nor overlordship among men in the church of Christ; but all are brethren. Christ only is the head of the church, and the head of every man in the church.

398

8. In the church each member has the same rights as any other member; but for the good of all and the mutual benefit of all concerned, as well as better to carry on His work in the world, the Lord has established His church, and with it a system of church order in which certain ones are chosen to exercise certain functions for the mutual benefit of all in the organization. These officers are chosen from among the membership by the voice of the membership. Of these officers there are two classes, and two only, -- bishops and deacons. This is shown by Paul's letter to the Philippians -- "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons."4

9. Bishops are sometimes called elders; but the same office is always signified. When Paul gave directions to Titus in this matter, he said: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless. . . . For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God."5 This is further shown in Acts 20, to which we have before referred; when Paul had called unto him to Miletus "the elders of the church" of Ephesus, among other things he said to them: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," -- episkopoi -- bishops.

10. Peter also writes to the same effect: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."6 This text not only shows that the terms "elder" and "bishop" refer to the same identical office, but it shows that Peter counted himself as one among them; and that not only by his precept but by his

example he showed that in this office, although overseers they were not overrulers or lords.

11. "It has been said that the pope, the bishops, the priests, and all those who people convents, form the spiritual or ecclesiastical

399

estate; and that princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants form the secular or lay estate. This is a specious tale. But let no man be alarmed. All Christians belong to the spiritual estate; and the only difference between them is in the functions which they fulfil. We have all but one baptism, but one faith, and these constitute the spiritual man. Uncction, tonsure, ordination, consecration, given by the pope or by a bishop, may make a hypocrite, but can never make a spiritual man. We are all consecrated priests by baptism, as St. Peter says: 'You are a royal priesthood;' although all do not actually perform the offices of kings and priests, because no one can assume what is common to all without the common consent. But if this consecration of God did not belong to us, the unction of the pope could not make a single priest. If ten brothers, the sons of one king, and possessing equal claims to his inheritance, should choose one of their number to administer for them, they would all be kings, and yet only one of them would be the administrator of their common power. So it is in the church." -- Luther.⁷

12. Such is the order in the church of Christ, and as every Christian is God's freeman and Christ's servant, it follows, as has been well stated, that "monarchy in spiritual things does not harmonize with the spirit of Christianity." -- Neander.⁸ Yet this order was not suffered long to remain. A distinction was very soon asserted between the bishop and the elder; and the bishop assumed a precedence and an authority over the elder, who was now distinguished from the bishop by the title of "presbyter" only. This was easily and very naturally accomplished.

13. For instance, a church would be established in a certain city. Soon perhaps another church or churches would be established in that same city, or near to it in the country. These other churches would look naturally to the original church as to a mother, and the elders of the original church would naturally have a care for the others as they arose. It was only proper to show Christian respect and deference to these; but this respect and deference was soon

400

demanding, and authority to require it was asserted by those who were the first bishops.

14. Again: as churches multiplied and with them also elders multiplied, it was necessary, in carrying forward the work of the gospel, for the officers of the church often to have meetings for consultation. On these occasions it was but natural and proper for the seniors to preside; but instead of allowing this to remain still a matter of choice in the

conducting of each successive meeting or assembly, it was claimed as a right that the one originally chosen should hold that position for life.

15. Thus was that distinction established between the elders, or presbyters, and the bishops. Those who usurped this permanent authority and office took to themselves exclusively the title of "bishop," and all the others were still to retain the title of "presbyter." The presbyters in turn assumed over the deacons a supremacy and authority which did not belong to them, and all together -- bishops, presbyters, and deacons -- held themselves to be superior orders in the church over the general membership, and assumed to themselves the title of "clergy," while upon the general membership the term "laity" was conferred.

16. In support of these three orders among the "clergy," it was claimed that they came in proper succession from the high priests, the priests, and the Levites of the Levitical law. "Accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites." -- Mosheim.⁹

17. These distinctions were established as early as the middle of the second century. This led to a further and most wicked invention. As they were now priests and Levites after the order of the priesthood of the former dispensation, it was necessary that they also should have a sacrifice to offer. Accordingly, the Lord's Supper was turned into "the unbloody sacrifice." Thus arose that which is still in the Roman Catholic Church the daily "sacrifice" of the mass. "The comparison of the Christian oblations with the Jewish

401

victims and sacrifices produced many unnecessary rites, and by degrees corrupted the very doctrine of the holy supper, which was converted, sooner, in fact, than one would think, into a sacrifice." -- Mosheim.¹⁰ With this also came a splendor in dress, copied from that of the former real priesthood.

18. The estimate in which the bishop was now held may be gathered from the following words of a document of the second century: --

"It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself." "It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honors the bishop has been honored of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil." -- Ignatius.¹¹

19. The next step was that certain bishops asserted authority over other bishops; and the plea upon which this was claimed as a right, was that the bishops of those churches which had been established by the apostles were of right to be considered as superior to all others. Furthermore, it was claimed that in those churches the true doctrine of Christ had been preserved in the greatest purity. As the bishops of those churches claimed to be the depositaries of the true doctrine, whenever any question arose upon any matter of

doctrine or interpretation of the Scripture, appeal was made to the bishop of the nearest apostolic church. As Rome was the capital of the empire, and as the church there claimed direct descent not only from one but from two apostles, it soon came to pass that the church of Rome claimed to be the source of true doctrine, and the bishop of that church to be supreme over all other bishops.

20. In the latter part of the second century, during the episcopate of Eleutherius, A. D. 176-192, the absolute authority of the church of Rome in matters of doctrine was plainly asserted in the following words: --

"It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church, -- those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father."

402

"Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain-glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its pre-eminent authority. . . . Since, therefore, we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers." -- Ireneus.¹²

21. When this authority and power was asserted during the bishopric of Eleutherius, it is not at all strange that his immediate successor, Victor, A. D. 192-202, should attempt to carry into practise the authority thus claimed for him. The occasion of it was the question of the celebration of what is now Easter, as already related in the preceding chapter. This action of Victor is pronounced by Bower "the first essay of papal usurpation." Thus early did Rome not only claim supremacy, but attempt to enforce her claim of supremacy, over all other churches. Such was the arrogance of the bishops of Rome at the beginning of the third century.

22. The character of the bishopric in A. D. 250 is clearly seen in the following quotation from one who was there at the time: --

"Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne,

deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries." -- Cyprian.¹³

23. As the bishopric became more exalted, and arrogated to itself more authority, the office became an object of unworthy ambition

403

and unholy aspiration. Arrogance characterized those who were in power, and envy those who were not. And whenever a vacancy occurred, unseemly and wholly unchristian strife arose among rival presbyters for the vacant seat. "The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order." -- Mosheim.¹⁴

24. These rivalries caused divisions and discussions which gave opportunity for the further assertion of the dignity and authority of the bishopric. Cyprian, "the representative of the episcopal system" (Neander)¹⁵, declared that --

"The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers." "Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the church."¹⁶

25. He insisted that God made the bishops and the bishops made the deacons, and argued thus: --

"But if we [bishops] may dare anything against God who makes bishops, deacons may also dare against us by whom they are made."¹⁷

26. "The epistle of Cyprian to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, shows the height to which the episcopal power had aspired before the religion of Christ had become that of the Roman Empire. The passages of the Old Testament, and even of the New, in which honor or deference is paid to the Hebrew pontificate, are recited in profuse detail; implicit obedience is demanded for the priest of God, who is the sole infallible judge or delegate of Christ." -- Milman.¹⁸

27. As the bishops arrogated to themselves more and more authority, both in discipline and doctrine, "heretics" increased. Whosoever might disagree with the bishop was at once branded as a heretic, and was cut off from his communion, as Diotrephes had counted as a heretic even the apostle John. Upon this point the representative of the episcopal system further declared: --

404

"Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from any other source than from this, that God's priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the co-bishops, would make himself a judge, not now of the bishop, but of God. No one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ." -- Cyprian.¹⁹

28. He therefore argued that if any person was outside of this system of episcopal unity, and was not obedient to the bishop, this was all the evidence necessary to demonstrate that he was a heretic. Consequently he declared that no one ought "even to be inquisitive as to what" any one "teaches, so long as he teaches out of the pale of unity." In this way the truth itself could be made heresy.

29. By this system, "heretics" soon became numerous, and as many persons were changing their residence from place to place, a question was raised whether baptism by heretics was valid. Some bishops of important churches held that it was, others insisted that it was not. Yet up to this time all bishops and churches had been allowed to decide this for themselves. A council of bishops in Africa and Numidia, about the beginning of the third century, had established in those provinces the discipline that all heretics must be rebaptized when applying for admission to any of those churches. This practise was also adopted in Cappadocia, Galatia, Phrygia, Cilicia, and neighboring provinces, by a council held at Iconium in Phrygia, A. D. 230. Pontus and Egypt followed the same course, but Italy, Gaul, and Spain held, on the contrary, that baptism by heretics was valid, it mattered not what the heresy might be.

30. Thus stood the question when Stephen became bishop of Rome, A. D. 253. In Africa some bishops of Numidia and Mauritania sent inquiries to Cyprian, raising anew the question of baptism by heretics. A council of seventy-one bishops was held at Carthage, which declared that the practise of rebaptizing should be invariably followed. The council sent a letter to Stephen of Rome, reporting their decision, and asking him to agree with it. Stephen answered

405

the council by letter, in which he first called particular attention to the great dignity of the bishopric of Rome, and the honor which it derived by succession from the apostle Peter. Next he informed them that he absolutely rejected and condemned their decrees. He then threatened to cut off from his communion all who should presume to disobey by rebaptizing any heretics, and finally not only ordered Cyprian to change his opinion on the subject, and practise accordingly, but declared him to be a "false Christ," a "false apostle," and a "deceitful workman."

31. On receipt of Stephen's letter, Cyprian called another council of eighty-five bishops, which met Sept. 1, A. D. 256. The council canvassed the whole subject anew, came to

their original conclusion, and again sent word by messengers to Stephen, who not only refused to receive them at all, but forbade all the church of Rome either to receive or entertain them in any manner. He then proceeded to execute his threat, and excommunicated the whole council, and whoever held the same opinion as the council. This excluded from his communion the bishops of Africa, Numidia, Mauritania, Egypt, Cilicia, Galatia, and Cappadocia. He endeavored by a letter, however, to win the bishop of Alexandria to his view, but failed.

32. Cyprian wrote to Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, telling him of Stephen's conduct. In reply Firmilian wrote to Cyprian a letter in which he compared Stephen to Judas Iscariot, and branded him as "inhuman," "audacious," "insolent," "wicked," "impious," "schismatic," "a defamer of Peter and Paul," and "worse than all heretics." This Firmilian is pronounced "one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church, both for piety and learning;" but Cyprian was not far behind him and Stephen in eminence for this kind of piety. For he wrote to the bishop of Sobrata a letter in which he charged Stephen with "pride and impertinence, self-contradiction and ignorance, with indifference, obstinacy, and childishness," and called him "a favorer and abetter of heretics against the church of God." -- Bower.²⁰ Stephen died Aug. 2, A. D. 257, and thus was stopped the generous flow of pious phrases.

406

33. Stephen was succeeded by Sixtus II, who held the office about a year, and was put to death in the persecution under Valerian. He was succeeded July 22, A. D. 259, by Dionysius. At this time there was another Dionysius, who was bishop of Alexandria, and who had entered into a certain controversy with Sabellius upon the subject of the trinity. In the arguments which he published, some persons thought they discovered heresy, and reported it to the bishop of Rome, who called a council of the bishops of Italy, and requested Dionysius to answer the accusation and give an explanation of his faith. Dionysius addressed to the bishop of Rome a "confutation and apology," explaining the expressions in his former writings, which, so it was charged, contained heresy.

34. During the bishopric of Dionysius, there occurred the case of Paul of Samosata, who at that time was bishop of Antioch, an account of which will illustrate the condition of the bishoprics of the principal cities of the empire at this time.

35. The bishops of the East said of Paul that before his connection with the church he was poor almost to beggary, and that he had received neither wealth from his father nor obtained possessions by any art or trade or business, yet had now acquired excessive wealth by his iniquities and sacrileges; that by various means which he employed, he had exacted and extorted from the brethren, promising to aid them for a reward; that he took advantage of those who were in difficulty, to compel them to give him money to be free from their oppressors; that he made merchandise of piety; that he affected lofty things, and assumed too great things, attaining worldly dignity, wishing rather to be called a magistrate than a bishop; that he went strutting through the Forum reading letters and repeating them aloud as he walked; that in public he was escorted by multitudes going

before and following after him; that he brought reproach upon the faith by his pomp and haughtiness; that out of vanity and proud pretensions he contrived in ecclesiastical assemblies to catch at glory and empty shadows, and to confound the minds of the more simple; that he had prepared himself a tribunal and a high throne, separating himself from the people, like a ruler of this world, rather than a disciple of Christ; that he was in the habit of slapping his hand upon

407

his thigh and stamping upon the tribunal with his foot, reproving and insulting those who would not applaud his sermons; that he magnified himself not as a bishop but as a sophist and juggler; that he stopped the singing of the psalms in honor of Christ, and had prepared choirs of women to sing other compositions at the great festivals; that he hired deacons and presbyters of neighboring districts to preach his views of the trinity; that he had with him certain women whom the people of Antioch called "adopted sisters;" that he allowed his presbyters and deacons also to follow the same practise; that he had made his presbyters and deacons rich by indulging their covetous dispositions, and had thus bought their favor, so that none of them would accuse him of the evil doing; that many bishops besides Paul had indulged themselves in the same things, or had incurred suspicion of it, especially in the matter of the adopted sisters; that although Paul had dismissed one of these, he retained two others with him, blooming in age and eminent in beauty, taking them with him wherever he went, indulging in luxury and surfeiting; that although men around him were groaning and lamenting because of these things, they were so much afraid of his tyranny and power that they did not venture to accuse him; and finally, that all these things might be borne with in the hope of correcting the evil, were it not that he had trifled away the sacred mystery, and paraded his execrable heresy.²¹

36. On account of Paul's heresy, a council of eighty bishops was assembled at Antioch. Paul was excommunicated, pronounced deposed from the bishopric, and the council on their own authority appointed a successor. Their assumed authority to appoint a successor without consulting the membership of the church of Antioch, caused yet a larger number to take sides with Paul, because such proceeding was decidedly irregular.

37. At this time Zenobia was queen of the East, and with her Paul was rather a favorite. Under her protection, and upon the irregularity of the proceedings of the council, he openly, for four years, defied the decrees of the council, and held his place as bishop of Antioch. When Aurelian, in A. D. 270, went to the East to

408

dethrone Zenobia, the bishops appealed to him to enforce their decrees and remove Paul. Aurelian referred the case for decision to the bishops of Rome and Italy. Before this controversy was ended, Dionysius died, and his successor, Felix, decided against Paul. Then according to the decree that Aurelian had already pronounced, Paul was removed from the office and emoluments of the bishopric of Antioch.

38. We do not know whether the charges brought against Paul were all true or not, as those who made the charges were all his enemies. But whether they were true or not, is not particularly important; because if they were true, it is not to the credit of the bishopric of that time, for they clearly involve other bishops in the most serious moral delinquencies of Paul. On the other hand, if the charges were not true, then that a company of eighty bishops should falsely make such charges, is scarcely less to the discredit of the bishopric of the time, than the other would be if it were true.

39. In either case, therefore, it is certain that the statement of Eusebius of the condition of the bishopric in 302, when the Diocletian persecution began, is strictly true. They "were sunk in negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and were almost on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity." Also some who appeared to be pastors were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.

40. The scripture was fulfilled. There had come a falling away; there was a self-exaltation of the bishopric; and THE TIME WAS COME WHEN THE MAN OF SIN SHOULD BE REVEALED.

1 [Page 397] 3 John 9.

2 [Page 397] Mark 10: 42-45.

3 [Page 397] Matt. 23: 6-12.

4 [Page 398] Chap. 1: 1.

5 [Page 398] Titus 1: 5-7.

6 [Page 398] 1 Peter 5: 1-3.

7 [Page 399] D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," book vi, chap. iii, par. 7.

8 [Page 399] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. i, sec. ii, part 1, div. i,A, par 5.

9 [Page 400] "Ecclesiastical History," Maclaine's translation, century ii, part ii, chap. ii, par. 4.

10 [Page 401] Id., Murdock's translation, chap. iv, par. 4.

- 11 [Page 401] "Epistle to the Ephesians," chap. vi, and "To the Smyrnaeans," chap. ix.
- 12 [Page 402] "Against Heresies," book iv, chap. xxvi, par. 2; book iii, chap. iii, par. 2; and book iii, chap. iv, par 1.
- 13 [Page 402] "On the Lapsed," chap. vi.
- 14 [Page 403] "Ecclesiastical History," century iii, part ii, chap. ii, par. 4.
- 15 [Page 403] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. i, sec. ii, part i, div. i, B,par. 5.
- 16 [Page 403] Epistle xxvi, chap. i, and epistle lxviii, chap. viii.
- 17 [Page 403] Epistle lxiv, chap. iii.
- 18 [Page 403] "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. i, par. 22.
- 19 [Page 404] Epistle liv, chap. v.
- 20 [Page 405] "Lives of the Popes," Stephen, par. 8.
- 21 [Page 407] Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book vii, chap. xxx.

28. ROME -- THE RISE OF CONSTANTINE.

DURING the eighty years occupied for the most part by the "dark, unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid, inhuman Domitian," "Rome groaned beneath an unremitting tyranny, which exterminated the ancient families of the republic, and was fatal to almost every virtue and every talent that arose in that unhappy period." -- Gibbon.¹

2. This dreary scene was relieved by a respite of eighty-four years through the successful reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius; only to be opened up again by Commodus, A. D. 180, and to continue unrelieved for more than one hundred years. It is useless to pursue the subject in detail. Of this period it may be remarked as of one before, that to attempt to follow it in detail would be only "to record the mandates of despotism, incessant accusations, faithless friendships, the ruin of innocence, -- one unvarying repetition of causes terminating in the same event, and presenting no novelty from their similarity and tiresome reiteration." -- Tacitus.²

3. The inroads of the barbarians obliged the legions to be always stationed on the frontier of the empire, all the way from the mouth of the Rhine to the mouth of the Danube. By the soldiers, according to their own caprice, emperors were made and unmade, many of whom never saw the capital of their empire. And the office was one so certain to be terminated by murder that although from Commodus to Constantine there were sixty men named as emperor, only seven died a natural death; two -- Decius and Valerian -- perished

410

in battle; all the rest were murdered in the internal strifes of the failing empire.

4. Diocletian, the commander of the imperial body-guard, was proclaimed emperor by the troops Sept. 17, 285. He organized a system by which he wished to give to the office of emperor a tenure more secure than that allowed by the licentious caprice of the soldiery. He had reigned alone only about six months, when -- April 1, A. D. 286 -- he associated with himself in the office of emperor, Maximian. Six years afterward, March 1, A. D. 292, he named two other associates, Galerius and Constantius, though in inferior stations.

5. Diocletian and Maximian each bore the title of Augustus, while Galerius and Constantius each bore that of Caesar. Both these Caesars were already married, but each was obliged to put away his wife and be adopted as a son, and marry a daughter, of one of the Augusti. Galerius was adopted as the son of Diocletian, and married his daughter; Constantius as the son of Maximian, and married his step-daughter.

6. The empire was then divided into four principal parts, each to be governed by one of the four emperors. Diocletian retained as his part, Thrace, Egypt, and Asia. To Maximian

was given Italy and Africa. Upon Galerius was bestowed what was known as the Illyrian provinces, bounded by Thrace, the Adriatic, the Danube, the Alps, and the Rhine; while to Constantius fell all that was west of the Rhine and the Alps; namely, Gaul, Spain, and Britain.

7. It appears to have been Diocletian's intention that whenever the place of either of the two Augusti became vacant, it should be filled by one of the Caesars, whose place in turn should be filled by a new appointment, thus securing a permanent, peaceful, and steady succession to the imperial authority. Nor did the division and distribution of the offices stop here. It was extended in regular gradation to the smallest parts of the empire. Diocletian fixed his capital at Nicomedia; and Maximian his at Milan, which under his care assumed the splendor of an imperial city. "The houses are described as numerous and well built; the manners of the people as polished and liberal. A circus, a theater, a mint, a palace, baths, --

411

which bore the name of their founder Maximian, -- porticoes adorned with statues, and a double circumference of walls, contributed to the beauty of the new capital By the taste of the monarch, and at the expense of the people, Nicomedia acquired, in the space of a few years, a degree of magnificence which might appear to have required the labor of ages, and became inferior only to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in extent or populousness." -- Gibbon. And with the exception of the short reign of Maxentius, from the day when these two emperors made these two cities their capitals, no emperor ever dwelt in Rome.

8. Diocletian and Maximian also established each a court and a ceremonial modeled upon that of the king of Persia. Whoever would address the emperor must pass a succession of guards and officers, and "when a subject was at last admitted to the imperial presence, he was required, whatever might be his rank, to fall prostrate on the ground, and to adore according to the Eastern fashion the divinity of his lord and master." The two emperors assumed not exactly crowns, but diadems, the first that had been worn by Romans since the abolition of the kingly office. "The sumptuous robes of Diocletian and his successors were of silk and gold, and it is remarked with indignation that even their shoes were studded with precious stones."

9. It is, however, as the author of the last and most terrible persecution of Christianity by pagan Rome -- the last effort of the pagan State against the freedom of thought and of worship taught by Christianity -- that Diocletian is chiefly known to the world, though, strictly speaking, he was not the author of it.

10. Diocletian and Constantius were both friendly to the Christians, and had many professed Christians in public offices. In considerable numbers they were employed in Diocletian's palace; but Galerius and Maximian were savagely opposed to every form of the Christian name. Galerius urged upon Diocletian the issuing of a decree condemning

Christianity. Diocletian hesitated, but agreed to prohibit any Christian from holding any public office or employment, and spoke strongly against the shedding of blood. Galerius

412

persuaded him to allow the calling of a council of the officers of the State, the outcome of which was that on Feb. 24, 303 A. D. , a "general edict of persecution was published; and though Diocletian, still averse to the effusion of blood, had moderated the fury of Galerius, who proposed that every one refusing to offer sacrifice should immediately be burnt alive, the penalty inflicted on the obstinacy of the Christians might be deemed sufficiently rigorous and effectual.

11. "It was enacted that their churches in all the provinces of the empire should be demolished to their foundations; and the punishment of death was denounced against all who should presume to hold any secret assemblies for the purpose of religious worship. The philosophers, who now assumed the unworthy office of directing the blind zeal of persecution, had diligently studied the nature and genius of the Christian religion; and as they were not ignorant that the speculative doctrines of the faith were supposed to be contained in the writings of the prophets, of the evangelists, and of the apostles, they most probably suggested the order that the bishops and the presbyter should deliver all their sacred books into the hands of the magistrates, who were commanded under the severest penalties to burn them in a public and solemn manner. By the same edict the property of the church was at once confiscated; and the several parts of which it might consist were either sold to the highest bidder, united to the imperial domain, bestowed on the cities and corporations, or granted to the solicitations of rapacious courtiers.

12. "After taking such effectual measures to abolish the worship and to dissolve the government of the Christians, it was thought necessary to subject to the most intolerable hardships the condition of those perverse individuals who should still reject the religion of nature, of Rome, and of their ancestors. Persons of a liberal birth were declared incapable of holding any honors or employments, slaves were forever deprived of the hopes of freedom, and the whole body of the people were put out of the protection of the law. The judges were authorized to hear and to determine every action that was brought against a Christian. But the Christians were not permitted

413

to complain of any injury which they themselves had suffered; and thus those unfortunate sectaries were exposed to the severity, while they were excluded from the benefits, of public justice."-- Gibbon.⁴

13. The attack upon the church buildings began the day before this decree was published. Then, "at the earliest dawn of day, the praetorian prefect, accompanied by several generals, tribunes, and officers of the revenue, repaired to the principal church of Nicomedia, which was situated on an eminence in the most populous and beautiful part of the city. The doors were instantly broken open; they rushed into the sanctuary; and as

they searched in vain for some visible object of worship, they were obliged to content themselves with committing to the flames the volumes of Holy Scripture. The ministers of Diocletian were followed by a numerous body of guards and pioneers, who marched in order of battle, and were provided with all the instruments used in the destruction of fortified cities. By their incessant labor, a sacred edifice which towered above the imperial palace, and had long excited the indignation and envy of the Gentiles, was in a few hours leveled with the ground." -- Gibbon.⁵

14. The decree had hardly been posted up in the most public place in Nicomedia, when a professed Christian, whose zeal outran his good sense, pulled it down and tore it to pieces. It had been now more than forty years since the decree of Gallienus had legally recognized Christianity. In this time of peace the churches had become filled with a mass of people who were Christians only in name. Large church buildings were built in all parts of the empire. The genuine faith and discipline of the church had been seriously relaxed long before that, and now in this time of peace, and through the vast numbers that united themselves with the name of Christianity, there came the natural result -- violent contention and ambitious aspirations.

15. Quite a striking picture of the churches in this time is given us in the following extract, by one who was there at the time: --

414

"When by reason of excessive liberty we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the divine judgment, which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situations as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves." -- Eusebius.⁶

16. When the decree was issued for the abolition of Christianity, vast multitudes of these formal professors turned back again with the same readiness and with the same selfish motives with which they had joined the church; and their easy rejection of the faith made the persecution the more severe upon those refusing to yield.

17. Within fifteen days after the publication of the edict, a fire broke out twice in the emperor's palace at Nicomedia, and although it was quenched both times without doing

any material damage, as it was attributed to the resentment of the Christians, it caused their suffering to be yet more severe. "At first, indeed, the magistrates were restrained from the effusion of blood; but the use of every other severity was permitted, and even recommended to their zeal; nor could the Christians, though they cheerfully resigned the ornaments of their churches, resolve to interrupt their religious assemblies, or to deliver their sacred books to the flames. "-- Gibbon.⁷

18. As they refused to discontinue their meetings or to burn the Scriptures, another edict was shortly issued, commanding that all the bishops, presbyters, readers, and exorcists should be punished. Another edict soon followed, commanding the magistrates everywhere to compel all these to renounce the Christian faith and return

415

to the worship of the gods by offering the appointed sacrifice. This again was soon followed by an edict, the fourth in the series, including the whole body of the Christians within the provisions of the edicts which had preceded. Heavy penalties were pronounced against all who should attempt to shield the Christians from the force of the edicts.

19. "Many were burnt alive, and the tortures by which the persecutors sought to shake their resolution were so dreadful that even such a death seemed an act of mercy. The only province of the empire where the Christians were at peace was Gaul, which had received its baptism of blood under Marcus Aurelius, but was now governed by Constantus Chlorus, who protected them from personal molestation, though he was compelled, in obedience to the emperor, to destroy their churches. In Spain, which was also under the government, but not under the direct inspection, of Constantius, the persecution was moderate, but in all other parts of the empire it raged with fierceness till the abdication of Diocletian in 305. This event almost immediately restored peace to the western province, but greatly aggravated the misfortunes of the Eastern Christians, who passed under the absolute rule of Galerius. Horrible, varied, and prolonged tortures were employed to quell their fortitude, and their final resistance was crowned by the most dreadful of all deaths -- roasting over a slow fire.

20. "It was not till A. D. 311, eight years after the commencement of the general persecution, ten years after the first measure against the Christians, that the Eastern persecution ceased. Galerius, the arch-enemy of the Christians, was struck down by a fearful disease. His body, it is said, became a mass of loathsome and fetid sores -- 2 living corpse, devoured by countless worms, and exhaling the odor of a charnel-house. He who had shed so much innocent blood, shrank himself from a Roman death. In his extreme anguish he appealed in turn to physician after physician, and to temple after temple. At last he relented toward the Christians. He issued a proclamation restoring them to liberty, permitting them to rebuild their churches, and asking their prayers for his recovery." -- Lecky⁸

416

21. The edict of Galerius here referred to was as follows: --

"Among the important cares which have occupied our mind for the utility and preservation of the empire, it was our intention to correct and re-establish all things according to the ancient laws and public discipline of the Romans. We were particularly desirous of reclaiming into the way of reason and nature the deluded Christians, who had renounced the religion and ceremonies instituted by their fathers; and presumptuously despising the practise of antiquity, had invented extravagant laws and opinions according to the dictates of their fancy, and had collected a various society from the different provinces of our empire. The edicts which we have published to enforce the worship of the gods, having exposed many of the Christians to danger and distress, many having suffered death, and many more who still persist in their impious folly, being left destitute of any public exercise of religion, we are disposed to extend to those unhappy men the effects of our wonted clemency. We permit them therefore freely to profess their private opinions and to assemble in their conventicles without fear or molestation, provided always that they preserve a due respect to the established laws and government. By another rescript we shall signify our intentions to the judges and magistrates, and we hope that our indulgence will engage the Christians to offer up their prayers to the Deity whom they adore, for our safety and prosperity, for their own, and for that of the republic."⁹

22. Shortly after Diocletian issued the last of the four edicts against Christianity, and in the twenty-second year of his reign, he abdicated the empire, May 1, A. D. 305. By previous arrangement Maximian on his part also abdicated the imperial authority at his palace in Milan. "The abdication of Diocletian and Maximian was succeeded by eighteen years of discord and confusion. The empire was afflicted by five civil wars; and the remainder of the time was not so much a state of tranquillity as a suspension of arms between several hostile monarchs who, viewing each other with an eye of fear and hatred, strove to increase their respective forces at the expense of their subjects." -- Gibbon.¹⁰

23. Galerius and Constantius immediately succeeded to the places of these two, each assuming the title of Augustus. Galerius at once assumed to himself the authority to appoint the two Caesars, without waiting to consult Constantius. As a matter of course he appointed those whom he could use to promote his own ambitious designs to secure to himself the supreme authority in the empire.

417

One of these was his own nephew, Maximin, who was given command of Syria and Egypt. The other was one of his own subordinate officers, Severus, who was sent to Milan as the successor of Maximian.

24. Thus Galerius virtually held control of three fourths of the empire, and only waited a good opportunity to lay claim to the rest. This opportunity he supposed was given him when, July 25, A. D. 306, Constantius died in Britain; but he was disappointed, for as

soon as Constantius was dead, the army proclaimed Constantine Augustus and emperor, and a messenger was sent to Galerius to announce to him the fact. Such a proceeding had not been included in his plans, and Galerius threatened to burn both the letter and the messenger who brought it. Constantine, however, at the head of the legions of Britain, was in a position not to be despised. Galerius, therefore, decided to make the best of the situation. He recognized Constantine as the successor of Constantius in that division of the empire, with the title of Caesar, but fourth in rank, while he raised Severus to the dignity of Augustus.

25. Just at this time there was another important move upon the stage of action. The people of the city of Rome were greatly offended at the action of Diocletian in removing the capital, and Galerius now took a step that deepened their sense of injury. A general census was begun to list all the property of the Roman citizens for the purpose of levying a general tax. Wherever there was any suspicion of concealment of any property, the citizen was tortured to compel an honest statement of his possessions. Rome had been exempt from taxation for nearly five hundred years, and when the census takers began their work there, the injury that the people felt they had suffered by the removal of their capital, was so deepened that they broke out into open revolt, and proclaimed Maxentius emperor, Oct. 28, A. D. 306. Maxentius was the son of Maximian. "The prefect of the city and a few magistrates, who maintained their fidelity to Severus, were massacred by the guards; and Maxentius, invested with the imperial ornaments, was acknowledged by the applauding Senate and people as the protector of the Roman freedom and dignity." -- Gibbon.¹¹

418

26. At the invitation of Maxentius and the Senate, Maximian gladly left his place of retirement, and again assumed the position of associate emperor. Galerius ordered Severus, who was stationed at Milan, to march to Rome and put down this rebellion. But when he reached the city, he found it so well fortified and defended against him that he dared not attack it. Besides this, a large number of his troops deserted him to their old commander Maximian, and he was compelled, if he would save his life, to march back again as fast as he could. He stopped at Ravenna, which was strongly fortified, and where he had a large fleet. Maximian soon came up and began a siege. Severus had found so little favor among the people of Italy, and had been deserted by so large a number of his troops, that Maximian found it an easy task to convince him that there was a plan formed by the city of Ravenna also, to betray him and deliver him up. By this means, and the positive assurance that his life would be preserved, Severus was persuaded to surrender. But he found that the only liberty that was left him was to kill himself.

27. February, A. D. 307, Maximian went to Milan, took possession of his former capital, and without waiting, crossed the Alps to meet Constantine, who was then at Arles in Gaul. March 31 an alliance was formed. Constantine married Maximian's daughter Fausta, and Maximian gave him the title of Augustus. Galerius himself now undertook to punish the Romans for their rebellion; but his experience was identical with that of Severus, only that he was fortunate enough to escape with his life and some of his troops.

In his retreat the enmity of the Romans was yet more deepened by the desolation which his legions left in their train. "They murdered, they ravished, they plundered; they drove away the flocks and herds of the Italians; they burnt the villages through which they passed; and they endeavored to destroy the country which it had not been in their power to subdue." -- Gibbon.¹²

28. Galerius, not willing to recognize either Maxentius or Maximian, appointed Licinius to the office of Augustus, Nov. 11, 307, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Severus. Maximin, governor of Syria and Egypt, with the title of Caesar, no sooner heard of the

419

appointment of Licinius to the title of Augustus, than he demanded of Galerius the same honor; and the demand was made in a tone which, in the existing condition of things, Galerius was compelled to respect. Thus at the beginning of the year 308, "for the first, and indeed for the last, time, the Roman world was administered by six emperors." -- Gibbon.¹³

29. It was not however the purpose of these six emperors to administer the Roman world together. Each one was determined to administer it alone. Each one was jealous of all the others, and narrowly watched them all, ready instantly to grasp and make the most of whatever opportunity might present itself. The first two of the emperors between whom this mutual jealousy produced an open quarrel, were Maximian and Maxentius. Maxentius refused to acknowledge himself subordinate to his father, and his father insisted that it was by his ability as a commander that Maxentius was made secure in his claim to the dignity of emperor. The difference between them was submitted to the troops for decision. They decided in favor of Maxentius. Maximian left his son and Italy, and went to his son-in-law Constantine, in Gaul, and there a second time he abdicated the imperial dignity; but only that he might the more securely contrive new mischiefs.

30. Not long afterward an invasion of the Franks called Constantine and his troops to the Rhine north of the Moselle. A report of the death of Constantine was hastily seized upon by Maximian as the truth, and he assumed the position of emperor, took the money from Constantine's treasury and distributed it among the soldiers, and began overtures for an alliance with Maxentius. Constantine heard of Maximian's movements, marched quickly from the Rhine to the Saone, took some boats at Chalons, and with his legions so unexpectedly arrived at Arles that Maximian considered it his only safety to take refuge in Marseilles. Constantine followed and attacked the city. The garrison gave up Maximian, who, like Severus, was granted the liberty of killing himself.

31. As Constantine was about to return to the Rhine to enter again upon the war with the Franks, he received the intelligence

420

that they had retired from Gaul to their own country; and to express his gratitude (A. D. 308) "he gave public thanks in a celebrated temple of Apollo, probably at Autun (Augustodunum), and presented a magnificent offering to the god." -- Neander.¹⁴

32. Galerius died in the month of May, A. D. 311. Four of the six emperors now remained, and another apportionment of the eastern dominions was made between Licinius and Maximin. With the latter, Maxentius formed an alliance which drew Constantine and Licinius together on the other side. "Maxentius was cruel, rapacious, and profligate," "a tyrant as contemptible as he was odious." In him it seemed as though the times of Commodus and Elagabalus were returned.

33. In A. D. 308, Marcellus was elected bishop of Rome. "This new bishop wished to avail himself of the calm which religion enjoyed, at the commencement of his pontificate, to ordain rules and re-establish in the church the discipline which the troubles [of the Galerian persecution] had altered. But his severity rendered him odious to the people, and caused divisions among the faithful. Discord degenerated into sedition, and the quarrel terminated in murder." Maxentius blamed Marcellus as being the chief cause of these disturbances, "and condemned him to groom post-horses in a stable on the high-road."

34. After about nine months of this service, some priests succeeded in carrying off Marcellus. They concealed him in the house of a Roman lady named Lucilla. When the officers would have taken him again, the faithful assembled under arms to defend him. Maxentius ordered out his guards and dispersed them. He then commanded that Lucilla's house should be converted into a stable, and obliged Marcellus to continue in the office of groom. In January, A. D. 310, Marcellus died, and was succeeded by Eusebius, whom Maxentius banished to Sicily. He died there after a few months, and was succeeded by Melchiades, in the same year, A. D. 310.

35. In A. D. 311, Melchiades wrote a letter to Constantine, and by a delegation of bishops sent it to him at Treves, in Gaul, inviting

421

him to come to the relief of the church, and to make the conquest of Rome. Constantine deliberated, and Maxentius became more and more tyrannical. In A. D. 312, an embassy from Rome went to Constantine at Arles, and in the name of the Senate and people requested him to deliver the city from the despotism of the tyrant. Constantine gladly embraced the opportunity thus offered, and quickly set out toward Rome.¹⁵

36. At Turin he met and destroyed a strong body of the troops of Maxentius; and at Verona, after a considerable siege of the city, and a hard-fought battle in the field, which, beginning in the afternoon, continued through the whole of the following night, he vanquished quite a formidable army. Between Verona and Rome there was nothing to check the march of Constantine. Maxentius drew out his army, and met Constantine on the banks of the Tiber, nine miles from Rome. He crossed the Tiber and set his army in battle array, with the river in his rear. The battle was joined. Maxentius was soon

defeated, and his army, broken to pieces, attempted to escape. In the confusion and by the terrible onslaught of Constantine's veterans, thousands of the soldiers of Maxentius were crowded into the river and drowned. Maxentius, endeavoring to escape on his horse across the Milvian bridge, was crowded off into the river, and being clothed with heavy armor, was drowned, Oct. 28, A. D. 312.

37. In the month of March, 313, Constantine and Licinius met in Milan. Constantine's sister Constantia was given in marriage to Licinius as a bond of friendship between the two emperors. Maximin, on hearing of the death of Maxentius, declared war against Licinius, and started with an army from Syria toward Europe. He crossed the Bosphorus, captured Byzantium, marched onward and took Heraclea. By this time Licinius himself had arrived within eighteen miles of that place, and April 30 a battle was fought, and Maximin was defeated. He himself, however, escaped, and in the month of August following, his life ended in a manner not certainly known.

422

38. The edict of Galerius restoring to the Christians the right to worship had had little or no effect upon Maximin. In his dominions and by his direction the persecutions had continued. Before Constantine and Licinius had separated, after their meeting at Milan in March, they jointly issued the celebrated edict of Milan, which acknowledged the right for which Christianity had contended for two hundred and fifty weary and painful years, by confirming "to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion." That part of the edict is as follows: --

"Wherefore as I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus, came under favorable auspices to Milan, and took under consideration all affairs that pertain to the public benefit and welfare, these things among the rest appeared to us to be most advantageous and profitable to all.

"We have resolved among the first things to ordain those matters by which reverence and worship to the Deity might be exhibited. That is, how we may grant likewise to the Christians, and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish; that whatsoever divinity and celestial power may exist, may be propitious to us and to all that live under our government. Therefore we have decreed the following ordinance as our will, with a salutary and most correct intention, that no freedom at all shall be refused to Christians to follow or to keep their observances or worship, but that to each one power be granted to devote his mind to that worship which he may think adapted to himself; that the Deity may in all things exhibit to us His accustomed favor and kindness.

"It was just and consistent that we should write that this was our pleasure. That all exceptions respecting the Christians being completely removed, which were contained in the former epistle that we sent to your fidelity, and whatever measures were wholly sinister and foreign to our mildness, that these should be altogether annulled, and now that each one of the Christians may freely and without molestation pursue and follow that course and worship which he has proposed to himself; which, indeed, we have resolved

to communicate most fully to your care and diligence, that you may know we have granted liberty and full freedom to the Christians to observe their own mode of worship, which as your fidelity understands absolutely granted to them by us, the privilege is also granted to others to pursue that worship and religion they wish. Which, it is obvious, is consistent with the peace and tranquillity of our times, that each may have the privilege to select and to worship whatsoever divinity he pleases. But this has been done by us that we might not appear in any manner to detract anything from any manner of religion, or any mode of worship."¹⁶

423

39. If all the professors of Christianity had been content with this victory, and had held the tide of events steadily to the principles of this edict, -- the principles for which Christianity had so long contended, -- the miseries of the ages to come would never have been.

1 [Page 409] "Decline and Fall," chap. iii, par. 33.

2 [Page 409] "Annals," book iv. chap. xxxiii.

3 [Page 411] Id., chap. xiii, par. 28.

4 [Page 413] Id., chap. xvi, par. 45.

5 [Page 413] Id., par. 44.

6 [Page 414] "Ecclesiastical History," book viii, chap. i.

7 [Page 414] "Decline and Fall," chap. xvi, par. 48.

8 [Page 415] "History of European Morals," chap. iii, par. 3 from end.

9 [Page 416] "Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book viii, chap. xvii - Gibbon's translation," "Decline and Fall," chap. xvi, par. 56.

10 [Page 416] Id., chap. xiv, par. 1.

11 [Page 417] Id., chap. xiv, par. 10.

12 [Page 418] Id., par. 14.

13 [Page 419] Id., par. 15.

14 [Page 420] "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. ii sec. i, part i, A, par. 11.

15 [Page 421] De Cormanin's "History of the Popes," Marcellus, and Melchiades; Bower's "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 16; Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xiv, par. 20.

16 [Page 422] Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book x. chap. v.

29. ROME -- THE RELIGION OF CONSTANTINE.

MUCH research and great effort have been made to discover the time of Constantine's conversion to Christianity. One writer dates it at his accession in 306, another in 312, another in 321, yet another not till 323, and still another about 327. Others put it at his death-bed baptism, while still others insist that he never was a Christian. When he became a Christian, or whether he ever did, is an interesting question even at this time.

2. It must be borne in mind that sun-worship was the principal form of worship in the Roman Empire and of the Romans. The sun, as represented in Apollo, was the chief and patron divinity recognized by Augustus. "Apollo was the patron of the spot which had given a name to his great victory of Actium; Apollo himself, it was proclaimed, had fought for Rome and for Octavius on that auspicious day." -- Merivale.¹

3. To Sol Deus Invictus -- the sun, the unconquerable god -- were attributed the world-wide conquests of the Roman power. The greatest and most magnificent temple that ever was on earth, except only that built by Solomon, was erected by Antoninus Pius, emperor of Rome, at Baalbec, in honor of the visible shining sun. Elagabalus, who became emperor June 7, A. D. 218, adopted as his imperial name the very name of the sun as it was worshiped at Emesa in Syria in the temple where he himself had been high priest. And as emperor and high priest of the sun, it was his chief purpose, and "it was openly asserted, that the worship of the sun, under the name of Elagabalus, was to supersede all other worship." -- Milman.² It was the oracle of the sun -- Apollo -- at Miletus

425

which Diocletian consulted before he issued the decree of persecution to which he was so strongly urged by Galerius, who in turn was prompted by his mother, a fanatical worshiper of Cybele.

4. Thus the worship of the sun itself was the principal worship of the Romans in the time of Constantine. And it was in Constantine that, after Elagabalus, the sun found its most worshipful devotee. Up to the period of his war with Maxentius, A. D. 312, "all that we know of Constantine's religion would imply that he was outwardly, and even zealously, pagan. In a public oration, his panegyrist extols the magnificence of his offerings to the gods. His victorious presence was not merely expected to restore more than their former splendor to the Gaulish cities ruined by barbaric incursions, but sumptuous temples were to arise at his bidding, to propitiate the deities, particularly Apollo, his tutelary god. The medals struck for these victories are covered with the symbols of paganism. Eusebius himself admits that Constantine was at this time in doubt which religion he should embrace." -- Milman.³

5. As emperor, and to satisfy the prejudices of the people, some respectful deference was shown to other gods, but "the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed

to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. The unerring shafts of that deity, the brightness of his eyes, his laurel wreath, immortal beauty, and elegant accomplishments, seemed to point him out as the patron of a young hero. The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelar deity; and that, either waking or in a vision, he was blessed with the auspicious omens of a long and victorious reign. The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine." -- Gibbon.⁴

6. However, about the latter part of the year 311 or early in 312, there certainly came such a change in his mind as to lead him to

426

favor Christianity. There was enmity between him and Galerius, which of itself naturally threw Constantine into opposition to the plans and ambitions of that emperor. Galerius had done all that he could to keep Constantine from escaping from the dominions of Diocletian to those of Constantius. Constantine knew that the purpose of Galerius in this was nothing but evil, if not death, to him. By extraordinary speed he defeated the scheme of Galerius in this, and when he was made emperor in Britain, as we have seen, the purposes of Galerius were almost wholly disconcerted.

7. This, we repeat, naturally made Constantine an opponent of the plans of Galerius. Therefore when Galerius spent his strongest efforts in behalf of the pagan party in the State, Constantine naturally leaned toward the other. In this also he had the example of his humane father, who, although not able to defeat wholly the edicts of persecution, greatly modified their effects. Another thing that influenced him in this direction was because, as he himself said, --

"My father revered the Christian God, and uniformly prospered, while the emperors who worshiped the heathen gods, died a miserable death; therefore that I may enjoy a happy life and reign, I will imitate the example of my father, and join myself to the cause of the Christians, who are growing daily, while the heathen are diminishing."⁵

8. And "this low utilitarian consideration weighed heavily in the mind of an ambitious captain, who looked forward to the highest seat of power within the gift of his age." -- Schaff. It is manifest that the only consideration that operated upon his mind at this time was this utilitarian one, and that whatever favor he felt toward Christians so far was merely as a matter of policy, with the hope that by this he might be aided in his aspirations to the sole rulership of the empire. To Constantine himself, if at this time Christianity had obtained any hold upon his mind, it was now the Christianity of the warrior, as subsequently it was that of the statesman. It was the military commander who availed himself of the assistance of any tutelar divinity who might insure success to his daring enterprise." -- Milman.⁶

9. Such was his attitude toward Christianity before the defeat of Maxentius. Nor was there afterward any material change, either in his profession or his character. In the same manner as the cruel emperors before him, at the defeat of Maxentius, not content with the death of that emperor himself and a large number of his adherents, he executed vengeance also on his infant son. "Utterly devoid of faith in anything else except himself and his own destiny, unyielding in that ambition to exercise dominion which nerved him for the doubtful war against Maxentius, he regarded both mankind and religion with pity and contempt, and sought to rule men for their good and his own glory, by means of any faith which they might prefer; and hence, as Christianity became more known and popular, he identified himself with it more and more, only in order to foster any agency which seemed to be available in the work of consolidating the warring factions of the empire, and securing the permanency of his throne." -- The Author of "Arius the Libyan."

10. At what time he made the labarum is not certainly known; but whenever it was, it was simply another instance of his policy in pretending to favor the church party while still retaining his paganism. For when he constructed the labarum, he simply "changed the heathen labarum into a standard of the Christian cross with the Greek monogram of Christ, which he had also put upon the shields of his soldiers." "On the top of the shaft was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the monogram of Christ; and just under this crown was a likeness of the emperor and his sons in gold." -- Schaff.⁷

11. That by this emblem Constantine intended to profess to the church party his alliance with them, is evident. Yet he did not propose to forsake his paganism; for "even in the labarum, if the initiated eyes of the Christian soldiery could discern the sacred symbol of Christ indistinctly glittering above the cross, there appeared, either embossed on the beam below or embroidered on the square purple banner which depended from it, the bust of the emperor and those of his family, to whom the heathen part of his army might pay their homage of veneration." "And so, for the first time, the meek

and peaceful Jesus became the God of battle; and the cross, the holy sign of Christian redemption, a banner of bloody strife." -- Milman.⁸

12. In honor of his triumph over Maxentius, a statue of himself was erected in the Roman Forum (A. D. 316). In his right hand was the labarum with the inscription, --

"By virtue of this salutary sign, which is the true symbol of valor, I have preserved and liberated your city from the yoke of tyranny." -- Eusebius.⁹

13. Afterward a triumphal arch was also built in Rome to commemorate the victory at the Milvian bridge, in which his ambiguous relationship to the two religions is again displayed. "The inscription on this arch of Constantine ascribes his victory over the hated

tyrant, not only to his master mind, but indefinitely also to the impulse of Deity, by which a Christian would naturally understand the true God, while a heathen, like the orator Nazarius, in his eulogy on Constantine, might take it for the celestial guardian power of the 'urbs ceterna' [eternal city]." -- Schaff.10

14. Again: after the defeat of Maxentius and his triumphal entry into the city of Rome, though he declined to celebrate the pagan rite of going to the Capitol to offer sacrifice to Jupiter and the gods, he restored the pagan temples, and assumed the title of pontifex maximus. And when some pagans of Africa brought to him the head of Maxentius, he granted as a reward that the province of Africa should be permitted to establish a priesthood and a worship in honor of the family of Constantine.

15. In A. D. 321, to please the bishops of the Catholic Church, he issued an edict commanding judges, townspeople, and mechanics to rest on Sunday. Yet in this also his paganism was still manifest, as the edict required rest on "the venerable day of the sun," and "enjoined the observance, or rather forbade the public desecration, of Sunday, not under the name of Sabbatum, or Dies Domini, but under its old astrological and heathen title, Dies Solis, familiar to

429

all his subjects, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Hercules, Apollo, and Mithras, as to the Christians." -- Schaff.11

16. "The same tenacious adherence to the ancient god of light has left its trace, even to our own time, on one of the most sacred and universal of Christian institutions. The retention of the old pagan name of 'Dies Solis,' or 'Sunday,' for the weekly Christian festival, is in great measure owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution." -- Stanley.12

17. The next day after issuing this Sunday law, that is, March 8, A. D. 321, he published another edict, in which he "expressly ordains that whenever lightning should strike the imperial palace or any other public building, the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use." And by yet another "law of the same year, he declares also the employment of heathen magic, for good ends, as for the prevention or healing of diseases, for the protection of harvests, for the prevention of rain and of hail, to be permitted, and in such expressions, too, as certainly betray a faith in the efficacy of these pretended supernatural means, unless the whole is to be ascribed simply to the legal forms of paganism." -- Neander.13

18. Meanwhile Constantine had been drawing closer to the bishops, and bestowing favors on the Catholic Church, the full account of which will be given in the following chapters. By this time, therefore, he could afford to hold the profession of the two

religions upon an equal balance. Accordingly, now "his coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ, on the other the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, 'Sol invictus' (the unconquerable sun), as if he could not bear to relinquish the patronage

430

of the bright luminary which represented to him, as to Augustus and to Julian, his own guardian deity." -- Stanley.¹⁴

19. In A. D. 315 there had been war between Constantine and Licinius. After two battles, a peace was concluded which continued till 323, when, "without any previous injury," but out of sheer ambition and "a love of power that would brook no rival," and "at the expense of truth and humanity," Constantine entered again upon a war with Licinius. On July 3 was fought the battle of Adrianople, in which Licinius was defeated with a loss of thirty-four thousand men. He retreated to Byzantium, where Constantine besieged him. When Constantine was about to take the city, Licinius deserted it and passed over to Asia. Constantine followed, and another battle was fought at Chrysopolis, where Licinius was again defeated with so great a loss of men that he was compelled to sue for peace. His wife Constantia, the sister of Constantine, interceded with her brother in favor of her husband, and obtained from him a solemn promise, confirmed by an oath, that if Licinius would resign all claims to the office of emperor, he should be allowed to pass the rest of his life in peace and as became his station. Thessalonica was appointed as the place of his dwelling, or as it proved, his imprisonment; and it was not long before he was put to death (A. D. 324) in violation of the solemn oath of Constantine. The fact that Licinius was past seventy years of age at the time, lent to the transaction, in addition to its character of deliberate perjury, the element of positive cruelty.

20. The next year (A. D. 325) Constantine convened at Nice the first general council of the Catholic Church, presided over its deliberations, and enforced its decrees. The following year (A. D. 326) he went to Rome to celebrate in that city the twentieth year of his accession to the office of emperor, and while there, in the month of April, and wholly in jealous tyranny, he had his son Crispus murdered. Crispus was his eldest son, who had assisted in his wars, especially with Licinius, and had proved himself an able commander. He commanded the fleet at the siege of Byzantium, and after the battle the names of Constantine and Crispus were united in the joyful

431

acclamations of their Eastern subjects. This excited the jealousy of Constantine, who soon began to slight Crispus, and bestow imperial favors upon his younger son, Constantius, who was but a mere boy. Constantine pretended that Crispus had entered into a conspiracy against him, and Oct. 21, 325, he issued an edict restoring the order of delators, after the manner of Tiberius and Domitian. "By all the allurements of honors and rewards, he invites informers of every degree to accuse without exception his magistrates or ministers, his friends or his most intimate favorites, protesting, with a solemn asseveration, that he himself will listen to the charge." -- Gibbon.¹⁵

21. The informers were not long in finding accusations against Crispus and a large number of his friends, and "in the midst of the festival, the unfortunate Crispus was apprehended by order of the emperor, who laid aside the tenderness of a father, without assuming the equity of a judge. . . . He was sent under a strong guard to Pola, in Istria, where, soon afterward, he was put to death, either by the hand of the executioner, or by the more gentle operation of poison. The Caesar Licinius, a youth of amiable manners, was involved in the ruin of Crispus; and the stern jealousy of Constantine was unmoved by the prayers and tears of his favorite sister, pleading for the life of a son, whose rank was his only crime, and whose loss she did not long survive." -- Gibbon.16

22. Nor were these the only ones involved in the execution. "The sword of justice or of cruelty, once let loose, raged against those who were suspected as partizans of the dangerous Crispus, or as implicated in the wide-spread conspiracy, till the bold satire of an eminent officer of State did not scruple, in some lines privately circulated, to compare the splendid but bloody times with those of Nero." -- Milman.17

23. Nor yet did he stop here. "This was only the first act of the domestic tragedy; the death of the emperor's wife Fausta, the partner of twenty years of wedlock, the mother of his three surviving sons, increased the general horror. She was suffocated in a bath

432

which had been heated to an insupportable degree of temperature." "The tragedy which took place in the family of Constantine betrayed to the surprised and anxious world, that, if his outward demeanor showed respect or veneration for Christianity, its milder doctrines had made little impression on the unsoftened paganism of his heart." -- Milman.18

24. Shortly after this, Constantine's mother went to Jerusalem on a pilgrimage to recover the holy places, and to build churches upon them. She carried a letter from Constantine to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, in which he stated that it was always his "first and only object to excite all minds to the observation of the holy law with alacrity and diligence proportioned to the brightness of the manifestation which is thrown by new miracles upon the truth of the faith day by day;" and that it was his "most intense desire to erect beautiful edifices" upon that spot which had been consecrated "by the sufferings of our Lord, who thus brought faith to light."19

25. Helena was said to be about eighty years old at this time, and the tale was invented, and one hundred years later became a matter of history, that she discovered the tomb in which the Saviour had been buried; that in it were found all three of the crosses that were used on the day of the crucifixion, the nails that were used in the crucifixion of the Saviour, and the tablet which Pilate had caused to be put upon the cross of the Saviour. But nobody could tell which was the true cross. Yet says the fable: --

"From this trouble she was shortly relieved by Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, whose faith solved the doubt, for he sought a sign from God and obtained it. The sign was this: A certain woman of the neighborhood, who had been long afflicted with disease, was now just at the point of death. The bishop therefore ordered that each of the crosses should be applied to the dying woman, believing that she would be healed upon being touched by the precious cross. Nor was he disappointed in his expectation; for the two crosses having been applied which were not the Lord's, the woman still continued in a dying state; but when the third, which was the true cross, touched her, she was immediately healed, and recovered her former strength. In this manner then was the genuine cross discovered. The emperor's mother erected over the place of the sepulcher a magnificent church, and named it New Jerusalem, having

433

built it opposite to that old and deserted city. There she left a portion of the cross, enclosed in a silver case, as a memorial to those who might wish to see it. The other part she sent to the emperor, who, being persuaded that the city would be perfectly secure where that relic should be preserved, privately enclosed it in his own statue, which stands on a large column of porphyry in the forum called Constantine's at Constantinople. I have written this from report indeed; but almost all the inhabitants of Constantinople affirm that it is true. Moreover, Constantine caused the nails with which Christ's hands were fastened to the cross (for his mother having found these also in the sepulcher had sent them) to be converted into bridle bits and a helmet, which he used in his military expeditions." -- Socrates.²⁰

26. From this it would seem that by this time he would be ready to stand by the profession of Christianity alone, but such was not the case; for in A. D. 328, when he traced the limits and laid the foundation of his projected new city of Constantinople, he held the same ambiguous course as formerly, and accordingly "issued an imperial edict announcing to the world that Constantine by the command of God had founded the eternal city." "But however the Deity might have intimated his injunctions to commence the work, or whatever the nature of the invisible guide which, as he declared, thus directed his steps, this vague appeal to the Deity would impress with the same respect all his subjects, and by its impartial ambiguity offend none." -- Milman.²¹

27. Yet a little later his actions seemed to indicate that he had reverted to paganism alone; for when in A. D. 330 the actual work of building the city was inaugurated, the "ancient ritual of Roman paganism contained a solemn ceremony, which dedicated a new city to the protection of the Deity" (Milman);²² and Sopater, a Neoplatonic heathen, "assisted with his heathen ceremonies at the consecration." -- Stanley.²³

28. However, in building the city he fully acquitted himself in the estimation of both pagans and Catholics. For while he erected magnificent edifices for the Catholic Church, he also set up the images of the pagan deities "in all the public places of Constantinople.

434

If the inhabitants were not encouraged, at least they were not forbidden, to pay divine honors to the immortal sculptures of Phidias and Praxiteles, which were brought from all quarters to adorn the squares and baths of Byzantium. The whole Roman world contributed to the splendor of Constantinople. The tutelar deities of all the cities of Greece (their influence, of course, much enfeebled by their removal from their local sanctuaries) were assembled, -- the Minerva of Lyndus, the Cybele of Mount Dindymus (which was said to have been placed there by the Argonauts), the Muses of Helicon, the Amphitrite of Rhodes, the Pan consecrated by united Greece after the defeat of the Persians, the Delphic Tripod. The Dioscuri [Castor and Pollux] overlooked the Hippodrome." -- Milman.²⁴

29. When in 334 the city was finished, and he would celebrate its completion, "the ceremonial of the dedication was attended by still more dubious circumstances. After a most splendid exhibition of chariot games in the Hippodrome, the emperor moved in a magnificent car through the most public part of the city, encircled by all his guards in the attire of a religious ceremonial, and bearing torches in their hands. The emperor himself held a golden statue of the Fortune of the city in his hands. An imperial edict enacted the annual celebration of this rite. On the birthday of the city, the gilded statue of himself, thus bearing the same golden image of Fortune, was annually to be led through the Hippodrome to the foot of the imperial throne, and to receive the adoration of the reigning emperor." -- Milman.²⁵

30. Yet he considered this not enough. When he had besieged Licinius at this place, he had pitched his tent on a certain hill. In the building of the city he chose that spot for the principal forum, at one end of which was a statue of Cybele, and at the other the goddess of Fortune, the patroness of the new city. In the center of the forum he planted a column, the pedestal of which was of white marble twenty feet high. Upon this were set, one upon another, ten pieces of porphyry, each of which measured about ten feet in

435

height and about thirty-three in circumference, making the pillar in all about one hundred and twenty feet in height. On the top of this pillar, Constantine placed a colossal bronze statue of Apollo, with the figure of his own head upon it, and round about the crown, like the rays of the sun, were the nails of "the true cross," which his mother had sent to him from Jerusalem.

31. "The lingering attachment of Constantine to the favorite superstition of his earlier days may be traced on still better authority. The Grecian worship of Apollo had been exalted into the Oriental veneration of the sun, as the visible representative of the Deity; and of all the statues that were introduced from different quarters, none were received with greater honor than those of Apollo. In one part of the city stood the Pythian, in another the Sminthian deity. The Delphic Tripod, which, according to Zosimus, contained an image of the god, stood upon the column of three twisted serpents, supposed to represent the mystic Python. But on a still loftier, the famous pillar of porphyry, stood

an image in which, if we are to credit modern authority (and the more modern our authority, the less likely is it to have invented so singular a statement), Constantine dared to mingle together the attributes of the sun, of Christ, and of himself. According to one tradition, this pillar was based, as it were, on another superstition. The venerable Palladium itself, surreptitiously conveyed from Rome, was buried beneath it, and thus transferred the eternal destiny of the old to the new capital. The pillar, formed of marble and of porphyry, rose to the height of a hundred and twenty feet. The colossal image on the top was that of Apollo, either from Phrygia or from Athens. But the head of Constantine had been substituted for that of the god. The scepter proclaimed the dominion of the world; and it held in its hand the globe, emblematic of universal empire. Around the head, instead of rays, were fixed the nails of the true cross. Is this paganism approximating to Christianity, or Christianity degenerating into paganism?" -- Milman.²⁶

32. The reader will have no difficulty in answering the question which is here propounded. "It is no more certain that he despised

436

and pitied paganism while he was solemnly offering sacrifices to Jupiter, and winning the admiration and love of the Roman world for his imperial piety, than it is certain that he pitied and despised the church of Christ, even while he was manipulating the faith into a sure and reliable support of the empire. In both courses he only played with the world, giving men any religious toy which the greater part might prefer to have, in exchange for the liberty of which he robbed them so plausibly and successfully that they scarcely perceived his theft, and enthusiastically caressed the royal thief." -- Author of "Arius the Libyan." It was the same mixture of pagan and apostate Christian wickedness, the origin and progress of which we have seen in the chapter on "The Apostasy."

33. Nor is the record yet complete. In A. D. 335, in the further exercise of his office of bishop of bishops in the church, Constantine convened the Synod of Tyre, to examine further into some questions that were raised in the trinitarian controversy. Yet all this time he was still keeping about him that Sopater who had assisted with the heathen ceremonials at the foundation of Constantinople. Sopater was so openly favored by Constantine that the church party grew jealous and quite alarmed for fear they should lose their emperor altogether.²⁷

34. In A. D. 337 Constantine was taken with a serious illness, and being satisfied that he was about to die, he called for an Arian bishop, and was baptized. Then "he was clothed in robes of dazzling whiteness; his couch was covered with white also; in the white robes of baptism, on a white death-bed, he lay, in expectation of his end . . . At noon on Whitsunday, the 22d of May, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the thirty-first of his reign, he expired . . . So passed away the first Christian emperor, -- the first defender of the faith, -- the first imperial patron of the papal See, and of the whole Eastern church, -- the first founder of the holy places, -- PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN, ORTHODOX AND HERETICAL, LIBERAL AND FANATICAL, not to be imitated or admired, but much to be remembered, and deeply to be studied." -- Stanley.²⁸

35. His body was enclosed in a coffin of gold and taken in solemn procession to Constantinople, where it lay in state for three months, waiting for his two eldest sons to arrive, the youngest only being present.

36. And yet the record is not complete. When he was attacked by his last illness, he suspected poison, and before he died, he gave to the bishop of Nicomedia his will to be handed to his eldest son when he should arrive at Constantinople. The bishop, having read it and found its terrible import, put it in the dead emperor's hand, and left it there until Constantius took it. The purport of the instruction was that he believed he had been poisoned by his brothers and their children, and instructed his sons to avenge his death. "That bequest was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the surviving princes of the imperial family. Two alone escaped." -- Stanley.²⁹

37. As neither Christians nor pagans could tell to which religion Constantine belonged while he was alive, and consequently both claimed him, so likewise "even after his death both religions vied, as it were, for Constantine. He received with impartial favor the honors of both. The first Christian emperor was deified by the pagans; in a later period he was worshiped as a saint by part of the Christian church. On the same medal appears his title of 'god,' with the monogram, the sacred symbol of Christianity; in another he is seated in the chariot of the sun, in a car drawn by four horses, with a hand stretched forth from the clouds to raise him to heaven." -- Milman.³⁰

38. Even to this time and to this extent Constantine himself was to blame for his ambiguous position, as he had been all the time he had lived as emperor. He himself had erected a grand church in Constantinople called the Church of the Apostles, which he intended to be his burial-place. "He had in fact made choice of this spot in the prospect of his own death, anticipating with extraordinary fervor of faith that his body would share their title with the apostles themselves, and that he should thus even after death become the subject, with them, of the devotions which would be performed to their

honor in this place. He accordingly caused twelve coffins to be set up in this church, like sacred pillars, in honor and memory of the apostolic number, in the center of which his own was placed, having six of theirs on either side of it." -- Eusebius.³¹

39. And as had been his practise all the way along, he called this church by a name "truly indicating the mixture of pagan and Christian ideas which led to its erection, the 'Heroon.'" -- Stanley.³² The word "Heroon" denotes the temple or chapel of a hero.

40. Such are the facts in regard to Constantine's religious life simply as they are. No one can have the slightest difficulty in deciding that he never was a Christian in any proper sense of the word. All must agree "that his progress in the knowledge of Christianity was

not a progress in the practise of its virtues;" that "his love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power; and that the very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age and the policy of an absolute monarch cannot excuse." -- Schaff.³³

41. The synopsis of the whole question as to what was the religion of Constantine, can be no better expressed than it has already been by another: "Constantine adopted Christianity first as a superstition, and put it by the side of his heathen superstition, till finally in his conviction the Christian vanquished the pagan, though without itself developing into a pure and enlightened faith." -- Schaff.³⁴

42. And the final analysis, the conclusion of the whole matter, the sum of all that has been, or that can be, said, is that in Constantine the elements of the actual pagan and the apostate Christian were so perfectly mixed as to produce THE TYPICAL PAPIST OF ALL TIMES.

1 [Page 424] "Romans under the Empire," chap. xxxiii, par. 13.

2 [Page 424] "History of Christianity," book ii, chap. viii, par. 22.

3 [Page 425] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. i, par. 36.

4 [Page 425] "Decline and Fall," chap. xx, par. 3.

5 [Page 426] Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, par. 15.

6 [Page 426] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. i, par. 41.

7 [Page 427] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, par. 24, and note 2.

8 [Page 428] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. i, pars. 42, 39.

9 [Page 428] "Life of Constantine," book i, chap. x1.

10 [Page 428] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, par. 25.

11 [Page 429] Id., sec. lxxv, par. 5.

12 [Page 429] "History of the Eastern Church," vi, par. 15.

13 [Page 429] "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. ii, sec. i, part i, A, par. 33.

14 [Page 430] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. vi, par. 14.

- 15 [Page 431] "Decline and Fall," chap. xviii, par. 6
- 16 [Page 431] Id., par. 7.
- 17 [Page 431] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. ii, par. 12.
- 18 [Page 432] Id., pars. 13, 10.
- 19 [Page 432] Theodoret's "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xvii
- 20 [Page 433] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xvii.
- 21 [Page 433] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 5.
- 22 [Page 433] Id., par. 4.
- 23 [Page 433] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. vi, par. 42.
- 24 [Page 434] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 6.
- 25 [Page 434] Id., par. 7.
- 26 [Page 435] Id., par. 7.
- 27 [Page 436] Id., chap. iv, par. 39.
- 28 [Page 436] "History of the Eastern Church," end of lect. vi.
- 29 [Page 437] Id. lect. vi, par. 7 from end.
- 30 [Page 437] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 3 from end.
- 31 [Page 438] "Life of Constantine," book iv, chap. vi.
- 32 [Page 438] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. vi, par. 5 from end.
- 33 [Page 438] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, pars. 10, 11.
- 34 [Page 438] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, par. 6.

30. ROME -- CONSTANTINE AND THE BISHOPS.

IT will be remembered that Diocletian had no sooner abdicated than the system of orderly government which he had established and which he hoped would continue, fell to pieces, and confusion once more ruled in the affairs of State. So far as the government was concerned, the army was now, as it had been for hundreds of years, the source of power; but among the four aspiring emperors not only the military force, but the territory, of the empire was almost equally divided. So nearly equal was this division that not one of the emperors had any material advantage over another in this respect. Yet it was the ambition of each one to become sole emperor. It therefore became a matter of vital concern to each one to obtain whatever power he might, and yet there was no further resource to be hoped for from the side of the empire. Thus stood matters among the emperors.

2. How was it with the church? Read again the word of Eusebius concerning the state of things in the churches before the persecution by Diocletian: --

"When by reason of excessive liberty, we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the divine judgment, which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But, as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situation as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some what appeared to be our pastors, deserting

440

the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves."

3. The persecution had caused all these divisions and disputes to be laid aside. Every other interest was forgotten in the one all-absorbing question of the rights of conscience against pagan despotism. Thus there was created at least an outward unity among all the sects of whatever name professing the Christian religion in any form. Thus was molded a compact power which permeated every part of the empire, and which was at the same time estranged from every material interest of the empire as it then stood. Here was power, which if it could be secured and used, would assure success to him who would gain it, as certainly as he could make the alliance. This condition of affairs was clearly

discerned at the time. Constantine "understood the signs of the times and acted accordingly."

4. "To Constantine, who had fled from the treacherous custody of Galerius, it naturally occurred that if he should ally himself to the Christian party, conspicuous advantages must forthwith accrue to him. It would give him in every corner of the empire men and women ready to encounter fire and sword. It would give him partizans not only animated by the traditions of their fathers, but -- for human nature will even in the religious assert itself -- demanding retribution for the horrible barbarities and injustice that had been inflicted on themselves; it would give him, and this was the most important of all, unwavering adherents in every legion in the army. He took his course. The events of war crowned him with success. He could not be otherwise than outwardly true to those who had given him power, and who continued to maintain him on the throne." -- Draper.¹

5. Constantine was not the only one who saw this opportunity. Maximin likewise detected it, but was distrusted by the church party. Constantine, being a much more accomplished politician, succeeded. In addition to the advantages which offered themselves in this asserted unity of the churches, there was a movement among the

441

bishops which made it an additional incentive to Constantine to form the alliance which he did with the church. Although it is true that all the differences and disputes and strifes among the bishops and sects had been forgotten in the supreme conflict between paganism and freedom of thought, there is one thing mentioned by Eusebius that still remained. That was the ambition of the bishops "to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves." Nor was it alone government in the church which they were anxious to assert; but government in the State as well, to be used in the interests of the church. For "there had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments." -- Neander.²

6. This theocratical theory of the bishops is the key to the whole history of Constantine and the church of his time, and through all the dreary period that followed. It led the bishops into the wildest extravagance in their worship of the imperial influence, and coincided precisely with Constantine's idea of an absolute monarchy.

7. The idea of the theocracy that the bishops hoped to establish appears more clearly and fully in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" than in any other one production of the time. There the whole scheme appears just as they had created it, and as it was applied in the history of the time. The church was a second Israel in Egyptian bondage. Maxentius was a second Pharaoh, Constantine was a second Moses. As the original Moses had grown up in the palace of the Pharaohs, so likewise this new Moses had grown up in the very society of the new Pharaohs. Thus runs the story: --

"Ancient history relates that a cruel race of tyrants oppressed the Hebrew nation; and the God who graciously regarded them in their affliction, provided that the prophet Moses, who was then an infant, should be brought up in the very palaces and bosoms of the oppressors, and instructed in all the wisdom they possessed. And when he had arrived at the age of manhood, and the time was come for divine justice to avenge the wrongs of the afflicted people, then the prophet of God, in obedience to the will of a more powerful Lord, forsook the royal household and estranging himself in word and deed from those by whom he

442

had been brought up, openly preferred the society of his true brethren and kinsfolk. And in due time God exalted him to be the leader of the whole nation, and after delivering the Hebrews from the bondage of their enemies, inflicted divine vengeance through his means upon the tyrant race. This ancient story, though regarded by too many as fabulous, has reached the ears of all. But now the same God has given to us to be eye-witnesses of miracles more wonderful than fables, and from their recent appearance, more authentic than any report. For the tyrants of our day have ventured to war against the supreme God, and have sorely afflicted His church. And in the midst of these, Constantine, who was shortly to become their destroyer, but at that time of tender age, and blooming with the down of early youth, dwelt, as God's servant Moses had done, in the very home of the tyrants. Young, however, as he was, he shared not in the pursuits of the impious; for from that early period his noble nature (under the leading of the Divine Spirit), inclined him to a life of piety and acceptable service to God." -- Eusebius.³

8. We have related how Galerius sought to prevent Constantine's joining his father in Britain, and how Constantine succeeded in eluding his vigilance. By the theocratical bishops this was made to be the flight of the new Moses from the wrath of the new Pharaohs. Thus the story continues: --

"The emperors then in power, who observed his manly and vigorous figure and superior mind with feelings of jealousy and fear, . . . carefully watched for an opportunity of inflicting some brand of disgrace on his character. But he, being aware of their designs (the details of which, through the providence of God, were more than once laid open to his view), sought safety in flight, and in this respect his conduct still affords a parallel to that of the great prophet Moses." -- Eusebius.⁴

9. As the original Moses, without the interposition of any human agency, had been called to the work to which the Lord had appointed him, so the theocratical bishops had the new Moses likewise appointed directly by the authority of God: --

"Thus, then, the God of all, the supreme Governor of the world, by his own will, appointed Constantine, the descendant of so renowned a parent, to be prince and sovereign; so that, while others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow men, he is the only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed." -- Eusebius.⁵

10. Eusebius knew as well as any other man in the empire that the legions in Britain had proclaimed Constantine emperor, precisely

443

as the armies had been doing in like instances for more than a hundred years. He knew full well that Constantine held his title to the imperial power by the same tenure precisely as had all the emperors before him from the accession of Claudius.

11. When Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses on his way to deliver Israel. When the army of Maxentius was defeated and multitudes were drowned in the river, it was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the bridge and by the weight of his armor sank instantly to the bottom of the river, it was the new Pharaoh and "the horse and his rider" being thrown into the sea and sinking to the bottom like a stone. Then was Israel delivered, and a song of deliverance was sung by the new Israel as by the original Israel at their deliverance. Thus the story continues: --

"And now those miracles recorded in Holy Writ, which God of old wrought against the ungodly (discredited by most as fables, yet believed by the faithful), did He in very deed confirm to all, alike believers and unbelievers, who were eye-witnesses to the wonders I am about to relate. For as once in the days of Moses and the Hebrew nation, who were worshipers of God, He cast Pharaoh's chariots and his host into the waves, and drowned his chosen chariot-captains in the Red Sea, so at this time did Maxentius and the soldiers and guards with him sink to the bottom as a stone, when in his flight before the divinely aided forces of Constantine he essayed to cross the river which lay in his way, over which he had made a strong bridge of boats, and had framed an engine of destruction, really against himself, but in the hope of ensnaring thereby him who was beloved of God. For his God stood by the one to protect him, while the other, destitute of His aid, proved to be the miserable contriver of these secret devices to his own ruin. So that one might well say, 'He made a pit, and digged it, and shall fall into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his iniquity shall come down upon his own pate.' Thus in the present instance, under divine direction, the machine erected on the bridge, with the ambuscade concealed therein, giving way unexpectedly before the appointed time, the passage began to sink down, and the boats with the men in them went bodily to the bottom. At first the wretch himself, then his armed attendants and guards, even as the sacred oracles had before described, 'sank as lead in the mighty waters.' So that they who thus obtained victory from God might well, if not in the same words, yet in fact in the same spirit, as the people of His great servant Moses, sing and speak as they did concerning the impious tyrant of old: 'Let us sing unto the Lord, for He has been glorified exceedingly; the horse and his rider has He thrown into the sea.

444

He is become my helper and my shield unto salvation.' And again, 'Who is like to thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, marvelous in praises, doing wonders?'" -- Eusebius.⁶

12. Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, of whom Eusebius was but one, and in his turn flattered them: --

"The emperor was also accustomed personally to invite the society of God's ministers, whom he distinguished with the highest possible respect and honor, treating them in every sense as persons consecrated to the service of God. Accordingly they were admitted to his table, though mean in their attire and outward appearance; yet not so in his estimation, since he judged not of their exterior as seen by the vulgar eye, but thought he discerned in them somewhat of the character of God himself." -- Eusebius.⁷

13. This worked charmingly. Throughout the empire the courtly bishops worked in Constantine's interest; and as only Licinius now remained between Constantine and his longed-for position as sole emperor and absolute ruler, the bishops and their political church followers prayed against Licinius and for Constantine. As these "worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about and entangle themselves in worldly concerns" (Neander,⁸ Licinius attempted to check it. To stop their meddling with the political affairs of his dominions, he forbade the bishops to assemble together or to pass from their own dioceses to others. He enacted that women should be instructed only by women; that in their assemblies the men and the women should sit separate; and commanded that they of Nicomedia should meet outside the city, "as the open air was more healthful for such large assemblies."

14. This only tended to make the bishops more active, as the acts of Licinius could be counted as persecution. Licinius next went so far as to remove from all public office whoever would not sacrifice to the gods; and the line was quickly drawn once more in his dominion in favor of paganism. This caused Constantine's party to put on a bolder face, and they not only prayed for Constantine

445

against Licinius, but they began to invent visions in which they pretended to see the "legions of Constantine marching victoriously through the streets at midday." -- Neander.⁹

15. These enactments on the part of Licinius furnished the new Moses with an opportunity to conquer the heathen in the wilderness, and to go on to the possession of the promised land and the full establishment of the new theocracy. War was declared, and Constantine, with the labarum at the head of his army, took up his march toward the dominions of Licinius.

16. Another step was now taken in furtherance of the theocratical idea, and in imitation of the original Moses. It will be remembered that, after the passage of the Red Sea, Moses erected a tabernacle, and pitched it afar off from the camp, where he went to consult the Lord and to receive what the Lord had to give in commandment to Israel. Constantine, to sustain his part in this scheme of a new theocracy, and as far as possible to conform to the theocratical plans of the bishops, likewise erected a tabernacle, and pitched it a considerable distance from his camp. To this tabernacle he would repair and pretend to have visions and communications from the Lord, and to receive directions in regard to his expected battle with Licinius.

17. The original account is as follows: --

"In this manner Licinius gave himself up to these impieties, and rushed blindly toward the gulf of destruction. But as soon as the emperor was aware that he must meet his enemies in a second battle, he applied himself in earnestness to the worship of his Saviour. He pitched the tabernacle of the cross outside and at a distance from his camp, and there passed his time in pure and holy seclusion, and in offering up prayers to God, following thus the example of his ancient prophet, of whom the sacred oracles testify that he pitched the tabernacle without the camp. He was attended only by a few, of whose faith and piety, as well as affection to his person, he was well assured. And this custom he continued to observe whenever he meditated an engagement with the enemy. For he was deliberate in his measures, the better to insure safety, and desired in everything to be directed by divine counsel. And since his prayers ascended with fervor and earnestness to God, he was always honored with a manifestation of His presence. And then, as if moved by a divine impulse, he would rush from the tabernacle, and suddenly give

446

orders to his army to move at once without delay, and on the instant to draw their swords. On this they would immediately commence the attack, with great and general slaughter, so as with incredible celerity to secure the victory, and raise trophies in token of the overthrow of their enemies." -- Eusebius.¹⁰

18. He soon carried this matter somewhat further, and provided a tabernacle in each legion, with attendant priests and deacons; and also another which was constructed in the form of a church, "so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship God, and participate in the mysteries. Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the church." -- Sozomen.¹¹ Such was the original of State chaplaincies. And it is but proper to remark that the system, wherever copied, has always been worthy of the original imposture.

19. In violation of his solemn oath to his sister Constantia, Constantine caused Licinius to be executed. Yet the courtier-bishop justified the wicked transaction as being the lawful execution of the will of God upon the enemy of God. Thus he speaks: --

"He then proceeded to deal with this adversary of God and his followers according to the laws of war, and consign them to the fate which their crimes deserved. Accordingly the tyrant himself [Licinius] and they whose counsels had supported him in his impiety, were together subjected to the just punishment of death. After this, those who had so lately been deceived by their vain confidence in false deities, acknowledged with unfeigned sincerity the God of Constantine, and openly professed their belief in Him as the true and only God." -- Eusebius.12

20. When Constantine went to take his seat as presiding officer in the Council of Nice, his theocratical flatterers pretended to be dazzled by his splendor, as though an angel of God had descended straight from heaven. He who sat at Constantine's right hand that day, thus testifies: --

"And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor's entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God." -- Eusebius.13

447

21. Constantine, to sustain his part in the farce, declared openly in the council that "the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offense or of sin;" and that if he should detect "a bishop in the very act of committing adultery," he would throw "his imperial robe over the unlawful deed, lest any should witness the scene," and be injured by the bad example. -- Theodoret.14 And when the council was closed, and the creed for which they had come together was established, he sent a letter to the "Catholic Church of the Alexandrians," in which he announced that the conclusions reached by the council were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and could be none other than the divine will concerning the doctrine of God.

22. After the council was over, he gave a banquet in honor of the twentieth year of his reign, to which he invited the bishops and clergy who had attended the council. The bishops responded by pretending that it seemed to be the very likeness of the kingdom of Christ itself. The description is as follows: --

"The emperor himself invited and feasted with those ministers of God whom he had reconciled, and thus offered, as it were, through them a suitable sacrifice to God. Not one of the bishops was wanting at the imperial banquet, the circumstances of which were splendid beyond description. Detachments of the body-guard and other troops surrounded the entrance of the palace with drawn swords, and through the midst of these the men of God proceeded without fear into the innermost of the imperial apartments, in which some were the emperor's own companions at table, while others reclined on couches arranged on either side. One might have thought that a picture of Christ's kingdom was thus shadowed forth, and that the scene was less like reality than a dream." -- Eusebius.15

23. At the banquet "the emperor himself presided, and as the feast went on, called to himself one bishop after another, and loaded each with gifts in proportion to his deserts."

This so delighted the bishops that one of them -- it was James of Nisibis, a member of that monkish tribe that habitually lived on grass, browsing like oxen -- was wrought up to such a height that he declared he saw angels standing round the emperor. Constantine, not to be outdone saw angels standing around James; and pronounced him one of the three

448

pillars of the world. He said, "There are three pillars of the world; Antony in Egypt, Nicolas of Myra, James in Assyria."16

24. Another instance of this mutual cajolery is given concerning Eusebius and the emperor as follows: --

"One act, however, I must by no means omit to record, which this admirable prince performed in my own presence. On one occasion, emboldened by the confident assurance I entertained of his piety, I had begged permission to pronounce a discourse on the subject of our Saviour's sepulcher in his hearing. With this request he most readily complied, and in the midst of a large number of auditors, in the interior of the palace itself, he stood and listened with the rest. I entreated him (but in vain) to seat himself on the imperial throne which stood near; he continued with fixed attention to weigh the topics of my discourse, and gave his own testimony to the truth of the theological doctrines it contained. After some time had passed, the oration being of considerable length, I was myself desirous of concluding; but this he would not permit, and exhorted me to proceed to the very end. On my again entreating him to sit, he in his turn admonished me to desist, saying it was not right to listen in a careless manner to the discussion of doctrines relating to God; and again, that this posture was good and profitable to himself, since it argued a becoming reverence to stand while listening to sacred truths. Having, therefore, concluded my discourse, I returned home, and resumed my usual occupations." -- Eusebius.17

25. Constantine himself occasionally appeared in the role of preacher also. "On these occasions a general invitation was issued, and thousands of people went to the palace to hear an emperor turned preacher" (Stanley);18 they were ready at the strong points to respond with loud applause and cheering. At times he would attack his courtiers for their rapacity and worldliness generally; and they, understanding him perfectly, would cheer him loudly for his preaching, and go on in the same old way imitating his actions.

26. Again: when his mother sent the nails of the true cross to him from Jerusalem with the instruction that some of them should be used as bridle bits for his war-horse, it was counted a further evidence that the kingdom of God was come; for it was made to be the fulfilment of that which "Zechariah the prophet predicted, 'that what is upon the bridles of the horses shall be holiness unto the Lord

449

Almighty." -- Theodoret.¹⁹ And when he appointed his sons and nephews as Caesars to a share in the governmental authority, this was made to be a fulfilment of the prophecy of Dan. 7:17, "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom!"

27. Yet more than this: Eusebius actually argued that the emperor's dining-hall might be the New Jerusalem described in the book of Revelation.²⁰ And at the celebration of the thirtieth year of his reign, another of the bishops was so carried away with the imperial honors conferred upon him, that he went so far as to declare that Constantine had been constituted by God to rule over all in the present world, and was destined also by the Lord to reign with the Son of God in the world to come. This, it seems, was rather too much even for Constantine, and he exhorted the gushing bishop not to use such language any more; but instead to pray for him that he might be accounted worthy to be a servant of God, rather than joint ruler, in the world to come.²¹

28. But after he was dead, and therefore unable to put any check upon the extravagance of their adulation, Eusebius pretended to hesitate as to whether it would not be committing gross sacrilege to attempt to write his life. However, he finally concluded to venture upon it. Some of his statements we have already given; but there are a few more that should be reproduced in this connection. Referring to Constantine's lying in state so long before his sons assumed the imperial authority, he says: --

"No mortal had ever, like this blessed prince, continued to reign even after his death, and to receive the same homage as during his life; he only, of all who have ever lived, obtained this reward from God, -- a suitable reward, since he alone of all sovereigns had in all his actions honored the supreme God and His Christ, and God himself accordingly was pleased that even his mortal remains should still retain imperial authority among men."²²

29. This was not enough, however. It must needs be that God should set him forth as the pattern of the human race: --

450

"And God himself, whom Constantine worshiped, has confirmed this truth by the clearest manifestations of His will, being present to aid him at the commencement, during the course, and at the end of his reign, and holding him up to the human race as an exemplary pattern of godliness."²³

30. Next he seeks some object worthy to be a standard of comparison for "this marvelous man." But he is unable to find any such thing or person but the Saviour himself. Therefore he declares: --

"We can not compare him with that bird of Egypt, the only one, as they say, of its kind, which dies, self-sacrificed, in the midst of aromatic perfumes, and rising from its own ashes, with new life soars aloft in the same form which it had before. Rather did he resemble his Saviour, who, as the sown corn which is multiplied from a single grain, had

yielded abundant increase through the blessing of God, and had overspread the world with His fruit. Even so did our thrice blessed prince become multiplied, as it were, through the succession of his sons. His statue was erected along with theirs in every province; and the name of Constantine was owned and honored even after the close of his mortal life."24

31. But even this does not satisfy the aspirations of the episcopal adulator. The task is now become one of such grandeur as to transcend all his powers; he stops amazed, and in impotence resigns it all to Christ, who only, he professes, is worthy to do the subject justice: --

"For to whatever quarter I direct my view, whether to the east, or to the west, or over the whole world, or toward heaven itself, I see the blessed emperor everywhere present; . . . and I see him still living and powerful, and governing the general interests of mankind more completely than ever before, being multiplied as it were by the succession of his children to the imperial power. . . .

"And I am indeed amazed when I consider that he who was but lately visible and present with us in his mortal body, is still, even after death, when the natural thought disclaims all superfluous distinctions as unsuitable, more marvelously endowed with the same imperial dwellings, and honors, and praises, as heretofore. But further, when I raise my thoughts even to the arch of heaven, and there contemplate his thrice blessed soul in communion with God himself, freed from every mortal and earthly vesture, and shining in a refulgent robe of light, and when I perceive that it is no more connected with the fleeting periods and occupations of mortal life, but honored with an ever-blooming crown, and an immortality of endless and blessed existence, I stand, as it were, entranced and deprived of all power of utterance; and so, while I condemn

451

my own weakness, and impose silence on myself, I resign the task of speaking his praises worthily to One who is better able, even to Him who alone has power (being the immortal God -- the Word) to confirm the truth of His own sayings."25

32. All this with much more to the same purpose is set forth by that bishop who above all others is entitled "one of the best among the bishops of Constantine's court," and the one who "can not be reckoned among the number of the ordinary court bishops of his period." -- Neander.26

33. By the plain, unbiased facts of history, Constantine stands before the world as a confirmed and constant hypocrite, a perjurer, and a many-times murderer. And yet this bishop, knowing all this, hesitates not to declare him the special favorite of God, to liken him to Jesus Christ, to make God endorse him to the human race as an example of godliness, and to exalt him so high that no one but "the immortal God" can worthily speak his praises!

34. When one of the best of the bishops of his court, one who was familiar with the whole course of his evil life, could see in the life and actions of such a man as this, a Moses, and angels, and the New Jerusalem, and the kingdom of God, and even the Lord Christ, -- when in such a life, all this could be seen by one of the best of the bishops, we can only wonderingly inquire what could not be seen there by the worst of the bishops!

35. Can any one wonder, or can any reasonable person dispute, that from a mixture composed of such bishops and such a character, there should come the mystery of iniquity in all its hideous enormity?

NOTE ON CONSTANTINE'S VISION OF THE CROSS. -- It will be observed that in this account of Constantine nothing has been said about his "vision of the cross," of which so much has been said by almost every other writer who has gone over this ground. For this there are two main reasons: (1) There is no point in the narrative where it could have been introduced, even though it were true. (2) The whole story is so manifestly a lie that it is unworthy of serious notice in any narrative that makes any pretensions to truth or soberness.

452

There is no point at which such an account could be inserted, because nobody ever heard of it until "long after" it was said to have occurred; and then it was made known by Constantine himself to Eusebius only, and was never made a matter of record until after Constantine's death.

These things of themselves would go far to discredit the story; but when it is borne in mind that the only record that was even then made of it was in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine," the character of which is quite clearly seen in the extracts which we have made from it in this chapter, the story may be entirely discredited. Eusebius's words are as follows: --

"While he was thus praying with fervent entreaty, a most marvelous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it might have been difficult to receive with credit, had it been related by any other person. But since the victorious emperor himself long afterward declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honored with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed his statement by an oath, who could hesitate to accredit the relation, especially since the testimony of after-time has established its truth?"²⁷

It will be seen at once that this account is of the same nature as that of Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" throughout. It is of the same piece with that by which "no mortal was allowed to contribute to the elevation of Constantine." If it should be pleaded that

Constantine confirmed his statement by an oath, the answer is that this is no evidence of the truth of the statement "That the emperor attested it on oath, as the historian tells us, is indeed no additional guarantee for the emperor's veracity." -- Stanley.²⁸

He gave his oath to his sister as a pledge for the life of her husband, and shortly had him killed. In short, when Constantine confirmed a statement by an oath, this was about the best evidence that he could give that the statement was a lie. This is the impression clearly conveyed by Stanley's narrative, as may be seen by a comparison of lect. iii, par. 11; lect. iv, par. 9; lect. vi, par. 10, and is sustained by the evidence of Constantine's whole imperial course.

In addition to this, there is the fact that Eusebius himself only credited the story because it came from Constantine, and because it was established "by the testimony of after-time," in which testimony he was ever ready to see the most wonderful evidence of God's special regard for Constantine; and the further fact that it was one of the principles of Eusebius that "it may be lawful and fitting to use falsehood as a medicine, for the advantage of those who require such a method,"²⁹ which principle is fully illustrated in his dealings with Constantine.

When all these things, and many others which might be mentioned, are fairly considered, they combine to make the story of Constantine's vision of the cross utterly unworthy of the slightest credit, or any place in any sober or exact history. Therefore this "flattering fable" "can claim no place among the authentic records of history: and by writers whose only object is truth, it may very safely be consigned to contempt and oblivion" -- Waddington.³⁰

1 [Page 440] "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. ix. par. 22.

2 [Page 441] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i div. i, par. 2.

3 [Page 442] "Life of Constantine," book i, chap. xii.

4 [Page 442] Id., chap. xx.

5 [Page 442] Id., chap. xxiv.

6 [Page 444] Id., xxxviii.

7 [Page 444] Id., chap. xiii.

8 [Page 444] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. i, part i, div. A. par. 26.

- 9 [Page 445] Id., sec. i, part i, div. A. par. 27.
- 10 [Page 446] "Life of Constantine," book ii, chap. xii.
- 11 [Page 446] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. viii.
- 12 [Page 446] "Life of Constantine," book ii, chap. xviii.
- 13 [Page 446] Id., book iii, chap. x.
- 14 [Page 447] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xi.
- 15 [Page 447] "Life of Constantine," book iii, chap. xv.
- 16 [Page 448] Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," lect. v, par. 34.
- 17 [Page 448] "Life of Constantine," book iv, chap. xxxiii.
- 18 [Page 448] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. vi, par. 24.
- 19 [Page 449] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xviii.
- 20 [Page 449] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Millennium.
- 21 [Page 449] "Life of Constantine," book iv. chap. xlvi.
- 22 [Page 449] Id., book iv, chap. lxvii.
- 23 [Page 450] Id., book i, chap. iv.
- 24 [Page 450] Id., book iv. chap. lxxii.
- 25 [Page 451] Id., book i, chaps. i, ii.
- 26 [Page 451] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. i, part i, div.A, par. 45, note.
- 27 [Page 452] "Life of Constantine," book i, chap. xxviii.
- 28 [Page 452] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. vi, par. 10.
- 29 [Page 452] Quoted by Waddington in "Note on Eusebius," at the end of chapter vi, of his "History of the Church."
- 30 [Page 452] "History of the Church," chap. vi, par. 2.

31. ROME -- THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

If the mutual flattery of Constantine and the bishops had concerned only themselves, it would have been a matter of very slight importance indeed; but this was not so. Each side represented an important interest. Constantine merely represented the State, and the bishops the church; and their mutual flattery was only the covering of a deep-laid and far-reaching scheme which each party was determined to work to the utmost, for its own interests. "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." -- Draper.¹ Consequently, in their mutual toadyism were involved the interests of both the church and the State, and the welfare of human society for ages to come.

2. Therefore "to the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years. It is the true close of the Roman Empire, the beginning of the Greek. The transition from one to the other is emphatically and abruptly marked by a new metropolis, a new religion, a new code, and, above all, a new policy. An ambitious man had attained to imperial power by personating the interests of a rapidly growing party. The unavoidable consequences were a union between the church and the State, a diverting of the dangerous classes from civil to ecclesiastical paths, and the decay and materialization of religion." -- Draper.²

3. When the alliance was formed between Constantine and what was represented to him as Christianity, it was with the idea on his part that this religion formed a united body throughout the empire.

As has been shown, this was true in a certain sense; because the persecution as carried on by Galerius under the edicts of Diocletian was against Christianity as a profession, without any distinction whatever as to its phases, and this caused all the different sects to stand together as one in defense of the principles that were common to all. Therefore the essential unity of all the professions of Christianity, Constantine supposed to be a fact; and from all his actions and writings afterward it is certain that representations had been made to him by the bishops in a stronger measure than was true, and in an infinitely stronger measure than he found it in practise to be.

4. As has also been shown, the alliance with Christianity on his part was wholly political. It was merely a part of the political machinery by which he designed to bring together again the divided elements of the empire into one harmonious whole, as

contemplated by Diocletian. It being represented to him by the bishops who met him in Gaul in A. D. 311, that Christianity was a united body which, if he would support it, would in turn be a powerful support to him, he accepted their representations as the truth, and formed the alliance solely as a part of his political designs, and to help him to forward his declared "mission to unite the world under one head."

5. But an apparent unity upon the grand principles common to all sects of Christianity, created by a defense of the rights of Christians to believe and to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, and a real unity which would stand together in Christian brotherhood under the blandishments of imperial favor, were two very different things. It was easy enough for all the sects in which Christianity claimed at that time to be represented, to stand together against an effort of the imperial power to crush out of existence the very name, as well as the right to profess it. It was not so easy for these same denominations to stand together as one, representing the charity and unifying influence of Christianity, when imperial support, imperial influence, and imperial power, were the prizes to be gained.

6. Therefore, although the alliance was formed with what was supposed to be Christianity as a whole, without any respect to internal divisions, it was very soon discovered that each particular faction

455

of the Christian profession was ambitious to be recognized as the one in which, above all other, Christianity was most certainly represented. The bishops were ready and willing to represent to Constantine that Christianity was one. They did so represent it to him. And although he entered the alliance with that understanding, the alliance had no sooner been well formed than it devolved upon him to decide among the conflicting factions and divisions just where that one was to be found.

7. The Edict of Milan ordered that the church property which had been confiscated by the edicts of Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," without any distinction as to particular sects or names. Thus runs that part of the edict: --

"And this we further decree with respect to the Christians, that the places in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble, concerning which also we formerly wrote to your fidelity, in a different form, that if any persons have purchased these, either from our treasury, or from any other one, these shall restore them to the Christians, without money and without demanding any price, without any superadded value or augmentation, without delay or hesitancy. And if any have happened to receive these places as presents, that they shall restore them as soon as possible to the Christians, so that if either those that purchased or those that received them as presents, have anything to request of our munificence, they may go to the provincial governor, as the judge, that provision may also be made for them by our clemency. All which it will be necessary to be delivered up to the body of Christians, by your care, without any delay.

"And since the Christians themselves are known to have had not only those places where they were accustomed to meet, but other places also, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the right of the whole body of Christians, you will also command all these, by virtue of the law before mentioned, without any hesitancy, to be restored to these same Christians, that is, to their body, and to each conventicle respectively. The aforesaid consideration, to wit, being observed; namely, that they who as we have said restore them without valuation and price, may expect their indemnity from our munificence and liberality. In all which it will be incumbent on you to exhibit your exertions as much as possible to the aforesaid body of Christians, that our orders may be most speedily accomplished, that likewise in this provision may be made by our clemency for the preservation of the common and public tranquillity. For by these means, as before said, the divine favor with regard to us, which we have already experienced in many affairs, will continue firm and permanent at all times.

456

"But that the purpose of this our ordinance and liberality may be extended to the knowledge of all, it is expected that these things written by us, should be proposed and published to the knowledge of all. That this act of our liberality and kindness may remain unknown to none."³

8. This was proper in itself. But Constantine and the bishops had formed an alliance for political purposes. The bishops had lent to Constantine their support, the fruit of which he was enjoying, and now they demanded that the expected return should be rendered. Accordingly, the restoration of the property of the Christians under the Edict of Milan had no sooner begun, than the contentions which had been raised before the late persecution, between the church of Rome and the churches of Africa, were not only made to assume new and political significance, but were made an issue upon which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of the Catholic Church.

9. As the rule had already been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics and not Christians, it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such could be partakers of the benefits of the edict restoring property to the Christians. The Catholic Church disputed the right of "heretics" to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. This forced an imperial decision upon the question as to who were Christians.

10. The dispute was raised in Africa. Anulinus was proconsul in that province. To settle this question, Constantine issued the following edict: --

"Hail our most esteemed Anulinus: This is the course of our benevolence, that we wish those things that belong justly to others, should not only remain unmolested, but should also, when necessary, be restored, most esteemed Anulinus. Whence it is our will that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to the Catholic Church of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by

the decurions or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined that whatsoever these same churches before possessed, shall be restored to their right. When therefore your fidelity has understood this

457

decree of our orders to be most evident and plain, make all haste to restore, as soon as possible, all that belongs to the churches, whether gardens or houses, or anything else, that we may learn thou hast attended to, and most carefully observed, this our decree. Farewell, most esteemed and beloved Anulinus."4

11. This was not the truth. The Edict of Milan did not say that the church property was to be restored to the "Catholic Church of the Christians." It said plainly "the Christians," "the whole body of Christians." That is what was said. Now, however, by this edict it was made evident that the imperial favors were meant only for the Catholic Church. Nor was it enough that Constantine should decide that all his favors were for the Catholic Church; he must next decide which was the Catholic Church. This was brought about by a division which was created in the church at Carthage, having its origin in the late persecution.

12. The edict issued by Diocletian had commanded the magistrates everywhere to compel the Christians to deliver up the Scriptures. Some Christians did so; others refused, and suffered all kinds of punishments rather than do so. When Constantine formed his alliance with the bishops, Mensurius was bishop of Carthage, and some of his enemies had falsely accused him of being one of those who had delivered up the Scriptures rather than to suffer. They were supported by a certain Donatus, bishop of a city in Numidia, and they separated themselves from communion with Mensurius. When Mensurius died, as the "primacy of the African church was the object of ambition to these two parties" (Milman),5 and as this primacy carried with it imperial patronage, there were several candidates. A certain Caecilianus was elected, however, "in spite of the cabals and intrigue of Botrus and Caelesius, two chief presbyters who aspired to that dignity." -- Bower.6

13. Botrus and Caelesius were now joined by Donatus and his party, and these all were further joined and supported by a certain Lucilla, a woman of great qualities, wealth, and interest, and an avowed enemy to Caecilianus. This faction gathered together about

458

seventy of the bishops of Numidia for the purpose of deposing Caecilianus as one having been illegally chosen. When they came together at Carthage, they found that the great majority of the people were in favor of Caecilianus; nevertheless they summoned him to the council. He refused to go, and it was well that he did so, because one of them had already said of him, "If he comes among us, instead of laying our hands on him by way of ordination, we ought to knock out his brains by way of penance." -- Bower.7

14. A council composed of men of this character, it is easy to believe, were readily susceptible to whatever influence might be brought to bear upon them to bring them to a decision. Lucilla, by the free use of money, succeeded in persuading them to declare the election of Caecilianus void, and the bishopric of Carthage vacant. They pronounced him and all who held with him separated from their communion, and proceeded to elect and ordain a certain Majorinus, who had formerly been one of Lucilla's servants, but was now a reader in the church.

15. Thus matters stood in the church in Africa when in March, A. D. 313, Constantine sent to the proconsul Anulinus the following edict: --

"Health to thee, most esteemed Anulinus. As it appears from many circumstances that when the religion was despised in which the highest reverence of the heavenly Majesty is observed, that our public affairs were beset with great dangers, and that this religion, when legally adopted and observed, afforded the greatest prosperity to the Roman name, and distinguished felicity to all men, as it has been granted by the divine beneficence, we have resolved that those men who gave their services with becoming sanctity, and the observance of this law, to the performance of divine worship should receive the recompense for their labors, O most esteemed Anulinus; wherefore it is my will that these men within the province entrusted to thee in the Catholic Church over which Caecilianus presides, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, by any error or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote themselves to their proper law, without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it appears the greatest good will be conferred on the State. Farewell, most esteemed and beloved Anulinus."⁸

459

16. As will be seen later, this exemption was a most material benefit. And when the party of Majorinus saw themselves excluded from it, they claimed that they were the Catholic Church, and therefore really the ones who were entitled to it. Accordingly, they drew up a petition to the emperor, entitled, "The petition of the Catholic Church, containing the crimes of Caecilianus, by the party of Majorinus." -- Bower.⁹ This petition requested the emperor to refer to the bishops of Gaul the controversy between them and Caecilianus. The petition, with a bundle of papers containing their charges against Caecilianus, they gave to the proconsul Anulinus, who immediately sent it by a messenger to Constantine, and sent also by the same messenger a letter giving him an account of the dispute.

17. When Constantine received the petition and the accompanying papers, he appointed three of the principal bishops of Gaul to meet with the bishop of Rome to examine the matter, and sent to Melchiades, the then bishop of Rome, the following letter: --

"Constantine Augustus, to Miltiades [the same as Melchiades], bishop of Rome, and to Marcus: As many communications of this kind have been sent to me from anulinus, the most illustrious proconsul of Africa, in which it is contained that Caecilianus, the bishop of Carthage, was accused, in many respects, by his colleagues in Africa; and as this appears to be grievous, that in those provinces which divine Providence has freely entrusted to my fidelity, and in which there is a vast population, the multitude are found inclining to deteriorate, and in a manner divided into two parties, and among others, that the bishops were at variance; I have resolved that the same Caecilianus, together with ten bishops who appear to accuse him, and ten others, whom he himself may consider necessary for his cause, shall sail to Rome. That you, being present there, as also Reticius, Maternus, and Marinus, your colleagues, whom I have commanded to hasten to Rome for this purpose, may be heard, as you may understand most consistent with the most sacred law. And indeed, that you may have the most perfect knowledge of these matters, I have subjoined to my own epistle copies of the writings sent to me by Anulinus, and sent them to your aforesaid colleagues. In which your gravity will read and consider in what way the aforesaid cause may be most accurately investigated and justly decided. Since it neither escapes your diligence that I show such regard for the holy Catholic Church that I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division. May the power of the great God preserve you many years, most esteemed."10

460

18. Several other bishops besides those named in this letter were appointed by the emperor to attend the council, so that when the council met, there were nineteen members of it. According to Constantine's letter, as well as by virtue of his own position, Melchiades presided in the council, and thus began to reap in imperial recognition and joint authority, the fruit of the offers which he made when in A. D. 311 he sent that letter and delegation of bishops to Constantine in Gaul, inviting him to the conquest of Rome and the deliverance of the church.

19. The council met in the apartments of the empress, in the Lateran Palace in Rome, Oct. 2, 313. Caecilianus appeared in person, and Donatus came as his accuser. The council decided that none of the charges were proved, pronounced Caecilianus innocent, and Donatus a slanderer and the chief author of all the contention. Their decision, with a full account of the proceedings, was immediately sent to Constantine.

20. The Donatists appealed from the council to the emperor' demanding a larger council, on the plea that the bishops who composed this one were partial, prejudiced, and had acted hastily, and besides this, were too few in number properly to decide a matter of so great importance. Constantine ordered another council to be held at Arles, to be composed of "many bishops." The following is the letter he sent to one of the bishops who was summoned to Arles, and will show his wishes in the matter: --

"Constantine Augustus to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse: As there were some already before who perversely and wickedly began to waver in the holy religion and celestial virtue, and to abandon the doctrine of the Catholic Church, desirous, therefore, of

preventing such disputes among them, I had thus written that this subject which appeared to be agitated among them might be rectified, by delegating certain bishops from Gaul, and summoning others of the opposite parties from Africa who are pertinaciously and incessantly contending with one another, that by a careful examination of the matter in their presence, it might thus be decided. But since, as it happens, some, forgetful of their own salvation and the reverence due to our most holy religion, even now do not cease to protract their own enmity, being unwilling to conform to the decision already promulgated, and asserting that they were very few that advanced their sentiments and opinions, or else that all points which ought to have been first fully discussed not being first examined, they proceeded with

461

too much haste and precipitancy to give publicity to the decision. Hence it has happened that those very persons who ought to exhibit a brotherly and peaceful unanimity, rather disgracefully and detestably are at variance with one another, and thus give this occasion of derision to those that are without, and whose minds are averse to our most holy religion. Hence it has appeared necessary to me to provide that this matter, which ought to have ceased after the decision was issued by their own voluntary agreement, now at length should be fully terminated by the intervention of many.

"Since, therefore, we have commanded many bishops to meet together from different and remote places, in the city of Arles, toward the calends of August, I have also thought proper to write to thee, that taking a public vehicle from the most illustrious Latronianus, corrector of Sicily, and taking with thee two others of the second rank, which thou mayest select, also three servants to afford you services on the way, I would have you meet them within the same day at the aforesaid place. That by the weight of your authority, and the prudence and unanimity of the rest that assemble, this dispute, which has disgracefully continued until the present time, in consequence of certain disgraceful contentions, may be discussed, by hearing all that shall be alleged by those who are now at variance, whom we have also commanded to be present, and thus the controversy be reduced, though slowly, to that faith, and observance of religion, and fraternal concord, which ought to prevail. May Almighty God preserve thee in safety many years."11

21. This council met according to appointment, August, A. D. 314, and was composed of the bishops from almost all the provinces of the western division of the empire. Sylvester, who was now bishop of Rome, was summoned to the council but declined on account of age, sending two presbyters and two deacons as his representatives. This council also declared Caecilianus innocent of the crimes laid against him by the Donatists. The council also decided that whoever should falsely accuse his brethren should be cut off from the communion of the church without hope of ever being received again, except at the point of death. It further decided that such bishops as had been ordained by the Donatists should officiate alternately with the Catholic bishops till one or the other should die.

22. But the council did not stop with the consideration of the question which it was summoned to consider. The bishops in council now took it upon themselves to legislate in matters of discipline for the world, and to bestow special preference and

462

dignity upon the bishop of Rome. They "ordained that Easter should be kept on the same day, and on a Sunday, by all the churches in the world" (Bower;12 and that the bishop of Rome should announce to the churches the particular Sunday upon which it should be celebrated. Before adjourning, the council sent to the bishop of Rome an account of their proceedings, with a copy of the decrees which they had adopted concerning the discipline of the churches, that he might publish them to all the churches.

23. The Donatists appealed again, not for a council, but to the emperor himself. Constantine held a consistory and heard their appeal, and in harmony with the council already held, pronounced in favor of Caecilianus and against the Donatists. Upon this the Donatists claimed that the emperor had been influenced by Hosius, one of his favorite bishops, and denied that he had any jurisdiction in the matter at all, because it was not right for civil magistrates to have anything to do with religion! This claim was true enough, if they had made it at the beginning, and had refused from the first to allow their controversy to be touched upon in any way by the imperial authority. Then they would have stood upon proper ground; but when they themselves were the first to appeal to the civil authority, when they had asked the emperor to consider the matter again and again, with the hope of getting the imperial power on their side, and when they had carried to the last extreme their efforts in this direction, -- when they had done all this in vain, and then turned about to protest, their protest was robbed of every shadow of force or merit.

24. The question as to which was the Catholic Church having now been decided, Constantine, in his next epistle, could add yet another distinguishing title. As we have seen, the Edict of Milan (March, A. D. 313) ordered that the churches should be restored to the Christians -- "the whole body of Christians," without distinction. When the Catholic Church asserted its sole right to the designation "Christian," and backed its assertion with political reasons which were then peculiarly cogent, the imperial epistle ran (March, A. D. 313) "to the Catholic Church of the Christians."

463

When the emperor wrote to Melchiades appointing the first council under the imperial authority, his epistle ran (autumn, A. D. 313) "the holy Catholic Church." When he wrote to Chrestus (summer, A. D. 314), summoning him to the second council under imperial authority, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "most holy religion." When it had been decided which was "the most holy Catholic religion," he addressed an epistle to Caecilianus (A. D. 316) announcing imperial favors to "the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion," and empowering Caecilianus to assist the imperial officers -- to use the civil power in fact -- in preventing any diversion "from the most holy Catholic Church."

25. The following is that letter: --

"Constantine Augustus to Caecilianus, bishop of Carthage: As we have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania something should be granted to certain ministers of the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion to defray their expenses, I have given letters to Ursus, the most illustrious lieutenant-governor of Africa, and have communicated to him that he shall provide, to pay to your authority, three thousand folles [about one hundred thousand dollars].

"After you shall have obtained this sum, you are to order these moneys to be distributed among the aforesaid ministers, according to the abstract addressed to thee from Hosius. But if thou shalt learn, perhaps, that anything shall be wanting to complete this my purpose with regard to all, thou art authorized, without delay, to make demands for whatever thou mayest ascertain to be necessary, from Heraclides, the procurator of our possessions. And I have also commanded him when present, that if thy authority should demand any moneys of him, he should see that it should be paid without delay. And as I ascertained that some men, who are of no settled mind, wished to divert the people from the most holy Catholic Church by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given, both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the prefects, when present, the following injunctions: that, among all the rest, they should particularly pay the necessary attention to this, nor should by any means tolerate that this should be overlooked. Wherefore, if thou seest any of these men persevering in this madness, thou shalt without any hesitancy proceed to the aforesaid judges and report it to them, that they may animadvert upon them, as I have commanded them when present. May the power of the great God preserve thee many years."13

464

26. When the Donatists rejected the decision of the emperor himself, and denied his right to say anything in the controversy in which they had invited him and over again to participate, as announced in the above letter to Caecilianus he carried against them (A. D. 316) the interference which they had solicited, to the full extent to which it would undoubtedly have been carried against the Catholics if the Donatists had secured the decision in their favor. The Donatist bishops were driven out, and Constantine ordered that all their churches be delivered to the Catholic party.

27. As this was done in the interest, and by the direct counsel, of the Catholic party, through Hosius, the emperor's chief counselor, the imperial authority thus became wholly partizan, and to both parties was given a dignity which was far, far beyond any merit that was in the question at issue. To the Catholic party it gave the dignity of an imperial alliance and the assurance of imperial favor. The Donatist party it elevated to a dignity and clothed with an importance which placed it before the world as worthy of imperial antagonism. Into the Catholic party it infused more than ever the pride of place, power, and imperial favor. To the Donatist party it gave the dignity and fame of a persecuted people, and increased the evil which it attempted to destroy.

28. More than this, when the governmental authority, which should be for the protection of all alike from violence, became itself a party to the controversy, it forsook the place of impartial protector, and assumed that of a partizan. This deepened the sense of injury felt by the defeated party, and magnified the triumph of the victor; and the antagonism was only the more embittered. "The implacable faction darkened into a sanguinary fend. For the first time, human blood was shed in conflicts between followers of the Prince of Peace." -- Milman.¹⁴ And the government, by becoming a partizan, had lost the power to keep the peace. By becoming a party to religious controversy it had lost the power to prevent civil violence between religious factions.

29. "Each party recriminated on the other, but neither denies the barbarous scenes of massacre and license which devastated the

465

African cities. The Donatists boasted of their martyrs, and the cruelties of the Catholic party rest on their own admission; they deny not, they proudly vindicate, their barbarities: 'Is the vengeance of God to be defrauded of its victims?' and they appealed to the Old Testament to justify, by the examples of Moses, of Phineas, and of Elijah, the Christian duty of slaying by thousands the renegades and unbelievers." -- Milman.¹⁵ This, though a shameful perversion of Scripture, was but the practical working out of the theocratical theory of government, which was the basis of the whole system of the union of church and State which had been created by Constantine and the bishops.

30. Constantine issued an edict commanding peace, but it was all in vain. The tumult went on, constantly increasing in violence, until the only alternative was for the imperial authority either to enter upon the horrors of a protracted war with its own subjects, or openly refuse to go any further. The latter step was taken. In A. D. 321, upon the advice of the civil officers of Africa, Constantine "repealed the laws against the Donatists, and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best." -- Mosheim.¹⁶

31. The Donatist controversy touched no point of doctrine, but of discipline only, and was confined to the provinces of Africa. The result in this case, however, ought to have convinced Constantine that the best thing for the imperial authority to do was to return, and strictly adhere, to the principles of the Edict of Milan, -- to let religious questions and controversies entirely alone, and allow each individual "the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion."

32. Yet, even if this thought had occurred to him, it would have been impossible for him to do so and attain the object of his ambition. The principles of the Edict of Milan had no place in the compact entered into between Constantine and the bishops. As yet he possessed only half the empire; for Licinius still held the East,

466

and Constantine's position was not yet so secure that he dared risk any break with the bishops. He had bargained to them his influence in religious things for theirs in politics. The contract had been entered into, he had sold himself to the church influence, and he could not go back even if he would. The empire was before him, but without the support of the church party it could not be his.

33. It is necessary now to notice the material point in that edict issued in A. D. 313, exempting from all public offices the clergy of the Catholic Church. As a benefit to society and that "the greatest good might be conferred on the State," the clergy of the Catholic Church were to "be held totally free and exempt from all public offices."

34. At this time the burdens and expenses of the principal offices of the State were so great that this exemption was of the greatest material benefit. The immediate effect of the edict, therefore, was to erect the clerical order into a distinct and privileged class. For instance, in the days of the systematic governing of the empire, the decurionate was the chief office of the State. "The decurions formed the Senates of the towns; they supplied the magistrates from their body, and had the right of electing them. Under the new financial system introduced by Diocletian, the decurions were made responsible for the full amount of taxation imposed by the cataster, or assessment on the town and district." - Milman.¹⁷

35. As the splendor and magnificence of the court display was increased, and as the imperial power became more absolute, the taxation became more and more burdensome. To such an extent indeed was this carried that tenants, and indeed proprietors of moderate means, were well-nigh bankrupted. Yet the imperial power demanded of the decurions the full amount of the taxes that were levied in their town or district. "The office itself grew into disrepute, and the law was obliged to force that upon the reluctant citizen of wealth or character which had before been an object of eager emulation and competition." -- Milman.¹⁸

467

36. The exemption of the clerical order from all public offices opened the way for all who would escape these burdens, to become, by whatever means possible, members of that order. The effect was, therefore, to bring into the ministry of the church a crowd of men who had no other purpose in view than to be relieved from the burdensome duties that were laid upon the public by the imperial extravagance of Constantine. So promptly did this consequence follow from this edict, and "such numbers of persons, in order to secure this exemption, rushed into the clerical order," that "this manifest abuse demanded an immediate modification of the law." It was therefore ordered that "none were to be admitted into the sacred order except on the vacancy of a religious charge, and then those only whose poverty exempted them from the municipal functions." -- Milman.¹⁹

37. Nor was this all. The order of the clergy itself found that it was required to pay for this exemption a tribute which it had not at all contemplated in the original bargain.

Those already belonging to the clerical order who were sufficiently wealthy to exercise the office of decurion, were commanded to "abandon their religious profession" (Milman),²⁰ in order that they might fill the office which had been deserted because of the exemption which had been granted to their particular order. This of course was counted by the clergy as a great hardship. But as they had willingly consented at the first to the interference of the authority of the State when it was exercised seemingly to their profit, they had thereby forfeited their right to protest against that same interference when it was exercised actually to the denial of their natural rights.

38. Yet the resources of dishonest intrigue were still left to them, -- especially the plea that their possessions belonged not to themselves but to the church, -- and this subterfuge was employed to such an extent as virtually to defeat the purpose of this later law. Thus the evil consequences of the original law still flowed on, and "numbers, without any inward call to the spiritual office, and without any fitness for it whatever, now got themselves ordained as ecclesiastics, for the sake of enjoying this exemption, whereby many of the worst

468

class came to the administration of the most sacred calling." -- Neander.²¹

39. Another scheme adopted by Constantine was fraught with more evil in the same direction. As he had favored the new religion only on account of its value to him as a political factor, he counted it to his advantage to have as many as possible to profess that religion. He therefore used all the means that could be employed by the State to effect this purpose. He made the principal positions about his palace and court a gift and reward to the professors of the new imperial religion; and "the hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace. . . . As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that in one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of women and children, and that a white garment, with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor to every convert." -- Gibbon.²²

40. It will be observed that in this statement Gibbon inserts the cautious clause, "if it be true," but such a precaution was scarcely necessary; because the whole history of the times bears witness that such was the system followed, whether this particular instance was a fact or not. This is proved by the fact that he wrote letters offering rewards both political and financial to those cities which, as such, would forsake the heathen religion, and destroy or allow to be destroyed their heathen temples. "The cities which signaled a forward zeal by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donatives." -- Gibbon.²³

41. In cities that would accept this offer, he would build churches at the public expense, and send there "a complete body

469

of the clergy and a bishop" when "there were as yet no Christians in the place." Also upon such churches he bestowed "large sums for the support of the poor; so that the conversion of the heathen might be promoted by doing good to their bodies." -- Neander.²⁴ And that this was simply the manifestation of his constant policy, is shown by the fact that at the Council of Nice, in giving instruction to the bishops as to how they should conduct themselves, he said: --

"In all ways unbelievers must be saved. It is not every one who will be converted by learning and reasoning. Some join us from desire of maintenance, some for preferment, some for presents; nothing is so rare as a real lover of truth. We must be like physicians, and accommodate our medicines to the diseases, our teaching to the different minds of all."²⁵

42. He further enacted "that money should be given in every city to orphans and widows, and to those who were consecrated to the divine service; and he fixed the amount of their annual allowance [of provisions] more according to the impulse of his own generosity, than to the exigencies of their condition." -- Theodoret.²⁶ In view of these things it is evident that there is nothing at all extravagant in the statement that in a single year twelve thousand men, besides women and children, were baptized in Rome.

43. In addition to all this, he exempted all church property from taxation, which exemption, in the course of time, the church asserted as of divine right; and the example there set is followed to this day, even among people who profess a separation of church and State.

44. The only result which could possibly come from such proceedings as these, was, first, that the great mass of the people, of the pagans, in the empire, with no change either of character or convictions, were drawn into the Catholic Church. Thus the State and the church became one and the same thing; and that one thing was simply the embodiment of the second result; namely, a solid mass of hypocrisy. "The vast numbers who, from external considerations, without any inward call, joined themselves to the Christian communities, served to introduce into the church all the corruptions

470

of the heathen world. Pagan vices, pagan delusions, pagan superstition, took the garb and name of Christianity, and were thus enabled to exert a more corrupting influence of the Christian life.

45. "Such were those who, without any real interest whatever in the concerns of religion, living half in paganism and half in an outward show of Christianity, composed

the crowds that thronged the churches on the festivals of the Christians, and the theaters on the festivals of the pagans. Such were those who accounted themselves Christians if they but attended church once or twice in a year; while, without a thought of any higher life, they abandoned themselves to every species of worldly pursuit and pleasure." -- Neander.²⁷

46. It could not be otherwise. The course pursued by Constantine in conformity with the political intrigues of the bishops, drew into the Catholic Church every hypocrite in the Roman Empire. And this for the simple reason that it could draw no other kind, because no man of principle, even though he were an outright pagan, would allow himself to be won by any such means. It was only to spread throughout all the empire the ambiguous mixture of paganism and apostate Christianity which we have seen so thoroughly exemplified in the life of Constantine himself, who was further inspired and flattered by the ambitious bishops.

47. There were some honest pagans who refused all the imperial bribes and kept aloof from the wicked system thereby established. There were some genuine Christians who not only kept aloof from the foul mass, but protested against every step that was taken in creating it. But speaking generally, the whole population of the empire was included in the system thus established.

48. "By taking in the whole population of the Roman Empire, the church became, indeed, a church of the masses, a church of the people, but at the same time more or less a church of the world. Christianity became a matter of fashion. The number of hypocrites and formal professors rapidly increased; strict discipline, zeal, self-sacrifice, and brotherly love proportionally ebbed away; and many heathen customs and usages, under altered names, crept into the worship of God and the life of the Christian people. The Roman

471

State had grown up under the influence of idolatry, and was not to be magically transformed at a stroke. With the secularizing process, therefore, a paganizing tendency went hand in hand." -- Schaff.²⁸

49. The effect of all this was further detrimental to true Christianity in that it argued that Christianity consists in the mere profession of the name, pertaining not to the essential character, nor implying any material change in the general conduct. Consequently those who had been by this means brought into the church acted worse, and really were worse, than those who remained aloof. When the bishops or clergy of the church undertook to exhort the heathen to become Christians, the pagans pointed to the hypocritical professors who were already members of the church, and to the invitation replied: "'We lead good lives already; what need have we of Christ? We commit no murder, theft, nor robbery; we covet no man's possessions; we are guilty of no breach of the matrimonial bond. Let something worthy of censure be found in our lives, and whoever can point it out may make us Christians.' Comparing himself with nominal Christians: 'Why would you

persuade me to become a Christian? I have been defrauded by a Christian, I never defrauded any man; a Christian has broken his oath to me, I never broke my word to any man." -- Neander.²⁹

50. Not only was the church thus rendered powerless to influence those who were without, she was likewise powerless to influence for any good those who were within. When the mass of the church was unconverted, and had joined the church from worldly and selfish motives, living only lives of conscious hypocrisy, it was impossible that church discipline should be enforced by church authority.

51. The next step taken by the bishopric, therefore, was to secure edicts under which they could enforce church discipline. This, too, not only upon the members of the church, but likewise upon those who were not members. The church having, out of lust for worldly power and influence, forsaken the power of God, the civil power was the only resource that remained to her. Conscious of her loss of moral power, she seized upon the civil.

1 [Page 453] "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. x. par. 6.

2 [Page 453] Id., chap. ix, par. 24.

3 [Page 456] Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. v.

4 [Page 457] Id.

5 [Page 457] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. i, par. 10 from end.

6 [Page 457] "History of the Popes," Melchiades, par. 2.

7 [Page 458] Id., par. 3.

8 [Page 458] Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. vii.

9 [Page 459] "History of the Popes," Melchiades, par. 5.

10 [Page 459] Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. v.

11 [Page 461] Id.

12 [Page 462] "History of the Popes," Sylvester, par. 1, note A.

13 [Page 463] Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. vi.

14 [Page 464] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. i. par. 5 from end.

15 [Page 465] Id.

16 [Page 465] "Ecclesiastical History," century iv, book ii, part ii, chap. v. par. 5, Murdock's translation.

17 [Page 466] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. ii, pars. 2, 3.

18 [Page 466] Id., par. 3.

19 [Page 467] Id.,

20 [Page 467] Id.,

21 [Page 468] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. i, par. 11.

22 [Page 468] "Decline and Fall," chap. xx, par. 18.

23 [Page 468] Id.

24 [Page 469] "History of the Christian Religion and Church." Vol. ii, sec. i, part i, A, par. 38.

25 [Page 469] Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," lect. v, par. 13 from end.

26 [Page 469] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xi.

27 [Page 470] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iii part i, div. i, par. 1.

28 [Page 471] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xxii. par. 2.

29 [Page 471] "History of the Christian Religion and Church." Vol. ii, sec. i. part i. div. C, par. 1.

32. ROME -- THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

THE church was fully conscious of her loss of the power of God before she sought the power of the State. Had she not been, she never would have made any overtures to the imperial authority, nor have received with favor any advances from it. There is a power that belongs with the gospel of Christ, and is inseparable from the truth of the gospel; that is, the power of God. In fact, the gospel is but the manifestation of that power; for the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." As long, therefore, as any order or organization of people professing the gospel of Christ maintains in sincerity the principle of that gospel, so long the power of God will be with them, and they will have no need of any other power to make their influence felt for good wherever known. But just as soon as any person or association professing the gospel loses the spirit of it, so soon the power is gone also. Then and only then, does such an organization seek for another kind of power to supply the place of that which is lost.

2. Thus was it with the church at this time. She had fallen, deplorably fallen, from the purity and the truth, and therefore from the power, of the gospel. And having lost the power of God and of godliness, she greedily grasped for the power of the State and of ungodliness. And to secure laws by which she might enforce her discipline and dogmas upon those whom she had lost the power either to convince or to persuade, was the definite purpose which the bishopric had in view when it struck that bargain with Constantine, and lent him the influence of the church in his imperial aspirations.

3. In the chapter on "Constantine and the Bishops," evidence has been given which shows how diligently the bishops endeavored to convince themselves that in the theocracy which they had framed

473

and of which they were now a part, the kingdom of God was come. But they did not suppose for a moment that the Lord himself would come and conduct the affairs of this kingdom in person. They themselves were to be the representatives of God upon the earth; and the theocracy thus established was to be ruled by the Lord through them. This was but the culmination of the evil spirit manifested in the self-exaltation of the bishopric. That is to say, their idea of a theocracy was utterly false; and the working out of the theory was but the manifestation of the mystery of iniquity.

4. Yet this is not to say that all ideas of a theocracy have always been false. The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, led them through the Red Sea and through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There He himself ruled them by judges, to whom "in divers manners" He revealed His will, "until Samuel the prophet."

5. In the days of Samuel, Israel would have a king. They even rejected God that they might have a king. Indeed, they had to reject God before they could have a king; because God was their king. Yet even though God was rejected from being their king, He still acknowledged the people as His, and guided the nation. Even the kingdom which they had set up, against His solemn protest, He made a means of instruction concerning Christ. And when because of iniquity that kingdom could no longer subsist, to the last king, and in him to all people, He sent this message: "Thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is; and I will give it Him."¹

6. The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time.

474

When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek Empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "It shall be no more, until He come whose right it is; and I will give it Him." When Christ was born in Bethlehem, of Him it was said: "Thou . . . shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end."

7. But that kingdom is not of this world, nor will He sit upon that throne in this world. While Christ was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, He refused to exercise any earthly authority or office whatever. When appealed to, to mediate in a dispute between two brothers in regard to their inheritance, He replied, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" And when the people would have taken Him and made Him a king, He withdrew himself from them, and went to the mountain alone. On the last night He spent on earth before His crucifixion, and in the last talk with Pilate before He went to the cross, He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will be no more in this world nor of this world, until, as King of kings and Lord of lords, He whose right it is shall come again. And that time is the end of this world and the beginning of the world to come. This is shown by many scriptures, some of which it will be in order here to quote.

8. To the twelve, disciples the Saviour said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." As to when this shall be, we are informed by the word in Matthew thus: "In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And the time when He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, is stated by another passage in Matthew thus: "When the Son of

Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations."

9. By these scriptures and all others on the subject, it is evident that the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of God, is not only not of this world, but is nevermore to be of this world. Therefore while this world stands, a theocracy can never exist in it again. From the death of Christ until now, every theory of an earthly theocracy has been a false theory. And from now until the end of the world, every such theory will be a false theory. Yet such was the theory of the bishops of the fourth century; and being such, it was utterly false and wicked.

10. The falsity of this theory of the bishops of the fourth century has been clearly seen by but one of the church historians: that one is Neander. And this, as well as the scheme which the bishops had in mind, has been better described by him than by all the others put together. He says: "There had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way." "This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." -- Neander.²

11. That which they had in mind when they joined their interests to Constantine's, was to use the power which through him they would thus secure, to carry into effect in the State and by governmental authority their theocratical project. The State was not only to be subordinate to the church, but was to be the servant of the church to assist in bringing all the world into the new kingdom of God. The bishops were the channel through which the will of God was to be made known to the State. Therefore the views of the

bishops were to be to the government the expression of the will of God, and whatever laws the bishopric might deem necessary to make the principles of their theocracy effective, it was their purpose to secure.

12. As we have found in the evidence of the previous chapter, the church had become filled with a mass of people who had no respect for religious exercises, and now it became necessary to use the power of the State to assist in preserving respect for church discipline. As the church-members had not religion enough to lead them to do what they professed was their duty to do, the services of the State had to be enlisted to assist them in doing what they professed to believe it was right to do. In other words, as only worldly and selfish interests had been appealed to in bringing them to membership in the church,

and as they therefore had no conscience in the matter, the services of the State were employed as aids to conscience, or rather to supply the lack of conscience.

13. Accordingly, one of the first, if not the very first, of the laws secured by the bishops in behalf of the church, was enacted, as it is supposed, about A. D. 314, ordering that on Friday and on Sunday "there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." -- Neander.³ To justify this, the specious plea was presented that when the courts and public offices were open and regularly conducted by the State on these church days, the members were hindered from attending to their religious exercises. It was further argued that if the State kept its offices open, and conducted the public business on those days, as the church-members could not conduct the public business and attend to church services both, they could not well hold public offices; and that, therefore, the State was in fact discriminating against the church, and was hindering rather than helping the progress of the kingdom of God.

14. This was simply to confess that their Christianity was altogether earthly, sensual, and selfish. It was to confess that there was not enough virtue in their profession of religion to pay them

477

for professing it; and they must needs have the State pay them for professing it. This was in fact in harmony with the whole system of which they were a part. They had been paid by the State in the first place to become professors of the new religion, and it was but consistent for them to ask the State to continue to pay them for the continued profession of it. This was consistent with the system there established; but it was totally inconsistent with every idea of true religion. Any religion that is not of sufficient value in itself to pay men for professing it, is not worth professing, much less is it worth supporting by the State. In genuine Christianity there is a virtue and a value which make it of more worth to him who professes it than all that the whole world can afford -- yea, of more worth than life itself.

15. This, however, was but the beginning. The State had become an instrument in the hands of the church, and she was determined to use that instrument to the utmost for her own aggrandizement and the establishment of her power as supreme. As we have seen by many proofs, one of the first aims of the apostate church was the exaltation of Sunday as the chief sacred day. And no sooner had the Catholic Church made herself sure of the recognition and support of the State, than she secured from the emperor an edict setting apart Sunday especially to the purposes of devotion. As the sun was the chief deity of the pagans, and as the forms of sun-worship had been so fully adopted by the apostate church, it was an easy task to secure from the sun-loving and church-courting Constantine, a law establishing the observance of the day of the sun as a holy day.

16. Accordingly, March 7, A. D. 321, Constantine issued his famous Sunday edict, which, both in matter and in intent, is the original and the model of all the Sunday laws that have ever been made. It runs as follows: --

"Constantine, Emperor Augustus, to Helpidius: 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,

478

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.)"4

17. Schaff attempts to give the Sunday legislation of Constantine a "civil" character; but this is not only an error as to fact, but an anachronism by fifteen hundred and fifty years. There was no such idea in the conception of government entertained by Constantine and the bishops; nor was there any place for any such idea in this piece of legislation. The whole thing was religious. This is seen in at least five distinct counts.

18. First Count. The theory of government intended by the bishops and sanctioned by Constantine, was a theocracy; that is, a government of God, which, in itself, could be nothing else than religious. We have seen the bishops, on behalf of the church, playing the part of oppressed Israel; while Maxentius was made to occupy the place of a second Pharaoh, and Constantine that of a new Moses delivering Israel. We have seen the new Pharaoh -- the horse and his rider -- thrown into the sea, and sunk to the bottom like a stone. We have heard the song of deliverance of the new Israel when the new Moses had crossed the Red Sea -- the river Tiber. We have seen that the new Moses, going on to the conquest of the heathen in the wilderness, set up the tabernacle and pitched it far off from the camp, where he received "divine" direction as to how he should conduct "the battles of the Lord." Thus far in the establishment of the new theocracy, each step in the course of the original theocracy had been imitated.

19. Now this establishment of Sunday observance by law, was simply another step taken by the creators of the new theocracy in imitation of the original. After the original Israel had crossed the Red Sea, and had gone a considerable journey in the wilderness, God established among them, by a law, too, the observance of the Sabbath, a

479

day of weekly rest. This setting apart of Sunday in the new theocracy, and its observance being established and enforced by law, was in imitation of the act of God in the original theocracy in establishing the observance of the Sabbath. This view is confirmed by the testimony of the same bishop who has already given us so extensive a view of the workings of the new theocracy. These are the words: --

"All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day." -- Eusebius.⁵

20. Now the Sabbath is wholly religious. The government in which its observance was enforced was the government of God. The law by which its observance was enforced was the law of God. The observance of the Sabbath was in recognition of Jehovah as the true God, and was a part of the worship of Him as such. Now when it was declared by one of the chiefest factors in the new theocracy that "all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred" to the Sunday -- this, in the connection in which it stands, is the strongest possible proof that the observance of the day, and the object of the law, were wholly religious, without a single civil element anywhere even contemplated.

21. Second Count. In accordance with their idea of a theocracy, the governmental system which was now established composed the kingdom of God. We have seen how this idea was entertained by the bishops at the banquet which Constantine gave to them at the close of the Council of Nice. We have seen it further adopted when Constantine's mother sent to him the nails of the "true cross," of which he made a bridle bit, when the bishops declared that the prophecy was fulfilled which says, "In that day [the day of the kingdom of God upon earth] shall there be upon the bridles of the horses, Holiness unto the Lord."

22. This idea, however, stands out in its fulness, in an oration which Eusebius delivered in praise of Constantine, and in his presence, on the thirtieth anniversary of the emperor's reign. The flattering bishop announced that God gave to Constantine greater proofs of His beneficence in proportion to the emperor's holy services

480

to Him, and accordingly had permitted him to celebrate already three decades, and now he was entered upon the fourth. He related how the emperor at the end of each decennial period had advanced one of his sons to a share of the imperial power; and now in the absence of other sons, he would extend the like favor to other of his kindred. Then he gave the meaning of it all as follows: --

"The eldest, who bears his father's name, he received as his partner in the empire about the close of the first decade of his reign; the second, next in point of age, at the second; and the third in like manner at the third decennial period, the occasion of this our present festival. And now that the fourth period has commenced, and the time of his reign is still further prolonged, he desires to extend his imperial authority by calling still more of his kindred to partake his power; and, by the appointment of the Caesars, fulfils the predictions of the holy prophets, according to what they uttered ages before: 'And the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.'" -- Eusebius.⁶

23. Then as the sun was the chief deity in this new kingdom of God, the bishop proceeds to draw for the edification of the Apollo-loving emperor, the following picture of him as the sun in his chariot traversing the world; and positively defines the system of government as a "monarchy of God" patterned after the "divine original:" --

"He it is who appoints him this present festival, in that He has made him victorious over every enemy that disturbed his peace; He it is who displays him as an example of true godliness to the human race. And thus our emperor, like the radiant sun, illuminates the most distant subjects of his empire through the presence of the Caesars, as with the far-piercing rays of his own brightness. To us who occupy the eastern regions he has given a son worthy of himself, and a second a third respectively to other departments of his empire, to be, as it were, brilliant reflectors of the light which proceeds from himself. Once more, having harnessed, as it were, under the selfsame yoke the four most noble Caesars as horses in the imperial chariot, he sits on high and directs their course by the reins of holy harmony and concord; and himself everywhere present, and observant of every event, thus traverses every region of the world. Lastly, invested as he is with a semblance of heavenly sovereignty, he directs his gaze above, and FRAMES HIS EARTHLY GOVERNMENT ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN OF THAT DIVINE ORIGINAL, feeling strength in its CONFORMITY TO THE MONARCHY OF GOD."7

481

24. This is evidence enough to show that the system of government established by Constantine and the bishops was considered as in very fact the kingdom of God. The laws therefore, being laws of the kingdom of God, would necessarily have a religious character; and that such was held to be the case is made plain by the following passage: --

"Our emperor, ever beloved by Him, who derives the source of imperial authority from above, and is strong in the power of his sacred title, has controlled the empire of the world for a long period of years. Again: that Preserver of the universe orders these heavens and earth, and the celestial kingdom, consistently with His Father's will. Even so, our emperor, whom He loves, by bringing those whom he rules on earth to the only begotten Word and Saviour, renders them fit subjects of His kingdom."8

25. Third Count. As the object of the emperor was to render the people fit subjects for this kingdom of God, the Sunday law was plainly in the interests of the new kingdom of God, and was therefore religious only. The purpose of the first Sunday law was "that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." This is Neander's translation of the statement of Sozomen respecting the first law closing public offices on Friday and Sunday.⁹ Professor Walford's translation of the passage is as follows: --

"He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's day. which the Jews call the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicate to the sun, as likewise the day before the seventh, and commanded that no judicial or other business should be

transacted on those days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications." -
- Sozomen.10

26. Such was the character and intent of the first enactment respecting Sunday. And of the second Sunday law we have a statement equally clear, that its purpose was the same. In praise of Constantine, the episcopal "orator" says: --

"He commanded too, that one day should be regarded as a special occasion for religious worship." -- Eusebius.11

482

27. And in naming the great things which Christ had been enabled to accomplish by the help of Constantine, this same bishop shuts out every element upon which a civil claim might be based, and shows the law to be wholly religious, by continuing in the following words: --

"Who else has commanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord's day, and to observe it as a festival, not indeed for pampering of body, BUT FOR THE COMFORT AND INVIGORATION OF THE SOUL BY INSTRUCTION IN DIVINE TRUTH?"12

28. Fourth Count. The title which is given to the day by Constantine in the edict is distinctively religious. It is *venerabilis dies solis* -- venerable day of the sun. This was the pagan religious title of the day, and to every heathen was suggestive of the religious character which attached to the day as the one especially devoted to the sun and its worship. An additional act of the emperor himself in this connection, has left no room for reasonable doubt that the intent of the law was religious only. As the interpreter of his own law, and clearly indicating its intent, he drew up the following prayer, which he had the soldiers repeat in concert at a given signal every Sunday morning: --

"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." -- Eusebius.13

29. Fifth Count. If, however, there should be yet in the mind of any person a lingering doubt as to whether Constantine's Sunday legislation was religious only, with no thought of any civil character whatever, even this must certainly be effectually removed by the fact that it was by virtue of his office and authority as pontifex maximus, and not as emperor, that the day was set apart to this use; because it was the sole prerogative of the pontifex maximus to

483

appoint holy days. In proof of this, we have excellent authority in the evidence of two competent witnesses. Here is the first: --

"The rescript, indeed, for the religious observance of the Sunday . . . was enacted . . . for the whole Roman Empire. Yet, unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, it may be doubted whether the act would not be received by the greater part of the empire as merely adding one more festival to the Fasti of the empire, as proceeding entirely from the will of the emperor, or even grounded on his authority as Supreme Pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy days." -- Milman.¹⁴

30. It is true that this statement is qualified by the clause "unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day;" but this qualification is wholly removed by another statement from the same author which says that "the rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration. . . . But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week."¹⁵ This is confirmed also by the fact that "there is no reference whatever in his law either to the fourth commandment or the resurrection of Christ." -- Schaff.¹⁶

31. Therefore, as it is admitted that unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, it was merely adding one more festival to the Fasti of the empire, the appointment of which lay in the plenary power of the pontifex maximus; and as it is plainly stated that there is no such proof, this plainly proves that the authority for the appointment of the day lay in the office of the pontifex maximus, and that authority was wholly religious.

32. Our second witness testifies as follows: --

"A law of the year 321 ordered tribunals, shops, and workshops to be closed on the day of the sun, and he [Constantine] sent to the legions, to be recited upon that day, a form of prayer which could have been employed by a worshiper of Mithra, of Serapis, or of Apollo, quite as well

484

as by a Christian believer. This was the official sanction of the old custom of addressing a prayer to the rising sun. IN DETERMINING WHAT DAYS SHOULD BE REGARDED AS HOLY, and in the composition of a prayer for national use, CONSTANTINE EXERCISED ONE OF THE RIGHTS BELONGING TO HIM AS PONTIFEX MAXIMUS; and it caused no surprise that he should do this." -- Duruy.¹⁷

33. In the face of such evidence as this, to attempt to give to the Sunday legislation of Constantine a civil character, seems, to say the very least, to spring from a wish to have it so, rather than from a desire to recognize the facts simply as they are.

34. The Council of Nice, in A. D. 325, gave another impetus to the Sunday movement. It decided that the Roman custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday only, should be followed throughout the whole empire. The council issued a letter to the churches, in which is the following passage on this subject: --

"We have also gratifying intelligence to communicate to you relative to unity of judgment on the subject of the most holy feast of Easter; for this point also has been happily settled through your prayers; so that all the brethren in the East who have heretofore kept this festival when the Jews did, will henceforth conform to the Romans and to us, and to all who from the earliest time have observed our period of celebrating Easter."¹⁸

35. This was followed up by a letter from "Constantine Augustus to the churches," in which upon this point he said: --

.. The question having been considered relative to the most holy day of Easter, it was determined by common consent that it would be proper that all should celebrate it on one and the same day everywhere. . . . And in the first place it seemed very unsuitable in the celebration of this sacred feast, that we should follow the custom of Jews, people who, having imbrued their hands in a most heinous outrage, and thus polluted their souls, are deservedly blind. . . . Let us then have nothing in common with that most hostile people the Jews. . . . Surely we should never suffer Easter to be kept twice in one and the same year. But even if these considerations were not laid before you, it became your prudence at all times to take heed, both by diligence and prayer, that the purity of your soul should in nothing have communion, or seem to have accordance, with the customs of men so utterly depraved. . . .

"Since then it was desirable that this should be so amended that we should have nothing in common with that nation parricides, and of these

485

who slew their Lord; and since the order is a becoming one which is observed by all the churches of the western, southern, and northern parts, and by some also in the eastern; from these considerations all have on the present occasion thought it to be expedient, and I pledged myself that it would be satisfactory to your prudent penetration, that what is observed with such general unanimity of sentiment in the city of Rome, throughout Italy, Africa, all Egypt, Spain, France, Britain, Libya, the whole of Greece, and the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Cilicia, your intelligence also would readily concur in. Reflect, too, that not only is there a greater number of churches in the places before mentioned, but also that this in particular is a most sacred obligation, that all should in common desire

whatever strict reason seems to demand, and which has no communion with the perjury of the Jews.

"But to sum up matters briefly, it was determined by common consent that the most holy festival of Easter should be solemnized on one and the same day; for in such a hallowed solemnity any difference is unseemly, and it is more commendable to adopt that opinion in which there will be no intermixture of strange error, or deviation from what is right. These things therefore being thus ordered, do you gladly receive this heavenly and truly divine command; for whatever is done in the sacred assemblies of the bishops is referable to the divine will."

36. This throws much light upon the next move that was made; as these things were made the basis of further action by the church. At every step in the course of the apostasy, at every step taken in adopting the forms of sun-worship, and against the adoption and the observance of Sunday itself, there had been constant protest by all real Christians. Those who remained faithful to Christ and to the truth of the pure word of God, observed the Sabbath of the Lord according to the commandment, and according to the word of God, which sets forth the Sabbath as the sign by which the Lord, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, is distinguished from all other gods. These accordingly protested against every phase and form of sun-worship. Others compromised, especially in the East, by observing both Sabbath and Sunday. But in the West, under Roman influences and under the leadership of the church and the bishopric of Rome, Sunday alone was adopted and observed.

37. Against this Church-and-State intrigue throughout, there had been also, as against every other step in the course of the apostasy, earnest protest by all real Christians. But when it came to the point where the church would enforce by the power of the State

486

the observance of Sunday, this protest became stronger than ever. And additional strength was given to the protest at this point by the fact that it was urged in the words of the very arguments which the Catholic Church had used when she was antagonized, rather than courted, by the imperial authority. This, with the strength of the argument upon the merit of the question as to the day which should be observed, greatly weakened the force of the Sunday law. But when, in addition to these considerations, the exemption was so broad, and when those who observed the Sabbath positively refused to obey the Sunday law, its effect was virtually nullified.

38. In order, therefore, to the accomplishment of her original purpose, it now became necessary for the church to secure legislation extinguishing all exemption, and prohibiting the observance of the Sabbath so as to quench that powerful protest. And now, coupled with the necessity of the situation, the "truly divine command" of Constantine and the Council of Nice that "nothing" should be held "in common with the Jews," was made the basis and the authority for legislation utterly to crush out the

observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, and to establish the observance of Sunday only in its stead. Accordingly, the Council of Laodicea enacted the following canon: --

"CANON 29. Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ."¹⁹

39. The report of the proceedings of the Council of Laodicea is not dated. A variety of dates has been suggested, of which A. D. 364 seems to have been the most favored. Hefele allows that it may have been as late as 380. But whatever the date, before A. D. 380, in the political condition of the empire, this could not be made effective by imperial law. In A. D. 364 Valens and Valentinian

487

became emperors, the former of the East, and the latter of the West. For six years Valens was indifferent to all parties; but in A. D. 370 he became a zealous Arian, and so far as in him lay, established the Arian doctrine throughout his dominion. Valentinian, though a Catholic, kept himself aloof from all the differences or controversies among church parties. This continued till 375, when Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, one aged sixteen, the other four, years. In 378 the reign of Valens ended, and Theodosius, a Spanish soldier, was appointed emperor of the East. In 380 he was baptized into the Catholic Church, and immediately an edict was issued in the name of the three emperors, commanding all subjects of the empire, of whatever party or name, to adopt the faith of the Catholic Church, and assume the name of "Catholic Christians."

40. As now "the State itself recognized the church as such, and endeavored to uphold her in the prosecution of her principles and the attainment of her ends" (Neander);²⁰ and as Theodosius had already ordered that all his subjects "should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition" had preserved, and which was then "professed by the pontiff Damasus" of Rome; and that they should all "assume the title of Catholic Christians;" it was easy to bring the imperial power to the support of the decrees of the church, and make the Laodicean Canon effective.

41. Now was given the opportunity for which the church had waited so long, and she made use of it. At the earliest possible moment she secured the desired law; for, "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. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege." -- Neander.²¹

42. As the direct result of this law, there soon appeared an evil which, under the circumstances and in the logic of the case, called for further legislation in the same

direction. The law forbade all work. But as the people had not such religion as would cause them

488

to devote the day to pious and moral exercises, the effect of the law was only to enforce idleness. Enforced idleness only multiplied opportunity for dissipation. The natural consequence was that the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday.

43. The object of the Sunday law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and that the people might go to church. But they had not sufficient religion to lead them to church when there was opportunity for amusement. Therefore, "owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart." -- Neander.²¹

44. Assuredly! An open circus or theater will always prove a great hindrance to the devotion of those Christians whose Christianity is "the least an affair of the life and of the heart." In other words, an open circus or theater will always be a great hindrance to the devotion of those who have not religion enough to keep them from going to it, but who only want to use the profession of religion to maintain their popularity, and to promote their selfish interests. On the other hand, to the devotion of those whose Christianity is really an affair of the life and of the heart, an open circus or theater will never be a particle of hindrance, whether open at church time or all the time. With the people there, however, if the circus and theater were open at the same time as the church, the church-members, as well as others, not being able to go to both places at once, would go to the circus or the theater instead of to the church.

45. But this was not what the bishops wanted. This was not that for which all work had been forbidden. All work had been forbidden in order that the people might go to church; but instead of that, they crowded to the circus and the theater, and the audiences of the bishops were rather slim. This was not at all satisfying

489

to their pride; and they took care to let it be known. "Church teachers . . . were, in truth, often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church." -- Neander.²²

46. And the church was now in a condition in which she could not bear competition. She must have a monopoly. Therefore, the next step to be taken, the logical one, too, was to

have the circuses and theaters closed on Sundays and other special church days, so that the churches and the theaters should not be open at the same time.

47. There was another feature of the case which gave the bishops the opportunity to make their new demands appear plausible, by urging in another form the selfish and sophistical plea upon which they had asked for the first edict respecting church days. In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But, rather than give up their places, the church-members would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were "compelled to work," and were "prohibited to worship;" they pronounced it "persecution," and demanded more Sunday laws for "protection."

48. As a consequence, therefore, and in the logic of the situation, at a council held at Carthage in June, A. D. 401, the following canon was enacted: --

"CANON 5. On Sundays and feast-days, no plays may be performed."23

49. That this canon might be made effective, the bishops in the same council passed a resolution, and sent up a petition to the emperor Honorius, praying "that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast-days, to some other days of the week." -- Neander.²⁴ The reason given in support of the petition was not only, as above, that those who worked in government offices and employments at such times, were persecuted, but that "the people congregate more to the circus than to the

490

church."²⁵ The church-members had not enough religion or love of right to do what they professed to believe was right; therefore the State was asked to take away from them all opportunity to do wrong; then they would all be Christians! Satan himself could be made that kind of Christian in that way -- and he would be the devil still!

50. The petition of the Council of Carthage could not be granted at once, but in 425 the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made; namely, "in order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance."²⁶

51. It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which "the devotion of the faithful" was "disturbed" by these things was that when the circus or theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the "faithful" would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and therefore their "devotion" was "disturbed." And of course the only way in which the "devotion" of such "faithful" ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time.

52. In the logic of this theory, there was one more step to be taken. To see how logically it came about, let us glance at the steps taken from the first one up to this point: First, the church had all work on Sunday forbidden, in order that the people might attend to things

divine; work was forbidden, that the people might worship. But the people would not worship; they went to the circus and the theater instead of to church. Then the church had laws enacted closing the circuses and the theaters, in order that the people might attend church. But even then the people would not be devoted, nor attend church; for they had no real religion. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them to be devoted -- to compel them to attend to things divine.

53. This was the next step logically to be taken, and it was taken. The theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case;

491

and one of the greatest of the Catholic Church Fathers and Catholic saints was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote: --

"It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain the highest grade of religious development." -- Augustine.²⁷

54. Of this theory, the author who of all the church historians has best exposed the evil workings of this false theocracy, justly observes that "it was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism of intolerance and persecution which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition." -- Neander.²⁸

55. The history of the Inquisition is only the history of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded. In closing his history of this particular subject, the same author says: In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends." -- Neander.²⁹

56. This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases final, as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he did for them did he give them power over those who did not belong to the church, to compel them to act as though they did, except in the one thing of the Sunday law. In the Sunday law, power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday law there was given to the church control of the civil power, so that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as though they did. The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it

492

will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing -- the Sunday law. Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

57. That this may be set before the reader in as clear a light as possible, we shall here summarize the facts stated by Neander in their direct bearing. He says of the carrying into effect of the theocratical theory of the apostate bishops that they made themselves dependent upon Constantine by their disputes, and "by their determination to use the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." Then he mentions the first and second Sunday laws of Constantine, the Sunday law of A. D. 386, the Carthaginian council, resolution, and petition, of 401; and the law of 425 in response to this petition; and then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: "In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

58. She started out with the determination to do it; she did it; and "in this way" she did it. And when she had secured control of the power of the State, she used it for the furtherance of her own aims, and that in her own despotic way, as announced in the inquisitorial theory of Augustine. The first step logically led to the last. And the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step unto the last, as framed in the words of Augustine and illustrated in the horrors of the Inquisition during the fearful record of the dreary ages in which the bishopric of Rome was supreme over kings and nations.

1 [Page 473] Eze. 21 : 25-27.

2 [Page 475] "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. ii, sec. ii part i, div. i, pars. 2,3.

3 [Page 476] Id., sec. iii, part ii, div. iii. par. 2.

4 [Page 478] Schaff's translation, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. ii, sec. lxxv, par. 5, note 1. The following is the Latin, from the same place: "Imperator Constantinus Aug. Helpidio: Omnes judices, urbanaeque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa."

5 [Page 479] "Commentary on the Psalms," xcii, quoted in Cox's "Sabbath Literature," vol. i. p. 361, and in the "Sabbath Manual," by Justin Edwards, pp. 125-127.

6 [Page 480] "Oration in Praise of Constantine," chap. iii.

7 [Page 480] Id.

8 [Page 481] Id., chap. ii.

9 [Page 481] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii. sec. iii, part ii, div. iii.par.ii.

10 [Page 481] "Ecclesiastical History," book i. chap. viii.

11 [Page 481] "Oration in Praise of Constantine," chap. ix.

12 [Page 482] Id., chap. xvii.

13 [Page 482] "Life of Constantine," book iv, chap. xx.

14 [Page 483] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 9 from end.

15 [Page 483] Id., chap. i, par. 44.

16 [Page 483] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. lxxv, par. 5.

17 [Page 484] "History of Rome," chap. cii, part i. par. 4 from end.

18 [Page 484] Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book i. chap. ix.

19 [Page 486] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," Laodicea. In both the Greek and latin copies of this canon, the word "Sabbath" is used instead of "Saturday;" and the word "anathema" -- accursed -- is the one which Hefele translates "shut out." The following is the Latin: "Quod non oportet Christianos Judaizare et otiare in Sabbato, sed operari in eodem die. Preferentes autem in veneratione Dominicum diem si vacare voluerint, ut Christiani hoc faciat; quod si reperti fuerint Judaizare Anathema sint a Christo."

20 [Page 487] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iii, part ii, div. iii par. 4.

21 [Page 488] Id. par. 5.

21 [Page 530] Id., par. 19.

22 [Page 488] Id.

23 [Page 489] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," Fifth Carthaginian.

24 [Page 489] "History of the Christian Religion and Church." Vol. ii, sec. iii, part i, div. iii, par. 5.

25 [Page 490] Id.

26 [Page 491] Id.

27 [Page 491] "The Correction of the Donatists," chap. vi. I adopt Schaff's translation, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xxvii, par. 12.

28 [Page 491] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec.ii, part iii, div. i, last paragraph.

29 [Page 491] Id., sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, par. 5.

33. ROME -- ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

THE Donatist dispute had developed the decision, and established the fact, that it was "the Catholic Church of the Christians" in which was embodied the "Christianity" which was to be recognized as the imperial religion. Constantine had allied himself with the church only for political advantage. The only use he had for the church was in a political way. Its value for this purpose lay entirely in its unity. If the church should be all broken up and divided into separate bodies, its value as a political factor would be gone.

2. The Catholic Church, on her part, had long asserted the necessity of unity with the bishopric, -- a unity in which the bishopric should be possessed of authority to prohibit, as well as power to prevent, heresy. The church had supported and aided Constantine in the overthrow of Maxentius and the conquest of Rome. She again supported, and materially aided, him in the overthrow of Licinius and the complete conquest of the whole empire. She had received a rich reward for her assistance in the first political move; and she now, in the second and final one, demanded her pay for services rendered.

3. The Catholic Church demanded assistance in her ambitious aim to make her power and authority absolute over all; and for Constantine's purposes it was essential that the church should be a unit. These two considerations combined to produce results, both immediate and remote, that proved a curse to the time then present and to ages to follow. The immediate result was that Constantine had no sooner compassed the destruction of Licinius in A. D. 323, than he issued an edict against the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, Cataphrygians, and "all who devised and supported

494

heresies by means of private assemblies," denouncing them and their heresies, and commanding them all to enter the Catholic Church.

4. The edict runs as follows: --

"Victor Constantinus Maximus Augustus to the Heretics: Understand now, by this present statute, ye Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, ye who are called Cataphrygians, and all ye who devise and support heresies by means of your private assemblies, with what a tissue of falsehood and vanity, with what destructive and venomous errors, your doctrines are inseparably interwoven; so that through you the healthy soul is stricken with disease, and the living becomes the prey of everlasting death. Ye haters and enemies of truth and life, in league with destruction! All your counsels are opposed to the truth, but familiar with deeds of baseness, fit subjects for the fabulous follies of the stage; and by these ye frame falsehoods, oppress the innocent, and withhold the light from them that believe. Ever trespassing under the mask of godliness, ye fill all things with defilement; ye pierce the pure and guileless conscience with deadly wounds,

while ye withdraw, one may almost say, the very light of day from the eyes of men. But why should I particularize, when to speak of your criminality as it deserves, demands more time and leisure than I can give? For so long and unmeasured is the catalogue of your offenses, so hateful and altogether atrocious are they, that a single day would not suffice to recount them all. And, indeed, it is well to turn one's ears and eyes from such a subject, lest by a description of each particular evil, the pure sincerity and freshness of one's own faith be impaired. Why then do I still bear with such abounding evil; especially since this protracted clemency is the cause that some who were sound are become tainted with this pestilent disease? Why not at once strike, as it were, at the root of so great a mischief by a public manifestation of displeasure?

"Forasmuch, then, as it is no longer possible to bear with your pernicious errors, we give warning by this present statute that none of you henceforth presume to assemble yourselves together. We have directed, accordingly, that you be deprived of all the houses in which you are accustomed to hold your assemblies; and our care in this respect extends so far as to forbid the holding of your superstitious and senseless meetings, not in public merely, but in any private house or place whatsoever. LET THOSE OF YOU, THEREFORE, WHO ARE DESIROUS OF EMBRACING THE TRUE AND PURE RELIGION, TAKE THE FAR BETTER COURSE OF ENTERING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND UNITING WITH IT IN HOLY FELLOWSHIP, WHEREBY YOU WILL BE ENABLED TO ARRIVE AT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUTH. In any case the delusions of your perverted understandings must entirely cease to mingle with, and mar the felicity of, our present times; I mean the impious and wretched double-mindedness of heretics and schismatics. FOR IT IS AN OBJECT WORTHY OF THAT PROSPERITY WHICH WE ENJOY

495

THROUGH THE FAVOR OF GOD, TO ENDEAVOR TO BRING BACK THOSE WHO IN TIME PAST WERE LIVING IN THE HOPE OF FUTURE BLESSING, FROM ALL IRREGULARITY AND ERROR TO THE RIGHT PATH, FROM DARKNESS TO LIGHT, FROM VANITY TO TRUTH, FROM DEATH TO SALVATION. And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said) that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings; I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, AND THAT THESE BE MADE OVER WITHOUT DELAY TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering, in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public."¹

5. Some of the penal regulations of this edict "were copied from the edicts of Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and had pleaded for the rights of humanity." -- Gibbon.²

6. The Donatist dispute had resulted in the establishment of the Catholic Church. Yet that dispute involved no question of doctrine, but of discipline only. Just at this time, however, there sprang into prominence the famous Trinitarian controversy, which involved, and under the circumstances demanded, an imperial decision as to what was the Catholic Church in point of doctrine -- what was the Catholic Church in deed and in truth; and which plunged the empire into a sea of tumult and violence that continued as long as the empire itself continued, and afflicted other nations after the empire had perished.

7. A certain Alexander was bishop of Alexandria. Arius was a presbyter in charge of a parish church in the same city. Alexander attempted to explain "the unity of the Holy Trinity." Arius dissented from the views set forth by Alexander. A sort of synod of the presbyters of the city was called, and the question was discussed. Both sides claimed the victory, and the controversy spread. Then Alexander convened a council of a hundred bishops, by the majority of which the views of Alexander were endorsed. Upon this, Arius was commanded to abandon his own opinions, and adopt Alexander's.

496

Arius refused; and Alexander excommunicated him and all who held with him in opinion, of whom there were a considerable number of bishops and other clergy, and many of the people.

8. The partizans of Arius wrote to many bishops a statement of their views, with a request that if those views were considered correct, they would use their influence to have Alexander receive them to communion again, but that if they thought the views to be wrong in any particular, they would signify it, and show them what were the correct opinions on the question. Arius for himself wrote a book entitled "Thalia," -- Songs of Joy, -- a collection of songs in which he set forth his views. This expedient took well, for in the excited state of the parties, his doctrinal songs were hummed everywhere. Alexander on his part, likewise, sent circular letters to the principal bishops round about. The controversy spread everywhere, and as it spread, it deepened.

9. One of the chief reasons for the rapid and wide-spread interest in the controversy was that nobody could comprehend or understand the question at issue. "It was the excess of dogmatism founded on the most abstract words in the most abstract region of human thought." -- Stanley.³ There was no dispute about the fact of there being a Trinity, it was about the nature of the Trinity. Both parties believed in precisely the same Trinity; but they differed upon the precise relationship which the Son bears to the Father.

10. Alexander declared: --

"The Son is immutable and unchangeable, all-sufficient and perfect, like the Father, differing only in this one respect, that the Father is unbegotten. He is the exact image of his Father. Everything is found in the image which exists in its archetype, and it was this that our Lord taught when He said, 'My Father is greater than I.' And, accordingly, we

believe that the Son proceeded from the Father; for He is the reflection of the glory of the Father, and the figure of His substance. But let no one be led from this to the supposition that the Son is unbegotten, as is believed by some who are deficient in intellectual power; for to say that He was, that He has always been, and that He existed before all ages, is not to say that He is unbegotten."⁴

11. Arius said: --

497

We say and believe, and have taught, and do teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor in any way unbegotten, even in part; and that he does not derive His subsistence from any matter; but that by His own will and counsel He has subsisted before time, and before ages, as perfect God, and only begotten and unchangeable, and that He existed not before He was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established. For He was not unbegotten. We are persecuted because we say that the Son had a beginning, but that God was without beginning. This is really the cause of our persecution, and likewise, because we say He is from nothing. And this we say, because He is neither part of God, nor of any subjacent matter."⁵

12. From these statements by the originators of the respective sides of this controversy, it appears that with the exception of a single point, the two views were identical, only being stated in different ways. The single point where the difference lay was that Alexander held that the Son was begotten of the very essence of the Father, and is therefore of the same substance with the Father; while Arius held that the Son was begotten by the Father, not from His own essence, but from nothing; but that when He was thus begotten, He was, and is, of precisely the like substance with the Father.

13. Whether the Son of God, therefore, is of the same substance, or only of like substance, with the Father, was the question in dispute. The controversy was carried on in Greek, and as expressed in Greek the whole question turned upon a single letter. The word which expressed Alexander's belief is Homoousion. The word which expressed the belief of Arius is Homoiousion. One of the words has two "i's" in it, and the other has but one; but why the word should not have that additional "i," neither party could ever exactly determine. Even Athanasius himself, who succeeded Alexander in the bishopric of Alexandria, and transcended him in every other quality, "has candidly confessed that whenever he forced his understanding to meditate upon the divinity of the Logos, his toilsome and unavailing efforts recoiled on themselves; that the more he thought, the less he comprehended; and the more he wrote, the less capable was he of expressing his thoughts." -- Gibbon.⁶

498

14. It could not possibly be otherwise, because it was an attempt of the finite to measure, to analyze, and even to dissect, the Infinite. It was an attempt to make the

human superior to the divine. God is infinite. No finite mind can comprehend Him as He actually is. Christ is the Word -- the expression of the thought -- of God; and none but He knows the depth of the meaning of that Word. "He had a name written, that no man knew, but He himself; . . . and His name is called The Word of God." Neither the nature, nor the relationship, of the Father and Son can ever be measured by the mind of man. "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." This revelation of the Father by the Son can not be complete in this world. It will require the eternal ages for man to understand "the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus."

15. "If any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." No man's conception of God can ever be fixed as the true conception of God. God will still be infinitely beyond the broadest comprehension that the mind of man can measure. The true conception of God can be attained only through "the Spirit of revelation in the knowledge of Him." Therefore the only thing for men to do to find out the Almighty to perfection, is, by true faith in Jesus Christ, to receive the abiding presence of this "Spirit of revelation," and then quietly and joyfully wait for the eternal ages to reveal "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God."7

16. One who lived near the time of, and was well acquainted with, the whole matter, has well remarked that the discussion "seemed not unlike a contest in the dark; for neither party appeared to understand distinctly the grounds on which they calumniated one another. Those who objected to the word 'con-substantial' [Homoousion, of the same substance], conceived that those who approved it, favored the opinion of Sabellius and Montanus; they therefore called them blasphemers, as subverters of the existence of the Son of God. And again, the advocates of this term,

499

charging their opponents with polytheism, inveighed against them as introducers of heathen superstitions. . . . In consequence of these misunderstandings, each of them wrote volumes, as if contending against adversaries; and although it was admitted on both sides that the Son of God has a distinct person and existence, and all acknowledged that there is one God in a Trinity of persons, yet, from what cause I am unable to divine, they could not agree among themselves, and therefore were never at peace." -- Socrates.8

17. That which puzzled Socrates need not puzzle us. Although he could not divine why they should not agree when they believed the same thing, we may very readily do so, with no fear of mistake. The difficulty was that each disputant required that all the others should not only believe what he believed, but they should believe this precisely as he believed it, whereas just how he believed it, he himself could not define. And that which made them so determined in this respect was that "the contest was now not merely for a superiority over a few scattered and obscure communities; it was agitated on a far vaster theater -- that of the Roman world. The proselytes whom it disputed were sovereigns. . . . It is but judging on the common principles of human nature to conclude that the grandeur of the prize supported the ambition and inflamed the passions of the contending parties;

that human motives of political power and aggrandizement mingled with the more spiritual influence of the love of truth, and zeal for the purity of religion." -- Milman.⁹

18. It is but just to Arius, however, to say that he had nothing to do with the political aspect of the question. He defended his views in the field of argument, and maintained his right to think for himself. Others took up the argument with more ambitious motives, and these soon carried it far beyond the power or the guidance of Arius. The chief of these and really the leader of the Arian party in the politico-theological contest, was Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. This Eusebius is to be distinguished always from Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, who was Constantine's favorite, although both were Arians.

500

19. The controversy spread farther and farther, and raged more fiercely as it spread. "All classes took part in it, and almost all took part with equal energy. 'Bishop rose against bishop, district against district, only to be compared to the Symplegades dashed against each other on a stormy day.' So violent were the discussions that they were parodied in the pagan theaters; and the emperor's statues were broken in the public squares in the fierce conflicts.

20. "The common name by which the Arians and their system were designated (and we may conclude they were not wanting in retorts), was the 'Maniacs,' -- the 'Ariomaniacs,' the 'Ariomania,' and their frantic conduct on public occasions afterward goes far to justify the appellation. Sailors, millers, and travelers sang the disputed doctrines at their occupations or on their journeys. Every corner, every alley of the city [this was said afterward of Constantinople, but must have been still more true of Alexandria], was full of these discussions -- the streets, the market-places, the drapers, the money-changers, the victualers. Ask a man 'how many oboli?' he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, 'The Son is subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, 'The Son arose out of nothing.'" - Stanley.¹⁰

21. Constantine's golden dream of a united Christendom was again grievously disturbed. The bow of promise (of the bishops) which had so brilliantly irradiated all the political prospect when his alliance was formed with the church party, was rudely dissipated by the dark cloud of ecclesiastical ambition, and the angry storm of sectarian strife. He wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius, stating to them his mission of uniting the world under one head, and his anxious desire that there should be unity among all, and exhorted them to lay aside their contentions, forgive one another, use their efforts for the restoration of peace, and so give back to him his quiet days and tranquil nights.

22. This letter clearly shows the views and the hopes of Constantine as to the unity of the church, and that it was this that controlled him in his alliance with the church party: --

501

"Victor Constantinus Maximus Augustus to Alexander and Arius: I call that God to witness (as well I may) who is the Helper of my endeavors, and the Preserver of all men, that I had a twofold reason for undertaking that duty which I have now effectually performed.

"My design then was, first, to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity; and secondly, to restore a healthy tone to the system of the world, then suffering under the malignant power of a grievous distemper. Keeping these objects in view, I looked forward to the accomplishment of the one with the secret gaze of the mental eye, while the other I endeavored to secure by the aid of military power. For I was aware that, if I should succeed in establishing, according to my hopes, a common harmony of sentiment among all the servants of God, the general course of affairs would also experience a change correspondent to the pious desires of them all.

"Finding, then, that the whole of Africa was pervaded by an intolerable spirit of madness and folly, through the influences of those whose wanton temerity had presumed to rend the religion of the people into diverse sects, I was anxious to allay the virulence of this disorder, and could discover no other remedy equal to the occasion, except in sending some of yourselves to aid in restoring mutual harmony among the disputants, after I had removed that common enemy of mankind [Licinius] who had interposed his lawless sentence for the prohibition of your holy synods.

"For since the power of divine light, and the rule of our holy religion, which have illumined the world by their sacred radiance, proceeded in the first instance, through the favor of God, from the bosom, as it were, of the East, I naturally believed that you would be the first to promote the salvation of other nations, and resolved with all energy of purpose and diligence of inquiry to seek your aid. As soon, therefore, as I had secured my decisive victory and unquestionable triumph over my enemies, my first inquiry was concerning that object which I felt to be of paramount interest and importance.

"But O, glorious providence of God! how deep a wound did not my ears only, but my very heart, receive in the report that divisions existed among yourselves more grievous still than those which continued in that country, so that you, through whose aid I had hoped to procure a remedy for the errors of others, are in a state which demands even more attention than theirs. And yet having made a careful inquiry into the origin and foundation of these differences, I find the cause to be of a truly insignificant character, and quite unworthy of such fierce contention. Feeling myself, therefore, compelled to address you in this letter, and to appeal at the same time to your unanimity and sagacity, I call on Divine Providence to assist me in the task, while I interrupt your dissensions in the character of a minister of peace. And with reason; for if I might expect (with the help of a higher power) to be able without difficulty, by a judicious appeal to the pious feelings of those who heard me, to recall

them to a better spirit, how can I refrain from promising myself a far easier and more speedy adjustment of this difference, when the cause which hinders general harmony of sentiment is intrinsically trifling and of little moment?

"I understand, then, that the occasion of your present controversy is to be traced to the following circumstances: that you, Alexander, demanded of the presbyters what opinion they severally maintained respecting a certain passage in the divine law, or rather, I should say, that you asked them something connected with an unprofitable question; and then that you, Arius, inconsiderately gave utterance to objections which ought never to have been conceived at all, or if conceived, should have been buried in profound silence. Hence it was that a dissension arose between you; the meeting of the synod was prohibited; and the holy people, rent into diverse parties, no longer preserved the unity of the one body. Now, therefore, do ye both exhibit an equal degree of forbearance, and receive the advice which your fellow servant feels himself justly entitled to give. . . .

"Let, therefore, both the unguarded questions and the inconsiderate answer receive your mutual forgiveness. For your difference has not arisen on any leading doctrines or precepts of the divine law, nor have you introduced any new dogma respecting the worship of God. You are in truth of one and the same judgment; you may therefore well join in that communion which is the symbol of united fellowship. . . .

"Let us withdraw ourselves with a good will from these temptations of the devil. Our great God and common Saviour has granted the same light to us all. Permit me, who am His servant, to bring my task to a successful issue, under the direction of His Providence, that I may be enabled through my exhortations, and diligence, and earnest admonition, to recall His people to the fellowship of one communion. For since you have, as I said, but one faith and one sentiment respecting our religion, and since the divine commandment in all its parts enjoins on us all the duty of maintaining a spirit of concord, let not the circumstance which has led to a slight difference between you, since it affects not the general principles of truth, be allowed to prolong any division or schism among you. . . .

"Restore me then my quiet days and untroubled nights, that henceforth the joy of light undimmed by sorrow, the delight of a tranquil life, may continue to be my portion. Else must I needs mourn, with copious and constant tears, nor shall I be able to pass the residue of my days without disquietude. For while the people of God, whose fellow servant I am, are thus divided amongst themselves by an unreasonable and pernicious spirit of contention, how is it possible that I shall be able to maintain tranquillity of mind? . . . Permit me speedily to see the happiness both of yourselves and of all other provinces, and to render due acknowledgment to God in the language of praise and thanksgiving for the restoration of general concord and liberty to all."¹¹

23. This letter he sent by the hand of Hosius, whom he made his ambassador to reconcile the disputants. But both the letter and the mission of Hosius were in vain; and

yet the more so by the very fact that the parties were now assured that the controversy had attracted the interested attention of the imperial authority. As imperial favor, imperial patronage, and imperial power were the chief objects of the contest, and as this effort of the emperor showed that the reward was almost within the grasp of whichever party might prove successful, the contention was deepened rather than abated.

24. It had already been decided that the imperial favor and patronage were for the Catholic Church. Each of these parties claimed to be the orthodox and only Catholic Church. The case of the Donatists had been referred to a council of bishops for adjudication. It was but natural that this question should be treated in the same way. But whereas the case of the Donatists affected only a very small portion of the empire, this question directly involved the whole East, and greatly concerned much of the West. More than this, the Catholic religion was now the religion of the empire. This dispute was upon the question as to what is the truth of the Catholic religion. Therefore if the question was to be settled, it must be settled for the whole empire. These considerations demanded a general council. Therefore a general council was called, A. D. 325, which met at the city of Nice, the latter part of May or the first part of June, in that year.

25. The number of bishops that composed the council was three hundred and eighteen, while the number of "the presbyters and deacons in their train, and the crowd of acolytes and other attendants, was altogether beyond computation" (Eusebius),¹² all of whom traveled, and were entertained to and from the council and while there, at the public expense. "They came as fast as they could run, in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm; the actual crowd must have been enough to have metamorphosed the place." And "shrill above all other voices, vehement above all other disputants, 'brandishing their arguments like spears against those who sat under the same roof and ate off the same tables as themselves,'

504

were the combatants from Alexandria, who had brought to its present pass the question which the council was called to decide." -- Stanley.¹³

26. The emperor did not arrive at Nice for several days after the others had reached that place; but when he came, "he had no sooner taken up his quarters in the palace of Nicaea, than he found showered in upon him a number of parchment rolls, or letters, containing complaints and petitions against each other from the larger part of the assembled bishops. We can not ascertain with certainty whether they were collected in a single day, or went on accumulating day after day. It was a poor omen for the unanimity which he had so much at heart. . . . We are expressly told both Eusebius and Sozomen that one motive which had drawn many to the council was the hope of settling their own private concerns, and promoting their own private interests.

27. "There, too, were the pent-up grudges and quarrels of years, which now for the first time had an opportunity of making themselves heard. Never before had these remote, often obscure, ministers of a persecuted sect come within the range of imperial power. He

whose presence was for the first time so close to them, bore the same authority of which the apostle had said that it was the supreme earthly distributor of justice to mankind. Still after all due allowance, it is impossible not to share in the emperor's astonishment that this should have been the first act of the first Ecumenical Assembly of the Christian Church." -- Stanley.14

28. The council met in a large hall in the palace of the emperor, which had been arranged for the purpose. In the center

505

of the room, on a kind of throne, was placed a copy of the gospels; at one end of the hall was placed a richly carved throne, which was to be occupied by Constantine. The day came for the formal opening of the assembly. The bishops were all assembled with their accompanying presbyters and deacons; but as it was an imperial council, it could not be opened but by the emperor himself; and they waited in silence for him to come. "At last a signal from without -- probably a torch raised by the 'cursor' or avant-courier -- announced that the emperor was close at hand. The whole assembly rose and stood on their feet; and then for the first time set their admiring gaze on Constantine, the conqueror, the august, the great.

29. "He entered. His towering stature, his strong-built frame, his broad shoulders, his handsome features, were worthy of his grand position. There was a brightness in his look and mingled expression of fierceness and gentleness in his lion-like eye, which well became one who, as Augustus before him, had fancied, and perhaps still fancied, himself to be the favorite of the sun-god Apollo. The bishops were further struck by the dazzling, perhaps barbaric magnificence of his dress. Always careful of his appearance, he was so on this occasion in an eminent degree. His long hair, false or real, was crowned with the imperial diadem of pearls. His purple or scarlet robe blazed with precious stones and gold embroidery. He was shod, no doubt, in the scarlet shoes then confined to emperors, now perpetuated in the pope and cardinals. Many of the bishops had probably never seen greater functionary than a remote provincial magistrate, and gazing at his splendid figure as he passed up the hall between their ranks, remembering, too, what he had done for their faith and for their church, we may well believe that the simple and the worldly both looked upon him as though he were an angel of God, descended straight from heaven." -- Stanley.15

30. He paraded thus up the whole length of the hall to where the seat of wrought gold had been set for him; then he turned, facing the assembly, and pretended to be so abashed by the presence of so much holiness, that he would not take his seat until the bishops

506

had signaled to him to do so; then he sat down, and the others followed his example. On one side of Constantine sat Hosius, on the other, Eusebius. As soon as all had taken their seats after the entrance of Constantine, Eusebius arose and delivered an oration in honor

of the emperor, closing with a hymn of thanksgiving to God for Constantine's final victory over Licinius. Eusebius resumed his seat, and Constantine arose and delivered to the assembly the following address:-

"It has, my friends, been the object of my highest wishes to enjoy your sacred company, and having obtained this, I confess my thankfulness to the King of all, that in addition to all my other blessings, He has granted to me this greatest of all -- I mean, to receive you all assembled together, and to see one common, harmonious opinion of all. Let, then, no envious enemy injure our happiness, and after the destruction of the impious power of the tyrants by the might of God our Saviour, let not the spirit of evil overwhelm the divine law with blasphemies; for to me far worse than any war or battle is the civil war of the church of God; yes, far more painful than the wars which have raged without. As, then, by the assent and co-operation of a higher power I have gained my victories over my enemies, I thought that nothing remained but to give God thanks, and to rejoice with those who have been delivered by us. But since I learned of your divisions, contrary to all expectations, I gave the report my first consideration; and praying that this also might be healed through my assistance, I called you all together without delay. I rejoice at the mere sight of your assembly; but the moment that I shall consider the chief fulfilment of my prayers, will be when I see you all joined together in heart and soul, and determining on one peaceful harmony for all, which it should well become you who are consecrated to God, to preach to others. Do not, then, delay, my friends; do not delay, ministers of God, and good servants of our common Lord and Saviour, to remove all grounds of difference, and to wind up by laws of peace every link of controversy. Thus will you have done what is most pleasing to God, who is over all, and you will render the greatest boon to me, your fellow servant."16

31. Thus the council was formally opened, and then the emperor signified to the judges of the assembly to go on with the proceedings. "From this moment the flood-gates of debate were opened wide; and from side to side recriminations and accusations were bandied to and fro, without regard to the imperial presence. He remained unmoved amid the clatter of angry voices, turning from

507

one side of the hall to the other, giving his whole attention to the questions proposed, bringing together the violent partizans."-- Stanley.17 To end their personal spites, and turn their whole attention to the question which was to come properly before the assembly, he took from the folds of his mantle the whole bundle of their complaints and recriminations against one another, which they had submitted to him immediately upon his arrival. He laid the bundle out before the assembly, bound up, and sealed with the imperial ring. Then, after stating that he had not read one of them, he ordered a brazier to be brought in, and at once burned them in the presence of the whole assembly. As they were burning, he addressed the authors of them in the following words:-

"You have been made by God priests and rulers, to judge and decide, . . . and have been even made gods, so highly raised as you are above men; for it is written, "I have said ye

are gods, and ye are all the children of the Most High; " "and God stood in the congregation of the gods, and in the midst He judges the gods." You ought really to neglect these common matters, and devote yourselves to the things of God. It is not for me to judge of what awaits the judgment of God only.' And as the libels vanished into ashes, he urged them, never to let the faults of men in their consecrated offices be publicly known to the scandal and temptation of the multitude.' `Nay,' he added, doubtless spreading out the folds of his imperial mantle as he spoke, `even though I were with mine own eyes to see a bishop in the act of gross sin, I would throw my purple robe over him, that no one might suffer from the sight of such a crime.'"18

32. Then the great question that had caused the calling of the council was taken up. There were three parties in the council -- those who sided with Alexander, those who sided with Arius, and those who were non-committal, or, through hope of being mediators, held the middle ground. Arius, not being a bishop, could not hold an official seat in the council; but he had come at the express command of Constantine, and "was frequently called upon to express his opinions." Athanasius, who was more responsible for the present condition of the dispute than was Alexander himself, though only a deacon, came with his bishop Alexander. He, likewise, though not entitled to an official place in the council, had no small part in the discussion and in bringing about the final result of the council.

508

33. The party of Alexander and Athanasius, as it was soon discovered, could depend upon the majority of the council; and they determined to use this power in the formulation of such a statement of doctrine as would suit themselves first; and if it should be found impossible for the party of Arius honestly to accept it, so much the better would they be pleased.

34. In the discussion, some of the songs which Arius had written were read. As soon as Alexander's party heard them, they threw up their hands in horror, and then clapped them upon their ears and shut their eyes, that they might not be defiled with the fearful heresy. Next, the draft of a creed was brought in, signed by eighteen bishops of the party of Arius; but it was not suffered to exist long enough for anybody ever to obtain a copy. Their opponents broke into a wild uproar, tore the document to pieces, and expelled Arius from the assembly.

35. Next, Eusebius of Caesarea -- Constantine's panegyrist -- thought to bring the parties together by presenting a creed that had been largely in use before this dispute ever arose. He stated that this confession of faith was one which he had learned in his childhood, from the bishop of Caesarea, and one which he accepted at his baptism, and which he had taught through his whole career, both as a presbyter and as a bishop. As an additional argument, and one which he intended to be of great weight in the council, he declared that "it had been approved by the emperor, the beloved of heaven, who had already seen it." It read as follows:-

"I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the First-born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom also all things were made. Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived amongst men, and suffered, and rose on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in one Holy Ghost. Believing each of them to be and to have existed, the Father, only the Father; and the Son, only the Son; and the Holy Ghost, only the Holy Ghost; as also our Lord sending forth His own disciples to preach, said, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:' concerning which things we affirm that it is so, and that we so think, and

509

that it has long so been held, and that we remain steadfast to death for this faith, anathematizing every godless heresy. That we have thought these things from our heart and soul, from the time that we have known ourselves, and that we now think and say thus in truth, we testify in the name of Almighty God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, being able to prove even by demonstration, and to persuade you that in the past times also thus we believed and preached."¹⁹

36. As soon as this was read in the council, the party of Arius all signified their willingness to subscribe to it. But this did not suit the party of Alexander and Athanasius; it was rather the very thing that they did not want, for "they were determined to find some form of words which no Arian could receive." They hunted about, therefore, for some point or some word, upon which they could reject it. It will be noticed that this creed says nothing about the substance of the Son of God, while that was the very question which had brought the council together. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was chief of the Arians who held seats in the council. At this point a letter was brought forth, which he had formerly written, in which he had stated that "to assert the Son to be uncreated, would be to say that He was 'of one substance' -- Homoousion -- with the Father, and to say that 'He was of one substance' was a proposition evidently absurd."

37. This gave to the party of Alexander and Athanasius the very opportunity which they desired; it supplied from the opposite party the very word upon which they had all the time insisted, and one of the chiefs of that party had declared that the use of the word in that connection was evidently absurd. If they, therefore, should insist upon the use of that very word, it would certainly exclude the Arian party. "The letter produced a violent excitement. There was the very test of which they were in search; the letter was torn in pieces to mark their indignation, and the phrase which he had pledged himself to reject, became the phrase which they pledged themselves to adopt." -- Stanley.²⁰

38. As Constantine had approved the creed already read by Eusebius, the question of the party of Alexander now was whether he would approve it with the addition of this word; and the hopes of

both parties now hung trembling upon the emperor. Hosius and his associates, having the last consultation with him, brought him over to their side. At the next meeting of the assembly, he again presented the creed of Eusebius, approved it, and called upon all to adopt it. Seeing, however, that the majority would not accept the creed of Eusebius as it was, Constantine decided to "gain the assent of the orthodox, that is, the most powerful, part of the assembly," by inserting the disputed word. "He trusted that by this insertion they might be gained, and yet that, under the pressure of fear and favor, the others might not be altogether repelled. He therefore took the course the most likely to secure this result, and professed himself the patron and also the interpreter of the new phrase." -- Stanley.²¹

39. Constantine ordered the addition of the disputed word. The party of Alexander and Athanasius, now assured of the authority of the emperor, required the addition of other phrases to the same purpose, so that when the creed was finally written out in full, it read as follows: --

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who for us man, and for our salvation, came down, and was made flesh, and was made men, suffered, and rose again on the third day went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and dead.

"And in the Holy Ghost.

"But those that say, 'There was when He was not,' and 'Before He was begotten, He was not,' and that 'He came into existence from what was not,' or who profess that the Son of God is of a different 'person' or 'substance,' or that He is created, or changeable, or variable, are anathematized by the Catholic Church."²²

40. Thus came the original Nicene Creed. Constantine's influence carried with it many in the council, but seventeen bishops refused to subscribe to the creed. The emperor then commanded all to sign it under penalty of banishment. This brought to terms all of

them but five. Eusebius of Caesarea, the panegyrist and one of the counselors of Constantine, took a whole day to "deliberate." In his deliberation he consulted the emperor, who so explained the term Homoousion that it could be understood as Homoiousion. He "declared that the word, as he understood it, involved no such material

unity of the persons of the Godhead as Eusebius feared might be deduced from it." -- Stanley.²³ In this sense, therefore, Eusebius adopted the test, and subscribed to the creed.

41. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice subscribed to the body of the creed; but refused to subscribe to the curse which it pronounced upon the Arian doctrines. Sentence of banishment was pronounced; then they yielded and subscribed; yet they were removed from their bishoprics, and Catholics were put in their places. Two of the other bishops, however, -- Theonas of Marmarica in Libya, and Secundus of Ptolemais, -- absolutely refused from first to last to sign the creed, and they were banished.

42. As for Arius, he seems to have departed from Nice soon after he was expelled from the council. Sentence of banishment was pronounced against him with the others. But as he was the chief expositor of the condemned doctrines, Constantine published against him the following edict: --

"Victor Constantine Maximus Augustus to the Bishops and People: Since Arius has imitated wicked and impious persons, it is just that he should undergo the like ignominy. Wherefore, as Porphyry, that enemy of piety, for having composed licentious treatises against religion, found a suitable recompense, and such as thenceforth branded him with infamy, overwhelming him with deserved reproach, his impious writings also having been destroyed; so now it seems fit both that Arius and such as hold his sentiments should be denominated Porphyrians, that they may take their appellation from those whose conduct they have imitated. And in addition to thus, if any treatise composed by Arius should be discovered, let it be consigned to the flames, in order that not only his depraved doctrine may be suppressed, but also that no memorial of him may be by any means left. This therefore I decree, that if any one shall be detected in concealing a book compiled by Arius, and shall not instantly bring it forward and burn it, the penalty for this offense shall be death; for immediately after conviction the criminal shall suffer capital punishment. May God preserve you."²⁴

512

43. "His book, 'Thalia,' was burnt on the spot; and this example was so generally followed that it became a very rare work." -- Stanley.²⁵ The decree banishing Arius was shortly so modified as simply to prohibit his returning to Alexandria.

44. When the council finally closed its labors, Constantine gave, in honor of the bishops, the grand banquet before mentioned, in which it was pretended that the kingdom of God was come, and at which he loaded them with presents. He then exhorted them to unity and forbearance, and dismissed them to return to their respective places.

45. It was intended that the decision of this council, in the creed adopted, should put an end forever to all religious differences. "It is certain that the Creed of Nicaea was meant to be an end of theological controversy." -- Stanley.²⁶ Constantine published it as the inspiration of God. In a letter to the "Catholic Church of the Alexandrians," announcing the decision of the council, he said: --

"That which has commended itself to the judgment of three hundred bishops can not be other than the doctrine of God, seeing that the Holy Spirit dwelling in the minds of so many dignified persons has effectually enlightened them respecting the divine will. Wherefore let no one vacillate or linger, but let all with alacrity return to the undoubted path of duty."27

46. Another, expressing the reviews of the Catholic Church in this same century, ascribes absolute and irresistible infallibility to the decisions of the council. He flatly declares that even if those who composed the council had been "idiots, yet, as being illuminated by God and the grace of His Holy Spirit, they were utterly unable to err from the truth." -- Socrates.28 And Athanasius declared: --

"The word of the Lord, which was given in the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, remaineth forever."29

47. Those who had formed the creed were exalted as the Fathers of Nicaea, and then to the creed was applied the scripture,

513

"Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set."30 From that time forth the words, "Stand by the landmark," were considered a sufficient watchword to put every Catholic on his guard against the danger of heresy. "From this period we may date the introduction of rigorous articles of belief, which required the submissive assent of the mind to every word and letter of an established creed, and which raised the slightest heresy of opinion into a more fatal offense against God, and a more odious crime in the estimation of man, than the worst moral delinquency or the most flagrant deviation from the spirit of Christianity." -- Milman.31

48. In the unanimity of opinion attained by the council, however, the idea of inspiration from any source other than Constantine, is a myth, and even that was a vanishing quantity; because a considerable number of those who subscribed to the creed did so against their honest convictions, and with the settled determination to secure a revision or a reversal just as soon as it could possibly be brought about; and to bring it about they would devote every waking moment of their lives.

49. Yet more than this, this theory proceeds upon the assumption that religious truth and doctrine are subject to the decision of the majority, than which nothing could possibly be further from the truth. Even though the decision of the Council of Nicaea had been absolutely, and from honest conviction spontaneously, unanimous, it never could rest with the slightest degree of obligation or authority upon any soul who had not arrived at the same conclusion from honest conviction derived from the free exercise of his own power of thought. There is no organization nor tribunal on earth that has any right to decide for anybody what is the truth upon any religious question. "The head of every man is Christ." "One is your Master, even Christ." "Who art thou that judgest another man's

servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."32

50. In the quest for truth every man is free to search, to believe,

514

and to decide, for himself alone. And his assent to any form of belief or doctrine, to be true, must spring from his own personal conviction that such is the truth. "The truth itself, forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power, becomes falsehood." --

Neander.³³ And he who suffers anything to be so forced upon him, utters a lie against himself and against God.

51. The realm of thought is the realm of God. Whosoever would attempt to restrict or coerce the free exercise of the thought of another, usurps the dominion of God, and exercises that of the devil. This is what Constantine did at the Council of Nice. This is what the majority of the Council of Nice itself did. In carrying out the purpose for which it was met, this is the only thing that it could do, no matter which side of the controversy should prove victorious. What Constantine and the Council of Nice did, was to open the way and set the wicked precedent for that despotism over thought which continued for more than fourteen hundred dreary years, and which was carried to such horrible lengths when the pope succeeded to the place of Constantine as head over both church and State.

52. To say that the Holy Spirit had any part whatever in the council, either in discussing or deciding the question, or in any other way, is but to argue that the Holy Spirit of God is but the subject and tool of the unholy passions of ambitious and wicked men.

1 [Page 495] Eusebius's Life of Constantine," book III, chaps, lxiv, lxv.

2 [Page 495] "Decline and Fall." chap xxi, par. 1.

3 [Page 496] "History of the Eastern Church," lec, III. par. 8.

4 [Page 496] Theodoret's Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. iv.

5 [Page 497] Id., chap. v.

6 [Page 497] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxi. par. 8.

7 [Page 498] Rev. 19:12, 13; Matt, 11:27; 1 Cor. 8:2; Rom, 11:33; Eph. 2:7; 1:17.

8 [Page 499] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. xxiii.

9 [Page 499] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv par. 5.

10 [Page 500] "History of the Eastern Church," lect. iii, par. 10.

11 [Page 502] Eusebius's "Life of Constantine," book ii, chaps. lxxv-lxxii.

12 [Page 503] Id., book iii, chap. viii.

13 [Page 504] "History of the Eastern Church." lect. iii. par. 22.

14 [Page 504] Id., lect. iv, pars. 2,3. It is but proper to remark that which has already become apparent, and which becomes more and more emphatic as the history proceeds, that the term "Christian," in such connection as it is here used by Stanley, is totally misapplied. This was not an assembly of the Christian church; it was not the Christian church that united with the State. This was an assembly of the Catholic Church; it was the Catholic Church that formed the union with the State. The history of "the church" is not the history of Christianity. The history of Christianity has not been written except by the rack, by sword, and by flame; in tears, in sufferings, and in blood, -- and in the books that shall be opened at the last day. Faithfulness to the authors quoted will require, in a few instances, the printing of this misapplication of the word "Christian." But the reader will need merely to note the connection, to see that the word is sadly misused; and this note will be the assurance in every such case that, though it is so printed, it is not endorsed in any such connection.

15 [Page 505] Id. par. 4.

16 [Page 506] Stanley, Id., par. 6.

17 [Page 507] Id., par. 9.

18 [Page 507] Id., par. 9.

19 [Page 509] Id., par. 22.

20 [Page 509] Id., par. 22.

21 [Page 510] Id., par. 28.

22 [Page 510] Id., par. 29.

23 [Page 511] Id., par. 34.

24 [Page 511] Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book i. chap. ix.

25 [Page 512] "History of the Eastern Church." lect. iv. par. 39.

26 [Page 512] Id., par. 41.

27 [Page 512] Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. ix.

28 [Page 512] Id.

29 [Page 512] Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," lect. iv. par. 41.

30 [Page 513] Id.

31 [Page 513] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 1.

32 [Page 513] 1 Cor. 11: 3; Matt. 23:8; Rom. 14:4, 12.

33 [Page 514] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii. sec. ii, part i, div. i, par. 1.

34. ROME -- ARIANISM BECOMES ORTHODOX.

AS already observed, those who against their will had subscribed to the creed of the Council of Nice were determined to redeem themselves as soon as possible, and by whatever means it could be accomplished. And they did accomplish it. The story is curious, and the lessons which it teaches are valuable.

2. Shortly after the dismissal of the Council of Nice, but in A. D. 326, Alexander died, and Athanasius succeeded to the episcopal seat of Alexandria. He, much more than Alexander, had been the life and soul of the controversy with Arius. It was he who had continually spurred on Alexander in the extreme and uncompromising attitude which he had maintained toward Arius. And now when, at the age of thirty years, he became clothed with the power and the prerogatives of the archbishopric of Alexandria, the controversy received a new impulse from both sides -- from the side of the Catholics, by the additional pride and intensity of dogmatism of Athanasius; from the side of the Arians, in a determination to humble the proud and haughty Athanasius. To this end the Arians at once began to apply themselves diligently to win over Constantine to their side, or at least to turn him against Athanasius.

3. In A. D. 327 died Constantine's sister, Constantia. She had held with the Arian party, having an Arian presbyter as her spiritual adviser. This presbyter had convinced her that Arius had been unjustly condemned by the council. In her dying moments "she entreated the emperor to reconsider the justice of the sentence against that innocent, as she declared, and misrepresented man." Constantine soon afterward sent a message to Arius, recalling him from banishment, and promising to send him back to Alexandria. Arius came and presented a confession of faith which proved satisfactory

516

to the emperor. About the same time Constantine also restored to favor the other two leading Arians, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Ptolemais. "They returned in triumph to their dioceses, and ejected the bishops who had been appointed to their place." -- Milman.¹ Hosius having returned to his place in Spain, Constantine fell under strong Arian influences, and the Arian bishops began to use him for the accomplishment of their purposes.

4. In A. D. 328 Constantine made a journey to Jerusalem to dedicate the church that he had built there, and Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis both accompanied him. Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch, was a Catholic. In their journey, Eusebius and Theognis passed through Antioch, and set on foot a scheme to displace him. When they returned, a council was hastily called, and upon charges of immorality and heresy, "Eustathius was deposed, and banished by the imperial edict, to Thrace. . . . The city was divided into two fierce and hostile factions. They were on the verge of a civil war; and Antioch, where the Christians had first formed themselves into a Christian community,

but for the vigorous interference of civil power and the timely appearance of an imperial commissioner, might have witnessed the first blood shed, at least in the East, in a Christian quarrel." -- Milman.²

5. Next the Arian prelates exerted their influence to have the emperor fulfil his promise of restoring Arius to his place in Alexandria. They tried first by friendly representations and petitions, and at last by threats, to induce Athanasius to admit Arius again to membership in the church; but he steadily refused. Then they secured from the emperor a command that Athanasius should receive Arius and all his friends who wished to be received, to the fellowship of the church of Alexandria, declaring that unless he did so, he should be deposed and exiled. Athanasius refused; and Constantine neither deposed him nor exiled him. Then the Arians invented against him many charges. Constantine summoned him to Nicomedia to answer. He came, and was fully acquitted; and the emperor sent him back with a letter to the church of Alexandria, in which he pronounced him a "man of God."

517

6. The Arians then brought new accusations against him, this time even to the extent of murder. A synod of bishops was appointed to meet at Tyre to investigate these charges. As the synod was wholly Arian, Athanasius declined to appear; but at the positive command of the emperor he came, and succeeded in clearing himself of all the charges that could be tried in the synod. But as there were certain other charges which required to be investigated in Egypt, a committee was appointed for the purpose. Yet it was decreed by the synod that no one who belonged to the party of Athanasius should be a member of the committee. The committee reported against Athanasius, as it was expected to do; and by the synod he was deposed from the archbishopric of Alexandria.

7. Athanasius appealed to the emperor, and went to Constantinople to present his plea. As Constantine rode along the street, he was met by a band of ecclesiastics, in the midst of which he recognized Athanasius. "The offended emperor, with a look of silent contempt, urged his horse onward," when Athanasius loudly exclaimed, "God shall judge between thee and me; since thou thus espousest the cause of my calumniators, I demand only that my enemies be summoned and my cause heard in the imperial presence." -- Milman.³ Constantine consented, and the Arian accusers were summoned to appear.

8. At the head of the accusers were both Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea, who were now in high favor with Constantine. When the investigation was opened, however, all the old charges were abandoned, and one entirely new was brought which was much more likely to have weight with the emperor than all the others put together. Constantinople, as well as Rome, was dependent upon Egypt for the wheat which supplied bread to its inhabitants. Athanasius was now accused of threatening to force Constantine to support him, by stopping the supplies of grain from the port of Alexandria. Whether Constantine really believed this charge or not, it accomplished its purpose. Athanasius was again condemned, and banished to Treves, in Gaul, February, A. D. 336.

9. The return of Arius to Alexandria was the cause of continued

518

tumult, and he was called to Constantinople. At the request of the emperor, Arius presented a new confession of faith, which proved satisfactory, and Constantine commanded the bishop of Constantinople to receive Arius to the fellowship of the church on a day of public worship -- "it happened to be a Sabbath (Saturday), on which day, as well as Sunday, public worship was held at Constantinople." -- Neander.⁴ The bishop absolutely refused to admit him.

10. The Arians, under the authority of the emperor, threatened that the next day, Sunday, they would force their way into the church, and compel the admission of Arius to full membership in good and regular standing. Upon this the Athanasian party took refuge in "prayer;" the bishop prayed earnestly that, rather than the church should be so disgraced, Arius might die; and naturally enough, Arius died on the evening of the same day.

11. "In Constantinople, where men were familiar with Asiatic crimes, there was more than a suspicion of poison. But when Alexander's party proclaimed that his prayer had been answered, they forgot what then that prayer must have been, and that the difference is little between praying for the death of a man and compassing it." -- Draper.⁵ The bishop of Constantinople conducted a solemn service of thanksgiving. "Athanasius, in a public epistle, alludes to the fate of Judas, which had befallen the traitor to the coequal dignity of the Son. His hollow charity ill disguises his secret triumph," and to Athanasius, ever afterward, the death of Arius was a standing argument and a sufficient evidence that in the death of the heretic, God had condemned the heresy. -- Milman.⁶

12. Petition after petition was presented to Constantine for the return of Athanasius to his place in Alexandria; but the emperor steadily denounced him as proud, turbulent, obstinate, and intractable, and refused all petitions. In 337, in the presence of death, Constantine was baptized by an Arian bishop; and thus closed the life of him upon whom a grateful church has bestowed the title of "the Great," though, "tested by character, indeed, he stands

519

among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet has in ancient or modern times been applied."⁷

13. Constantine was succeeded by his three sons, -- Constantine, aged twenty-one years; Constantius, aged twenty; and Constans, aged seventeen. They apportioned the empire among themselves. Constantine II had Constantinople and some portions of the West, with pre-eminence of rank; Constantius obtained Thrace, Egypt, and all the East; and

Constans held the greater part of the West. Constantius was a zealous Arian, Constantine and Constans were no less zealous Catholics.

14. The religious parties now had another element added to their strifes -- they could use the religious differences of the emperors in their own interests. Athanasius being an exile at Treves, was in the dominions of Constans, his "fiery defender;" while the place of his bishopric was in the dominions of Constantius, his fiery antagonist. The Athanasian party, through Constantine II, succeeded in persuading Constantius to allow the return of Athanasius and all the other bishops who had been banished.

15. The return of these bishops again set all the East ablaze. The leaders of the Arian party addressed letters to the emperors, denouncing Athanasius. They held another council at Tyre, A. D. 340, in which they brought against him new charges, and condemned him upon them all. Immediately afterward a rival council was held at Alexandria, which acquitted Athanasius of all things in which the other council had condemned him. In this same year Constantine II was killed in a war with his brother Constans. This left the empire and the religion to the two brothers -- Constantius in Constantinople and the East, Constans in the West.

16. In the dominions of Constans all Arians were heretics; in the dominions of Constantius all Catholics were heretics. The religious war continued, and increased in violence. In A. D. 341 another council, consisting of ninety bishops, was held at Antioch, in the presence of the emperor Constantius. This council adopted a new creed, from which the Homousion was omitted; they ratified the decrees of the Council of Tyre of the preceding year, in which

520

Athanasius was condemned; and they appointed in his place a bishop of their own party, named Gregory.

17. At the command of Constantius, the imperial prefect issued an edict announcing the degradation of Athanasius, and the appointment of Gregory. With an escort of five thousand heavy-armed soldiers, Gregory proceeded to Alexandria to take possession of his bishopric. It was evening when he arrived at the church at which Athanasius officiated, and the people were engaged in the evening service. The troops were posted in order of battle about the church; but Athanasius slipped out, and escaped to Rome, and Gregory was duly and officially installed in his place. The Athanasians, enraged at such proceedings, set the church afire; "scenes of savage conflict ensued, the churches were taken, as it were, by storm," and "every atrocity was perpetrated by unbridled multitudes, embittered by every shade of religious faction." -- Milman.⁸

18. Similar scenes were soon after enacted in Constantinople, A. D. 342. In 338 occurred the death of Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, who had prayed Arius to death. The Arians favored Macedonius, the Athanasians favored Paul, for the vacant bishopric. Paul succeeded. This was while Constantius was absent from the city; and as

soon as he returned, he removed Paul, and made Eusebius of Nicomedia bishop of Constantinople. Eusebius died in 342. The candidacy of Paul and Macedonius was at once revived. The partizans of Paul claimed that he, having been unjustly deposed, was lawful bishop by virtue of his previous ordination. The supporters of Macedonius claimed, of course, that Paul had been justly deposed, and that therefore a new election was in order. "The dispute spread from the church into the streets, from the clergy to the populace; blood was shed; the whole city was in arms on one part or the other." -- Milman.⁹

19. Constantius was in Antioch. As soon as he heard of the tumult in Constantinople, he ordered Hermogenes, commander of the cavalry in Thrace, to go with his troops to Constantinople and expel Paul. In the attempt to do so, Hermogenes was met by such

521

a desperate attack that his soldiers were scattered, and he was forced to take refuge in a house. The house was immediately set on fire. Hermogenes was seized and dragged by the feet through the streets of the city till he was torn to pieces, and then his mangled body was cast into the sea. As soon as this news reached Constantius, he went to Constantinople and expelled Paul, without confirming the election of Macedonius, and returned to Antioch.

20. Paul went to Rome and laid his case before Julius. The bishop of Rome, glad of the opportunity to exert the authority thus recognized in him, declared Paul reinstated; and sent him back with a letter to the bishops of the Eastern churches, rebuking those who had deposed him, and commanding his restoration. With this Paul returned to Constantinople and resumed his place. As soon as Constantius learned of it, he commanded Philip, the praetorian prefect, to drive out Paul again, and establish Macedonius in his place. The prefect, bearing in mind the fate of Hermogenes, did not attempt to execute his order openly; but, on pretense of public business, sent a respectful message to Paul requesting his assistance. Paul went alone, and as soon as he arrived, the prefect showed him the emperor's order, carried him out through the palace a back way, put him on board a vessel that was waiting, and sent him away to Thessalonica.

21. Paul was out of the way, but Macedonius was not yet in his place. This part of the program must now be carried out. The prefect in his chariot, surrounded by a strong body of guards with drawn swords, with Macedonius at his side in full pontifical dress, started from the palace to the church to perform the ceremony of consecration. By this time the rumor had spread throughout the city, and in a wild tumult both parties rushed to the church. "The soldiers were obliged to hew their way through the dense and resisting crowd to the altar," and over the dead bodies of three thousand one hundred and fifty people, "Macedonius passed to the episcopal throne of Constantinople." -- Milman.¹⁰

22. About the time that Athanasius reached Rome, when he fled

522

from the invasion of Gregory, three messengers from the council that had condemned him also arrived there. The bishop of Rome summoned the accusers of Athanasius to appear before a council which he would hold in Rome; but they disclaimed his jurisdiction, and denied his right to rejudge the cause of a bishop who had already been condemned by a council. Julius proceeded, however, with the council, which was composed of fifty bishops. They unanimously pronounced Athanasius innocent of all the charges laid against him, and declared his deposition unlawful. This, instead of settling the difficulty, rather increased it. Another council was held shortly afterward at Milan, in the presence of the emperor Constans, which confirmed the decision of the council at Rome, A. D. 343.

23. As the original council at Antioch had been held in the presence of Constantius, and as this one was now held in the presence of Constans, both divisions of the empire were now involved. The next step, therefore, was to call for a general council; accordingly, at the joint command of the two emperors, a general council was ordered, which met at Sardica, A. D. 345-6. The number of bishops was one hundred and seventy, ninety-six from the West, and seventy-four the East.

24. Among the bishops came Athanasius and some others who had been condemned in the East. The Eastern bishops, therefore, demanded that these should be excluded from the council; the Western bishops refused, upon which the Eastern bishops all withdrew, and met in rival council at Philippopolis. "In these two cities sat the rival councils, each asserting itself the genuine representative of Christendom, issuing decrees, and anathematizing their adversaries." -- Milman.¹¹

25. The bishops at Sardica complained that the Arians had inflicted upon them deeds of violence by armed soldiers, and by the populace with cudgels, had threatened to prosecute them before the magistrates, had forged letters against them, had stripped virgins naked, had burnt churches, and had imprisoned the servants of God.

26. Those assembled at Philippopolis retorted against Athanasius and his followers that with violence, slaughter, and war, they had

523

wasted the churches of the Alexandrians and had stirred up the pagans to commit upon them assaults and slaughter. They declared that the assembly at Sardica, from which they had seceded, was composed of a multitude of all kinds of wicked and corrupt men from Constantinople and Alexandria, who were guilty of murder, bloodshed, slaughter, highway robbery, pillaging, and despoiling, of breaking altars, burning churches, plundering the houses of private citizens, profaning the sacred mysteries, of betraying their solemn obligations to Christ, and of cruelly putting to death most learned elders, deacons, and priests of God.¹²

27. There is little doubt that the statements of both parties were correct.

28. The bishops who remained at Sardica had everything their own way. As they were all zealous supporters of Athanasius, they unanimously revoked the decision of the Council of Antioch, and confirmed the acts of the Council of Rome. Athanasius and three other bishops who had been deposed at the same time with him were pronounced innocent; and those who had been put in their places were declared deposed and accursed, and entirely cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church.

29. They also enacted a series of canons, of which three, "full of pure love," bestowed special dignity upon the bishop of Rome as the source of appeal. One of these ordered that "if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, his judges, in honor of the memory of the holy apostle Peter, -- sancti Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus, -- shall acquaint the bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment or order the cause to be re-examined by such of the neighboring bishops as he shall think fit to name." Another ordered "that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant till his cause shall be judged by the bishop of Rome." A third ordered "that if a bishop condemned in his own province shall choose to be judged by the bishop of Rome, and desires him to appoint some of his presbyters to judge him in his name, together with the bishops, the bishop of Rome may grant him his request."

524

-- Bower.¹³ The effect of this was only to multiply and intensify differences and disputes among bishops, and infinitely to magnify the power of the bishop of Rome.

30. Athanasius, though fully supported by the council, preferred to remain under the protection of Constans, rather than risk the displeasure of Constantius by returning to Alexandria. He remained two years in the West, during which time he was often the guest of the emperor Constans, and made such use of these opportunities that in A. D. 349 Constans "signified, by a concise and peremptory epistle to his brother Constantius, that unless he consented to the immediate restoration of Athanasius, he himself, with a fleet and army, would seat the archbishop on the throne of Alexandria." -- Gibbon.¹⁴ Constantius was just at this time threatened with war with Persia, and fearing the result if war should be made upon him at the same time by his brother, he yielded, and became as effusive in his professed friendship for Athanasius as he had formerly been in his genuine hatred.

31. Constantius invited Athanasius to Antioch, where the two secret enemies met with open profession of friendship, and even with manifestations of "mutual respect and cordiality." Constantius ordered all the accusations against Athanasius to be erased from the registers of the city; and with a letter of commendation, couched in terms of courtly flattery, he sent the archbishop on his way to Alexandria. "The Arian bishop, Gregory, was dead; and Athanasius, amid the universal joy, re-entered the city. The bishops crowded from all parts to salute and congratulate the prelate who had thus triumphed over

the malice of even imperial enemies. Incense curled up in all the streets; the city was brilliantly illuminated." -- Milman.¹⁵

32. In February, A. D. 350, Constans was murdered by the usurper Magnentius; and in 353 Constantius became sole emperor by the final defeat and death of the usurper. Constantius no sooner felt himself assured of the sole imperial authority, than he determined to execute vengeance upon Athanasius, and make the Arian doctrine

525

the religion of the whole empire. Yet he proposed to accomplish this only in orthodox fashion, through a general council. As it was thus that his father had established the Athanasian doctrine, which was held by all the Catholics to be strictly orthodox, to establish the Arian doctrine by a like process, assuredly could be no less orthodox.

33. The way was already open for the calling of a general council, by the disputes which had arisen over the standing of a Council of Sardica. That council, when it was called, was intended to be general; but when the Eastern bishops seceded, they, with all the other Arians in the empire, denied that those who remained could by any fair construction be termed a general council. More than this, when the Eastern bishops seceded, there were but ninety-four remaining at Sardica; whereas the Council of Antioch, whose acts the bishops at Sardica had condemned, was composed of ninety bishops, who acted with the direct approval of Constantius himself. Upon this it was argued that the Council of Sardica was no more entitled to the dignity of a general council than was that of Antioch. Further, Liberius, who became bishop of Rome May 22, A. D. 352, had already petitioned Constantius for a general council.

34. Constantius summoned the council to meet at Arles, A. D. 353. Liberius was not present in person, but he sent as his representatives two bishops in whom he reposed entire confidence. We know not how many bishops were in this council, but when they assembled, it was found that the Arian bishops were in the majority; and they insisted first of all upon the condemnation of Athanasius. The Catholic bishops argued the question of the faith ought to be discussed before they should be required to condemn him; but the Arians insisted upon their point.

35. Constantius came to the support of the Arians with an edict sentencing to banishment all who would not sign the condemnation of Athanasius. The representatives of Liberius proposed a compromise, to the effect that they would sign the condemnation of Athanasius, if the Arians would likewise condemn as heresy the doctrine of Arius. The Arians had them reduce this proposition to writing, that they might have it as a testimony afterward; and then, knowing the advantage which they held by this concession, and under the edict

526

of Constantius, they insisted more strenuously than ever upon the unconditional condemnation of Athanasius. Finding that there was no escape, the representatives of Liberius, and all the other Athanasian bishops but one, signed the document. The one bishop who refused was Paulinus of Treves. He was accordingly banished, and died in exile five years afterward.

36. Liberius refused to confirm the action of his representatives, and utterly rejected the action of the council. In fact, he was so scandalized by the disgraceful surrender of his legates, that in a letter to Hosius, he expressed himself as willing to wash out "with his blood the stain which the scandalous conduct of his legates had brought upon his character." -- Bower.¹⁶ To relieve him from his distress, Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, advised him to ask the emperor for another council, offering to go himself to Arles and present the request to Constantius. Liberius accepted the proposition, and Lucifer, accompanied by a presbyter and a deacon of the church of Rome, went to Constantius, and presented the letter of Liberius. Constantius granted his request, and appointed a council to meet at Milan, in the beginning of the year 355.

37. The council met, accordingly, to the number of more than three hundred bishops of the West, but only a few from the East. This council was but a repetition on a larger scale, of that at Arles. Constantius insisted, without any qualification, that the bishops should sign the condemnation of Athanasius. He took a personal interest in all the proceedings. Like his father at the Council of Nice, he had the meetings of the council held in the imperial palace, and presided over them himself.

38. Constantius not only demanded that the Catholic bishops should sign the condemnation of Athanasius, but that they should also sign an Arian formula of faith. They pleaded that the accusers of Athanasius were unreliable. Constantius replied, "I myself am now the accuser of Athanasius, and on my word, Valens and the others [the accusers] must be believed." They argued that this was against the canon of the church. Constantius replied, "My will is the canon," and appealed to the Eastern bishops, who all assented

527

that this was correct. He then declared that whoever did not sign might expect banishment. At this the orthodox bishops lifted up their hands beseechingly toward heaven, and prayed the emperor "to fear God, who had given him the dominion, that it might not be taken from him; also to fear the day of judgment, and not to confound the secular power with the law of the church, nor to introduce into the church the Arian heresy." -- Hefele.¹⁷

39. They forgot that they themselves, many of them at least, had unanimously approved in Constantine at the Council of Nice the identical course which now they condemned in Constantius at the Council of Milan. In their approval of the action of Constantine in forcing upon others what they themselves believed, they robbed themselves of the right to protest when Constantius or anybody else should choose to force upon them what

somebody else believed. They ought not to have thought it strange that they should reap what they had sown.

40. Constantius, yet further to imitate his father, claimed to have had a vision, and that thus by direct inspiration from heaven, he was commissioned "to restore peace to the afflicted church." At last, by the "inspiration" of "flatteries, persuasions, bribes, menaces, penalties, exiles" (Milman),¹⁸ the Council of Milan was brought to a greater unanimity of faith than even the Council of Nice had been. For there, out of the three hundred and eighteen bishops, five were banished; while here, out of a greater number, only five were banished. Surely if a general council is of any authority, the Council of Milan must take precedence of the Council of Nice, and Arianism be more orthodox than Athanasianism.

41. The banished ones were Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer, and two other representatives of Liberius -- Pancratius and Hilary. Hilary was cruelly beaten with rods before he was sent away.

42. The documents which had been signed, "all the other Western bishops, like their colleagues at Milan, were to be forced to sigh, and the whole West compelled to hold communion with the

528

Arians." -- Hefele.¹⁹ Liberius rejected the decisions of the council, and still defended Athanasius. Constantius sent one of his chief ministers with presents to bribe, and a letter to threaten, him. Liberius rejected the bribes and disregarded the threats; and in return cursed all Arian heretics, and excommunicated Constantius. The officer returned to Milan, and reported his failure; upon this the emperor sent peremptory orders to the prefect of Rome to arrest Liberius and bring him to Milan. The prefect, dreading the violence of the populace, took the precaution to arrest Liberius by night.

43. Arrived at Milan, the captive bishop was brought before Constantius, and there also he maintained his refusal to endorse the action of the council. Constantius told him that he must either sign or go into exile, and that he would give him three days to decide. Liberius answered that he had already decided, and that he should not change his mind in three days nor in three months; therefore the emperor might as well send him that minute to whatever place he wanted him to go to. Nevertheless, Constantius gave him the three days, but before they were past, sent for him again, hoping to persuade him to yield. Liberius stood fast, and the emperor pronounced sentence of banishment, and sent him to Berea, in Thrace. Before Liberius was gone out of the palace, the emperor sent him a present of five hundred pieces of gold, as he said, to pay his expenses. Liberius sent it back, saying he had better keep it to pay his soldiers. The empress also sent him a like sum; this he returned with the same answer, with the additional message to the emperor that, if he did not know what to do with so much money, he might give it to Epictetus or Auxentius, his two favorite Arian bishops.

44. As soon as it was known in Rome that Liberius was banished, the people assembled, and bound themselves by an oath not to acknowledge any other bishop as long as Liberius lived. The Arian party, however, were determined to have a bishop in Rome. They selected a deacon of that church, Felix by name, who was willing to be bishop of Rome. The clergy would not receive him,

529

and the people collected in mutinous crowds, and refused to allow the Arians to enter any of the churches. The imperial palace in Rome was chosen as the place of ordination. Three of the emperor's eunuchs were appointed to represent the people, and they duly elected Felix. Three bishops of the court were appointed to represent the clergy, and they ordained the new bishop. "The intrusion of Felix created a great sedition, in which many lost their lives." -- Bower.²⁰

45. Another bishop, whose endorsement of the creed of Milan was scarcely less important than that of Liberius himself, was Hosius of Cordova, who had been one of the chief factors in forming the union of church and State. He was one of the bishops who visited Constantine in Gaul in A. D. 311, and was one of Constantine's chief advisers afterward in all his course, until after the Council of Nice. It was upon his advice and motion, more than any other, that the Council of Nice was called; it was his influence more than any other that caused Constantine to command that "Homousion" should be inserted in the Nicene Creed. His name was the first that was set to the creed of Nice; his name likewise was the first that was set to the decrees of the Council of Sardica, over which he presided; and it was he who secured the adoption in that council of the canons which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal. He was now about one hundred years old.

46. Constantius determined to have the signature of Hosius to the decisions of the Council of Milan. The emperor summoned him to Milan, and when he came, entertained him for several days before suggesting his purpose. As soon as he did suggest it, however, Hosius declared that he was ready to suffer now under Constantius, as he had suffered sixty years before under his grandfather Maximian; and in the end made such an impression upon Constantius, that he allowed him to return unmolested to Cordova. But it was not long before the favorites of Constantius prevailed upon him to make another attempt to bring Hosius to terms. He first sent him flattering and persuasive letters; and when these failed, he proceeded to threats. But all were unavailing, and Hosius was banished

530

to Sirmium. His relations were stripped of all their estates and reduced to beggary, but all without avail. Next he was closely imprisoned -- still he refused. Then he was cruelly beaten, and finally put to the rack and most inhumanly tortured. Under these fearful torments, the aged bishop yielded, A. D. 356, and signed.

47. "The case of Hosius deserves, without all doubt, to be greatly pitied; but it would be still more worthy of our pity and compassion had he been himself an enemy to all persecution. But it must be observed that he was the author and promoter of the first Christian persecution; for it was he who first stirred up Constantine against the Donatists, many of whom were sent into exile, and some even sentenced to death; nay, and led to the place of execution." -- Bower.²¹ The surrender of Hosius was counted as the most signal of victories; it was published throughout the whole East, and caused the greatest rejoicing among the Arians everywhere.

48. The next step was for Constantius to remove Athanasius from the archbishopric of Alexandria. It was now twenty-six months from the close of the Council of Milan, during which time Constantius had been paving the way for his final expulsion. As soon as the council closed, an order was sent to the prefect of Alexandria to deprive Athanasius of the imperial revenue, and give it to the Arians. At the same time, all who held public office were commanded wholly to abandon the cause of Athanasius, and to communicate with the Arians only. Messengers were sent into the provinces bearing the emperor's authority, to compel the bishops to communicate with the Arians, or to go into exile. Now he sent two of his secretaries and some other officials of the palace to Alexandria, to banish Athanasius. These officers, with the governor of Egypt and the prefect, commanded Athanasius to leave the city. He demanded that they produce the written authority of the emperor; but Constantius had sent no written order. Athanasius, supported by the people, refused to obey any verbal order.

49. A truce was agreed upon, until an embassy could be sent to Constantius to bring a written command; but on the part of the officers, this truce was granted merely for the purpose of disarming the

531

vigilance of the supporters of Athanasius. The officers immediately began with the greatest possible secrecy to gather the necessary troops into the city. When twenty-three days had thus been spent, a force of five thousand troops held possession of the most important parts of the city.

50. The night before a solemn festival day of the church, Athanasius was conducting the services in the church of St. Theonas. Suddenly, at midnight, there was all about the church the sound of trumpets, the rushing of horses, and the clash of arms; the doors were burst open, and with the discharge of a cloud of arrows, the soldiers, with drawn swords, poured in to arrest Athanasius. "The cries of the wounded, the groans of those who were trampled down in attempting to force their way out through the soldiery, the shouts of the assailants, mingled in wild and melancholy uproar." -- Milman.²²

51. In the tumult, Athanasius again escaped. "Counts, prefects, tribunes, whole armies, were successively employed to pursue a bishop and a fugitive; the vigilance of the civil and military powers was excited by the imperial edicts; liberal rewards were promised to the man who should produce Athanasius either alive or dead; and the most severe

penalties were denounced against those who should dare to protect the public enemy." -- Gibbon.²³ Yet Athanasius succeeded in so perfectly concealing himself for more than six years, that Constantius died without ever finding him.

52. Athanasius was gone. The next thing was to install an Arian bishop in his place. Their choice fell on George of Cappadocia, who was more savage and cruel than Gregory, the Arian bishop who had been appointed to this place before. George's original occupation was that of "a parasite," by which means he secured the contract for supplying the army with bacon. "His employment was mean; he rendered it infamous. He accumulated wealth by the basest arts of fraud and corruption," which finally became so notorious that he had to flee from justice. The Arian bishop of Antioch made him a priest and a church-member at the same time.

532

53. Surrounded by armed troops, George was now placed on the episcopal throne, "and during at least four months, Alexandria was exposed to the insults of a licentious army, stimulated by the ecclesiastics of a hostile faction." Every kind of violence was committed. "And the same scenes of violence and scandal which had been exhibited in the capital, were repeated in more than ninety episcopal cities of Egypt. The entrance of the new archbishop was that of a barbarian conqueror; and each moment of his reign was polluted by cruelty and avarice." -- Gibbon.²⁴

54. In A. D. 357 Constantius visited Rome and celebrated a triumph. The leading women of the church determined to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered to present a petition for the recall of Liberius. They first tried to press their husbands into the service of approaching the emperor, by threatening to leave and go in a body to Liberius, and share his exile. The husbands replied that the emperor would be much less likely to be offended by the visit of a delegation of women than of men, and that thus there would be more hope of really securing the recall of the banished bishop.

55. The women agreed that the suggestion was a wise one, and "having adorned themselves in the most splendid attire, that their rank might be evident from their appearance" (Theodoret²⁵), they proceeded to the imperial palace. Constantius received them courteously. They earnestly pleaded with him to take pity on that great city and its numerous flock "bereft of its shepherd, and ravaged by wolves." The emperor replied, "I thought you had a pastor. Is not Felix as capable of exercising the pastoral office as any other?" The women answered that Felix was detested and avoided by all, and that none would attend service so long as Liberius was absent. Constantius smiled, and said, "If so, you must have Liberius again; I shall without delay despatch the proper orders for his return."

533

56. The next day the edict of recall was read in the circus; but it provided that the two new bishops should rule jointly. It happened to be the most interesting and decisive

moment of a horse-race; but the excited feelings of the multitude were turned in an instant to the more absorbing question of the orthodox faith. Some cried in ridicule that the edict was just, because there were two factions in the circus, and now each one could have its own bishop. Others shouted, "What, because we have two factions in the circus, are we to have two factions in the church?" Then the whole multitude set up one universal yell, "There is but one God, one Christ, one bishop!" Upon which Theodoret devoutly remarks, "Some time after this Christian people had uttered these pious and just acclamations, the holy Liberius returned, and Felix retired to another city."²⁶

57. It is true that Liberius returned soon after this, but Constantius had made it the condition of his return that he should sign the decisions of the Council of Milan. Two years' sojourn in cold and barbarous Thrace, while a rival bishop was enjoying the splendors of the episcopal office in Rome, exerted a strong tendency to convince Liberius that Athanasius was rightly condemned, and that the Arian doctrine might be true. He therefore signed both the condemnation of Athanasius and the Arian creed of Milan.

58. Upon this concession Constantius called Liberius to Sirmium. But as in the meantime the emperor had changed his views and adopted the Semi-Arian doctrine, he would not allow Liberius to return to Rome unless he would first subscribe to the same. Liberius signed this also, and was allowed to go on his way to Rome. The people poured out through the gates to meet him, and escorted him in triumph to the episcopal palace, Aug. 2, 358. "The adherents of Felix were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of a Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacres of Marius and the proscriptions of Sylla." -- Gibbon.²⁷ Felix escaped, but returned and attempted to hold services in a church beyond the Tiber; but was again driven out.

534

59. As stated above, Constantius had again changed his opinion as to the nature of Christ, adopting the Semi-Arian view. The Semi-Arian party was a third one that had grown up between the strictly Arian and the Athanasian, based upon a third mental abstraction as elusive as either of the others. The three doctrines now stood thus: --

The Athanasians declared the Son of God to be of the same substance, the same existence, and the same essence, with the Father.

The strict Arians declared the Son to be like the Father, but rather by grace than by nature, -- as like as a creature could be to the Creator.

The Semi-Arians declared the Son to be like the Father in nature, in existence, in essence, in substance, and in everything else.

60. The Athanasian doctrine was expressed in Homoousion; the strict Arian in Anomean; and the Semi-Arian in Homoiousion. It will be seen that the Semi-Arian was nearer to the original doctrine of Arius than was the Arian of the present period. This was

owing to the followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who, in the bitterness of their opposition to the Athanasians, were carried away from the original Arian doctrine -- from the Homoiousion to the Anomean.

61. The Homoousion was the doctrine of the Council of Nice; the Anomean was the doctrine of the Council of Milan; the Homoiousion was the doctrine now held by Constantius, and a company that actually outnumbered the Arians.

62. In furtherance of his "visionary" commission to give peace to the church, Constantius determined to call a general council, and have the Semi-Arian doctrine adopted. The council was first appointed to meet at Nicomedia, A. D. 358, but while the bishops were on the way there, an earthquake destroyed that city. The appointment was then changed to Nice in early summer, 359. But before that time arrived, he decided to have two councils instead of one, that all might more easily attend. The bishops of the East were to meet at Seleucia, in Isauria; those of the West at Rimini on the Adriatic Sea in Italy.

63. The emperor issued an order commanding all bishops without exception to attend one or the other, as they might choose; and

535

the civil officers in the provinces were commissioned to see that the command was obeyed. "The bishops therefore set out from all parts; the public carriages, roads, and houses were everywhere crowded with them, which gave great offense to the catechumens, and no small diversion to the pagans, who thought it equally strange and ridiculous that men who had been brought up from their infancy in the Christian religion, and whose business it was to instruct others in that belief, should be constantly hurrying in their old age, from one place to another, to know what they themselves should believe." -- Bower.²⁸ To make sure that the two councils should act as one, it was ordered that each should appoint two deputies to report to the emperor the decisions arrived at, "that he might himself know whether they had come to an understanding in accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and might decide according to his own judgment what was best to be done."²⁹

64. In the summer of A. D. 359, more than four hundred bishops assembled at Rimini, of whom eighty were Arians. One hundred and sixty assembled at Seleucia, of whom one hundred and five were Semi-Arians; about forty were Arians, while the Catholics were still fewer in number. A civil officer of high rank was appointed to represent the emperor at each council. The one appointed to Rimini was directed not to allow any bishop to go home until all "had come to one mind concerning the faith."

65. That there might be as little difficulty as possible in coming to one mind, a creed was drawn up and sent to the council to be signed. There were at that time present with the emperor at Sirmium five bishops, one of whom was George of Alexandria, and all of

whom were Arians or Semi-Arians. They drew up a creed, the main points of which were as follows: --

"We believe in one only and true God, the Father and Ruler of all, Creator and Demiurge of all things, and in one only begotten Son of God, who was begotten of the Father without change before all ages, and all beginning, and all conceivable time, and all comprehensible substance. . . . God from God, similar to the Father, who has begotten Him according to the Holy Scriptures, whose generation no one knows [understands]

536

but the Father who has begotten Him. . . . The word ousia, because it was used by the Fathers in simplicity [that is, with good intention], but not being understood by the people, occasions scandal, and is not contained in the Scriptures, shall be put aside, and in future no mention shall be made of the Usia with regard to God. . . . But we maintain that the Son is similar to the Father in all things, as also the Holy Scriptures teach and say."³⁰

66. The emperor sent a letter to each council, commanding that the bishops should settle the question of the faith before they should have anything to do with an investigation of any of their own private differences. The council at Rimini was already in session, and was earnestly discussing the faith, when the bishops arrived from Sirmium with the above creed, which they read aloud to the assembly, and "declared that it was already confirmed by the emperor, and was now to be universally accepted, without discussion as to the sense which individuals might attach to its words."

67. To this all the Arians in the council readily agreed, but the Catholics, with loud voices, proclaimed their dissent. They declared that any new formula of faith was wholly unnecessary; that the Council of Nice had done all that was necessary in regard to the faith; and that the business of the council was not to find out what was the true faith, but to put to confusion all its opponents. They demanded that the bishops who brought this creed should with them unanimously curse all heresies, and especially the Arian.

68. This demand was refused by the Arians. Then the Catholics took everything into their own hands. They unanimously approved the Nicene Creed, especially the Homousion; and then declared heretical the creed which had come from the emperor. They next took up the doctrine of Arianism, and pronounced a curse upon each particular point; denounced by name the bishops who had come from the emperor, as "ignorant and deceitful men, impostors, and heretics; and declared them deposed." Finally, they unanimously pronounced a curse upon all heresies in general, and that of Arius in particular.

69. All this they put in writing; every one of them signed it July 21, A. D. 359, and sent it by the ten deputies to the emperor,

537

accompanied by a request that he would allow them to return to their churches. At the same time the Arians of the council also sent ten deputies to Constantius, who reached the emperor before the others, and made their report. When the others arrived, Constantius refused even to see them so much as to receive their report; but sent an officer to receive it, and under the pretext of being overwhelmed with public business, kept them waiting. After waiting long they were sent to Adrianople to await the emperor's pleasure; and at the same time he sent a letter to the bishops at Rimini, commanding them to await there the return of their deputies.

70. Shortly afterward the deputies were ordered to go to a small town called Nice, not many miles from Adrianople. This was a trick of the Arians and Semi-Arians, by which they proposed to have their creed signed there, and then pass it off upon the uninitiated as the original creed of the Council of Nice in Bithynia. There the creed was presented, but with the omission "in all things," so that it read, "the Son is like to the Father," instead of, "like to the Father in all things." This the deputies were required to sign, which of course they refused to do; but they were finally forced to sign it, and to reverse all the acts and proceedings of the Council of Rimini.

71. The emperor was highly pleased at this result, and calling it a good omen of like success with the whole council, gave the ten deputies leave to return to Rimini. At the same time he sent letters to the prefect, commanding him anew not to allow a single bishop to leave until all had signed; and to exile whoever should persist in a refusal, provided the number did not exceed fifteen.

72. The bishops were "eager to return to their sees; the emperor was inflexible; Taurus took care to render the place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their example, the rest began to waver, and being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the Arian party in such crowds that in a very short time the number of the orthodox bishops who continued steady, was reduced to twenty." -- Bower.³¹

538

73. At the head of these twenty was a certain Phaebadius, and they determined invincibly to hold their position. Nevertheless they were caught by a trick that the veriest tyro ought to have seen. Two bishops in particular, Ursacius and Valens, had charge of the creed; and they pretended in the interests of peace to be willing to make a concession, and to insert such alterations and additions as might be agreeable to Phaebadius, who exulted over the proud distinction which would thus be his as the guardian and preserver of orthodoxy.

74. They came together, and began to reconstruct the creed: first were inserted some curses against the Arian heresy, then an addition, declaring the Son to be "equal to the Father, without beginning, and before all things." When this was written, Valens proposed that in order to leave no room whatever for any new disputes or any question

upon this point, there should be added a clause declaring that "the Son of God is not a creature like other creatures." To this the twenty bishops assented, blindly overlooking the fact that in admitting that the Son was not a creature like other creatures, they did indeed place him among the creatures, and admitted the very point upon which the Arians had all the time insisted. Thus all were brought to "the unity of the faith." The council broke up, and the bishops departed to their homes.

75. The council was past, and no sooner did the Arians find themselves secure, than they loudly proclaimed the victory which they had gained. They gloried in the fact that the great council of Rimini had not declared that the Son was not a creature; but only that he was not like other creatures. They affirmed that it was, and always had been, their opinion that the "Son was no more like the Father than a piece of glass was like an emerald." Upon examination of the creed, the twenty bishops were obliged to confess that they had been entrapped. They renounced the creed, and publicly retracted "all they had said, done, or signed, repugnant to the truths of the Catholic Church." -- Bower.³²

76. The companion council which was called at Seleucia, met Sept. 27, 359, but as there were three distinct parties, besides

539

individuals who differed from all, there was among them such utter confusion, tumult, and bitterness, that after four days of angry debate, in which the prospect became worse and worse, the imperial officer declared that he would have nothing more to do with the council, and told them they could go to the church if they wanted to, and "indulge in this vain babbling there as much as they pleased." The parties then met separately, denounced, condemned, and excommunicated one another, and sent their deputies to Constantius, who spent a whole day and the greater part of the night, Dec. 31, 359, in securing their signatures to the confession of faith which he had approved.

77. The emperor's confession was then published throughout the whole empire, and all bishops were commanded to sign it, under penalty of exile upon all who refused. "This order was executed with the utmost rigor in all the provinces of the empire, and very few were found who did not sign with their hands what they condemned in their hearts. Many who till then had been thought invincible were overcome, and complied with the times: and such as did not, were driven without distinction from their sees into exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that confession being a qualification indispensably requisite both in obtaining and keeping the episcopal dignity. Thus were all the sees throughout the empire filled with Arians, insomuch that in the whole East not an orthodox bishop was left, and in the West but one; namely, Gregory, bishop of Elvira, in Andalusia, and he, in all likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his flock and lie concealed." -- Bower.³³

78. Thus Constantius had succeeded much more fully than had his father in establishing "the unity of the faith." That faith was the original Arian. Arianism was now as entirely

orthodox, and, if the accommodated sense of the word be used, as entirely Catholic, as Athanasianism had ever been.

79. Having, like his father, by the aid of the bishops, united the world "under one head," and brought the opinions respecting the Deity to a condition of "settled uniformity," the emperor Constantius died the following year, A. D. 361.

1 [Page 516] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 21.

2 [Page 516] Id., par. 23.

3 [Page 517] Id., par. 29.

4 [Page 518] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iv, div. ii, A, par. 30.

5 [Page 518] "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. ix, par. 39.

6 [Page 518] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 32. and note.

7 [Page 519] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Constantine.

8 [Page 520] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. v, par. 9.

9 [Page 520] Id., par. 11.

10 [Page 521] Id., par. 18; Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book chap. xvi; Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxi, par. 36.

11 [Page 522] Id., par. 14.

12 [Page 523] See the original, in Milman's "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. v. note to par. 34.

13 [Page 524] "History of the Popes," Julius, par. 5; and Hefele's "History of the Councils," Sardica, canons 3, 4, 5.

14 [Page 524] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxi, par. 26.

15 [Page 524] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. v, par. 15.

16 [Page 526] "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 4.

17 [Page 527] "History of the Church Councils," sec. lxxiv, par. 6.

- 18 [Page 527] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. v, par. 22.
- 19 [Page 528] "History of the Church Councils," sec. lxxv, par. 1.
- 20 [Page 529] "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 6.
- 21 [Page 530] Id., par. 19.
- 22 [Page 531] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. v, par. 28.
- 23 [Page 531] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxi, par. 33.
- 24 [Page 532] Id., chap. xxi, par. 31, and chap xxiii, par. 27. Nov. 30, A. D. 361, he was murdered by the pagans. In the fifth century (A. D. 404) Pope Gelasius made him a martyr. In the sixth century he was worshiped as a Catholic saint; and since the Crusades, he has been "the renowned Saint George of England, patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the Garter."
- 25 [Page 532] "Ecclesiastical History," book ii, chap. xvii.
- 26 [Page 533] Id., and Bower's "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 7.
- 27 [Page 533] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxi, par. 35.
- 28 [Page 535] "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 21.
- 29 [Page 535] Hefele's History of the Church Councils," sec. lxxxii, par. 1.
- 30 [Page 536] Id., par. 2.
- 31 [Page 537] "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 24.
- 32 [Page 538] Id., pars. 24, 25.
- 33 [Page 539] Id., par. 28.

35. ROME -- THE CATHOLIC FAITH RE-ESTABLISHED.

THE emperor Constantius was succeeded by Julian, who restored paganism as the religion of the emperor and the empire, and exerted his influence, though not his power, in favor of its restoration as the religion of the people.

2. Julian refused to take any part whatever in the strifes of the church parties, "saying that as he was not so well acquainted with the nature of their disputes as a just and impartial judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuse him, lest he should be guilty of some injustice." -- Bower.¹ He therefore directed them to settle their differences among themselves. To this end he issued an edict of toleration to all classes of Christians, and recalled from banishment all the bishops and clergy who had been banished by Constantius.

3. Thus there was restored to the afflicted empire a condition of peace and quietness such as had not been for fifty years. And because of his refusal to allow himself and his authority to be made the tool of the riotous and bigoted church parties -- to this more than to any other one thing, is to be attributed the spiteful epithet of "the apostate," which ever since has been affixed to his name. Pagan though he was, if he had, like Constantine, assumed the hypocritical mask, and had played into the hands of the dominant church party, there is no room for doubt that he would, like Constantine, have been an orthodox emperor, with the title of "the Great."

4. Under the circumstances, it would be almost surprising if Julian had been anything else than what he was. His own father, an uncle, and seven of his cousins, were the victims of a murder instigated by the dying Constantine and faithfully carried out by

541

Constantius. Julian himself, though only six years of age, by the care of some friends barely escaped the same fate. Constantius was his cousin, and, as emperor, assumed the place of his guardian. "His place of education had been a prison, and his subsequent liberty was watched with suspicious vigilance." -- Milman.² He had seen the streets of the chief cities of the empire run with blood, in the savage strifes of church parties. Over the bodies of slaughtered people he had seen bishops placed upon thrones of episcopal ambition. Such impressions forced upon his young mind, confirmed by more than twenty years' observation of the violent and unchristian lives of Constantius, and hundreds of ecclesiastics, and multitudes of the populace, all professing to be living depositaries of the Christian faith, -- all this was not the best calculated to convince him of the virtues of the imperial religion.

5. It is indeed charged that in issuing the edict of toleration, and the recall of the exiled ecclesiastics, Julian's motive was to vent his spite against Christianity, by having the church parties destroy one another in their contentions. Even if this is true, if he was to be guided by the experience and observations of his whole life, he is hardly to be blamed for

thinking that there was some prospect of such a result. No such result followed, however, because when the prospect of imperial favor and patronage and power was gone, the church parties had nothing to contend for; because "party passions among the Christians would, undoubtedly, never have risen to so high a pitch, had it not been for the interference of the State. As this disturbing and circumscribing influence of a foreign power now fell away of itself, and the church was left to follow out naturally its own development from within itself, the right relations were everywhere more easily restored." -- Neander.³

6. Julian died June 26, A. D. 363, beyond the river Tigris, of a wound received in a war with Persia, after a reign of one year, eight months, and twenty-three days. Upon his death, the army in the field elected Jovian emperor, and returned to Antioch. The emperor was no sooner arrived at Antioch than the ecclesiastical

542

commotion was again renewed. The leaders of the church parties endeavored to outdo one another in their eager haste to secure his support; "for the heads of each party assiduously paid their court to the emperor, with a view of obtaining not only protection for themselves, but also power against their opponents." -- Socrates. ⁴

7. Among the first of these came the party of Macedonius of Constantinople, with a petition that the emperor would expel all the Arians from their churches, and allow them to take their places. To this petition Jovian replied, "I abominate contentiousness; but I love and honor those who exert themselves to promote unanimity." This somewhat checked the factious zeal. Another attempt was made, but Jovian declared "that he would not molest any one on account of his religious sentiments, and that he should love and highly esteem such as would zealously promote the unity of the church." A pagan philosopher in an oration in honor of the emperor, rebuked these parties with the observation that such persons worshiped the purple and not the Deity, and resembled the uncertain waves of the sea, sometimes rolling in one direction and again in the very opposite way; and praised the emperor for his liberality in permitting every one freely to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.⁵

8. Jovian, though guaranteeing a general toleration, himself professed the Nicene Creed, and a particular preference for Athanasius, who at his invitation visited Antioch, and after having settled the faith of the emperor, and promised him "a long and peaceful reign," returned to his episcopal seat at Alexandria. The long and peaceful reign assured by the zealous ecclesiastic continued only about two months from this time, and ended in the death of Jovian, Feb. 17, A. D. 364, after a total reign of seven months and twenty-one days from the death of Julian.

9. Ten days after the death of Jovian, Valentinian was chosen emperor; and thirty days after this, he bestowed upon his brother Valens an equal share in the imperial dignity. Valens assumed the jurisdiction of the whole East, with his capital at Constantinople. Valentinian retained the dominion of the West, with his capital at

Milan. Both of these emperors pursued the tolerant policy of Jovian, so far as paganism and the church parties were concerned; but they let loose a cruel persecution upon the profession of "magic."

10. The practise of magic was made treason, and under the accusations of sorcery and witchcraft, an infinite number and variety of individual spites and animosities were let loose, and it seemed as though the horrors of the days of Tiberius and Domitian were returned. Rome and Antioch were the two chief seats of the tribunals of this persecution, and "from the extremities of Italy and Asia, the young and the aged were dragged in chains to the tribunals of Rome and Antioch. Senators, matrons, and philosophers expired in ignominious and cruel tortures. The soldiers who were appointed to guard the prisons declared, with a murmur of pity and indignation, that their numbers were insufficient to oppose the flight or resistance of the multitude of captives. The wealthiest families were ruined by fines and confiscations; the most innocent citizens trembled for their safety." -- Gibbon.⁶

11. In 370 Valens cast his influence decidedly in favor of the Arian faith, by receiving baptism at the hands of the Arian bishop of Constantinople. The tumults of the religious parties again began, and "every episcopal vacancy was the occasion of a popular tumult, . . . as the leaders both of the Homoousians and of the Arians believed that if they were not suffered to reign, they were most cruelly injured and oppressed. . . . In every contest, the Catholics were obliged to pay the penalty of their own faults, and of those of their adversaries. In every election, the claims of the Arian candidate obtained the preference, and if they were opposed by the majority of the people, he was usually supported by the authority of the civil magistrate, or even by the terrors of a military force." -- Gibbon.⁷

12. In 373 Athanasius died, and the emperor Valens commanded the prefect of Egypt to install in the vacant bishopric an Arian prelate by the name of Lucius, which was done; but not without the accompaniment of riot and bloodshed, which was now hardly more

than a part of the regular ceremony of induction into office in the principal bishoprics of the empire.

13. In the West, after the death of Constantius, the bishops returned to the faith established by the Council of Nice, which so largely prevailed there that the differences springing from the Arian side caused no material difficulty. As before stated, Valentinian suffered all religious parties, even the pagan, to continue unmolested; yet he himself was always a Catholic. About the year 367 he greatly increased the dignity and authority of the bishop of Rome by publishing a law empowering him to examine, and sit as judge upon, the cases of other bishops. In 375 Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, Gratian, aged sixteen years, and Valentinian II, aged four years.

14. Gratian was but the tool of the bishops. Ambrose was at that time bishop of Milan, and never was episcopal ambition more arrogantly asserted than in that insolent prelate. Soon the mind of the bishop asserted the supremacy over that of the boy emperor, and Ambrose "wielded at his will the weak and irresolute Gratian." -- Milman.⁸ But above all things else that Gratian did, that which redounded most to the glory of the Catholic Church was his choice of Theodosius as associate emperor. Valens was killed in a battle with the Goths, A. D. 378. A stronger hand than that of a youth of nineteen was required to hold the reins of government in the East.

15. In the establishment of the Catholic Church, the place of Theodosius is second only to that of Constantine. About the beginning of A. D. 380 he was baptized by the Catholic bishop of Thessalonica, and immediately afterward he issued the following edict: --

"It is our pleasure that the nations which are governed by our clemency and moderation, should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition has preserved, and which is now professed by the pontiff Damasus, and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. According to the discipline of the apostles, and the doctrine of the gospel, let us believe the sole deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, under an equal majesty, and a pious Trinity. We authorize the followers of this doctrine to assume the title of Catholic Christians, and as we judge that all others are

545

extravagant madmen, we brand them with the infamous name of "heretics," and declare that their conventicles shall no longer usurp the respectable appellation of churches. Besides the condemnation of divine justice, they must expect to suffer the severe penalties which our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to inflict upon them."⁹ 16. This law was issued in the names of the three emperors, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius. "Thus the religion of the whole Roman world was enacted by two feeble boys and a rude Spanish soldier." -- Milman.¹⁰

17. In Constantinople the Catholics were so few that at the accession of Theodosius they had no regular place of meeting, nor had they any pastor. No sooner was the new emperor proclaimed, however, than they called to their aid Gregory, bishop and native of Nazianzum, and hence called Gregory Nazianzen. A room in a private house was fitted up as the place of meeting, and Gregory began his ministry in the imperial city. The quarrel between the religious parties again broke out into open riot. A great crowd, led on by monks and women, with clubs, stones, and firebrands, attacked the meeting-place of the Catholics, broke down the doors, and ravaged the place inside and outside. Blood was shed, lives were lost, and Gregory was accused before the magistrate; but upon the strength of the imperial edict establishing the Catholic religion, he secured his acquittal.

18. And now the contentions began among the Catholics themselves. The occasion of it was this: As soon as Constantine had become sole emperor by the murder of Licinius, he

proceeded to complete the organization of the government of the empire which had been planned, and in a manner begun, by Diocletian. He divided the empire into prefectures, dioceses, and provinces. Of the provinces there were one hundred and sixteen; of the dioceses, thirteen; of the prefectures, four.

19. The heads of the prefectures were entitled prefects. The heads of the dioceses were entitled vicars, or vice-prefects. The heads of the provinces were designated by different titles, of which the term "governor" will be sufficiently exact.

546

20. The governors were subject to the jurisdiction of the vicars, or vice-prefects; the vicars, or vice-prefects, were subject to the jurisdiction of the prefects; and the prefects were subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the emperor himself.

21. Now when the church and State became one, the organization of the church was made to conform as precisely as possible to that of the empire. In fact, so far as the provinces and the dioceses, the organization of the church was identical with that of the empire. There was a gradation in the order and dignity of the bishoprics according to the political divisions thus formed.

22. The dignity of the chief bishop in a province or diocese was regulated by the chief city. The bishop of the chief city in a province was the principal bishop of that province, and all the other bishops in the province were subject to his jurisdiction; to him pertained the ordination to vacant bishoprics and all other matters. The bishop of the principal city in the diocese was chief bishop of that diocese, and all other bishops within said diocese were subject to his jurisdiction.

23. The chief bishop of the province was called "metropolitan," from the metropolis or chief city, or "primate" from primus, first. The chief bishop of a diocese was called "exarch." Above these were four bishops corresponding to the four prefects, and were called "patriarchs." These patriarchs, however, were not apportioned according to the lines of the prefectures; but were bishops of the four chief cities of the empire, -- Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.

24. This was the general plan of the organization of the church, though through the mutual ambitions and jealousies of the whole hierarchy there were many exceptions; and as time went on, titles and jurisdictions overran the limits defined in this general plan.

25. The bishopric of Alexandria had always been held as second only to that of Rome in dignity, since Alexandria was the second city of the empire. Constantinople was now an imperial city, and its bishopric was fast assuming an importance which rivaled that of Alexandria for second place. To this the archbishop of Alexandria did not propose to assent. That Peter, bishop of Alexandria, whom

547

the edict of Theodosius had advertised and endorsed as a man of apostolic holiness, asserted his episcopal jurisdiction over Constantinople. He sent up seven Alexandrians, who ordained a certain Maximus to be bishop of Constantinople. A tumult was raised, and Maximus was driven out by the party of Gregory. He fled to Theodosius, but his claim was rejected by the emperor also.

26. Theodosius soon came to Constantinople, and immediately on his arrival, summoned to his palace Damophilus, the Arian bishop of the city, and commanded him to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, or else surrender to the Catholics the episcopal palace, the cathedral, and all the churches of the city, which amounted to fully a hundred. Damophilus refused, and Nov. 24, A. D. 380, an edict was issued expelling all the Arians from all their houses of worship, and forfeiting the same to the Catholics, who in fact were barely able to fill the single house of worship which they already owned.

27. Damophilus was exiled, and Gregory, accompanied by the emperor and surrounded by armed troops, was conducted to the cathedral, which was already occupied by a body of imperial guards, where he was regularly installed in the office of bishop of Constantinople. "He beheld the innumerable multitude of either sex and of every age, who crowded the streets, the windows, and the roofs of the houses; he heard the tumultuous voice of rage, grief, astonishment, and despair; and Gregory fairly confesses that on the memorable day of his installation, the capital of the East wore the appearance of a city taken by storm, in the hands of a barbarian conqueror." -- Gibbon.¹¹

28. At the beginning of the year 381, Theodosius issued an edict expelling from all the churches within his dominions, all the bishops and other ecclesiastics who should refuse to subscribe to the creed of Nice. By a commissioned officer with a military force, the edict was executed in all the provinces of the East. Having thus established his religion throughout the empire, the next thing to do was to have a general council endorse his action, compose the disputes which disturbed the Catholic party itself, and again "settle" the

548

faith of the Catholic Church. To this end a general council was called to meet at Constantinople this same year, A. D. 381.

29. The council met in the month of May, and was composed of one hundred and eighty-six bishops -- one hundred and fifty Catholics and thirty-six Macedonians. The first question considered was the disputed bishopric of Constantinople. For that Maximus who had been ordained at the direction of Peter of Alexandria, though disallowed by the emperor, still claimed to be the regular bishop of Constantinople, and exercised the office by ordaining other bishops. The council, however, adjudged his ordination to be irregular; declared that he was not, and had never been, a bishop; and that therefore all the ordinations performed by him were null and void. The appointment of Gregory Nazianzen was then confirmed, by regular services of installation.

30. The next question that was considered by the council was of the same nature as the foregoing, but one of much more far-reaching consequences, as it involved both the East and the West. Just fifty years before (A. D. 331) Eustathius, the Catholic bishop of Antioch, had been displaced by an Arian, who was received by the greater part of the Catholics as well as the Arians; but a small party still adhered to the cause of Eustathius, and declared that they would acknowledge no other bishop, and have no fellowship with any of the others, as long as he lived. From this they acquired the name of Eustathians. Thirty years afterward (A. D. 360) the see of Antioch became vacant by the translation of its bishop to that of Constantinople, and the two parties agreed upon a certain Meletius to fill the vacant bishopric. No sooner had he been installed, than he openly declared for the Homoousion, and excommunicated "as rotten and incurable members," all who held the contrary doctrine. The bishops round about pleaded with him to conduct his office in the spirit in which he had been elected to it, instead of making matters worse by his extreme position.

31. It was all of no avail. He declared that "nothing should, and nothing could, make him desist from, or relent in, the work he had undertaken, till he had utterly extirpated the Arian heresy, without leaving the least shoot of so poisonous a weed in the field

549

which by divine appointment he was to guard and cultivate." -- Bower.¹² The Arians then applied to Constantius, and had Meletius banished thirty days after his installation.

32. The partizans of Meletius then separated entirely from the Arians, and clung so tenaciously to this course that they acquired the name of Meletians. This created a third party, because the Eustathians refused to have anything at all to do with either the Meletians or the Arians, -- with the Arians because they were Arians; with the Meletians because they had communicated with the Arians, and because they still acknowledged Meletius, who had been chosen with the help of the Arians.

33. In 363, Lucifer of Cagliari, the same who had been the messenger of Liberius to Constantius at Milan, attempted to reconcile the two Catholic factions; but being more anxious to display authority than to promote real peace, he made the matter worse by ordaining as bishop certain Paulinus, who was the leader of the Eustathians, and the most bitter opponent of the Meletians. From this the schism spread yet farther. Lucifer was not only a Western bishop, but had been a confidant of the bishop of Rome. Athanasius endorsed his action by communicating with Paulinus, and not with Meletius; and all the bishops of Egypt, Cyprus, and the West followed his example, while all the rest of the Catholic bishops in the East espoused the cause of Meletius.

34. Basil, the Catholic bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, finding it impossible to moderate the schism in any other way, thought to do so by applying to the bishop of Rome. He therefore (A. D. 371) wrote a letter to Damasus, and with it sent another signed by many of the Eastern bishops, asking him to lend his assistance. "He added that it was

from his zeal alone they expected relief, from that zeal which he had made so eminently to appear on other occasions; that Dionysius, one of his predecessors, had afforded them a seasonable assistance, when their wants were less pressing, and their condition not so deplorable; and therefore that there was no room left to doubt of his readily conforming to so glorious an example." -- Bower.¹³

550

35. It was some time before Damasus took any notice of this request, and when he did, it was only to assume the office of dictator and judge, rather than that of mediator. He declared Paulinus lawful bishop of Antioch, and Meletius "a transgressor of the canons, an intruder, a schismatic, and even a heretic." -- Bower.¹⁴ Basil repented of his application to Rome, with the wise observation that "the more you flatter haughty and insolent men, the more haughty and insolent they become." He should have thought of that before, and indulged in neither flattery nor appeal.

36. Such was the grave question, and thus that question arose, which now engaged the serious attention of the Council of Constantinople; and Meletius presided at the council. Before they reached this subject, however, Meletius died. He and Paulinus had previously agreed that when either of them should die, the other should be sole bishop of the two factions; but he was no sooner dead than some of the bishops in the council moved for the election of a successor.

37. Gregory Nazianzen was now president of the council, and he exerted all his influence to persuade the council to put an end to the schism, by having nothing more to do with it, but to let Paulinus end his days in peace, according to the arrangement with Meletius. He was joined by other members of the council, but the vast majority loved discussion more than they loved anything else besides power; and as disputes and schisms were the way to power, they could not bear to let slip such an opportunity to show that the East was not subject to the West -- especially as the Western bishops, with the bishop of Rome at their head, had already assumed the authority to dictate in the matter. They declared that they would not betray to the West the dignity which of right belonged to the East, from its being the scene of the birth and death of the Son of God. They therefore elected Flavianus as successor to Meletius, and thus only aggravated the schism which they attempted to heal, and which continued for eighteen years longer.

38. Gregory Nazianzen, having done all he could to prevent this act of the council, and knowing that what they had done could only

551

strengthen the contentions already rife, resigned his bishopric, and left both the council and the city of Constantinople. He likened a church council to a nest of wasps, or a flock of magpies, cranes, or geese; declared that no good ever came of one, and refused evermore to have anything to do with them.¹⁵ Had a few other men been as wise as Gregory Nazianzen showed himself to be in this case, what miseries the world might

have escaped! how different history would have been! As Gregory has been, for ages, a Catholic saint, even the Catholic Church ought not to blame any one for adopting his estimate of the value of church councils.

39. Gregory's resignation made it necessary to elect a new bishop of Constantinople. The choice fell upon Nectarius, a senator and praetor of the city, who had never yet been baptized. He was first elected bishop, next baptized into membership of the church, and then by the bishops of the council was installed in his new office.

40. Having "settled" these things, the council proceeded to "settle" the Catholic faith again. The same question which had been so long discussed as to the nature of Christ was now up in regard to the nature of the Holy Spirit. Now, the question was whether the Holy Spirit is Homousion with the Father and the Son. The Macedonians held that He is not. The council decided that He is. The Macedonians left the assembly, and the remaining hundred and fifty bishops framed the following creed: --

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all times [ages], Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not created, of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; who was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the

552

Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And in one Holy Catholic and apostolic church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. We look for a resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."16

41. They also established seven canons, in one of which they attempted to settle the question of dignity between the bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople by ordaining as follows: --

"CANON 3. The bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."17

42. This, however, like every other attempt to settle their ecclesiastical disputes, only bred new and more violent contentions. For, by a trick in words, and a casuistical interpretation, this canon was afterward made the ground upon which was claimed by the bishopric of Constantinople, superiority over that of Rome. It was argued that the words

"the first rank after the bishop of Rome," did not mean the second in actual rank, but the first, and really carried precedence over Old Rome; that the real meaning was that hitherto Rome had held the first rank, but now Constantinople should hold the first rank, i. e., after Rome had held it!

43. The bishops in council, having finished their labors, sent to Theodosius the following letter: --

"In obedience to your letters, we met together at Constantinople, and having first restored union among ourselves, we then made short definitions confirming the faith of the Fathers of Nicaea, and condemning the heresies which have risen in opposition to it. We have also, for the sake of ecclesiastical order, drawn up certain canons; and all this we append to our letter. We pray you now, of your goodness, to confirm by a letter of your piety the decision of the synod, that, as you have honored the church by your letters of convocation, you will thus seal the decisions." 18

44. Accordingly, the emperor confirmed and sealed their decisions in an edict issued July 30, 381, commanding that all "the churches were at once to be surrendered to the bishops who believed in the oneness of the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and were in communion with Nectarius of Constantinople; in Egypt with Timotheus of Alexandria; in the East with Pelagins

553

of Laodicea and Diodorus of Tarsus; in proconsular Asia and the Asiatic diocese with Amphilochius of Iconium and Optimus of Antioch (in Pisidia); in the diocese of Pontus with Helladius of Caesarea, Otreius of Melitene, and Gregory of Nyssa; lastly (in Moesia and Scythia) with Terentius, the bishop of Scythia (Tomi), and with Martyrius, bishop of Marcianople (now Preslaw in Bulgaria). All who were not in communion with the above named, should, as avowed heretics, be driven from the church." -- Hefele. 19

45. While the Council of Constantinople was sitting, the emperor Gratian called a council at Aquileia in Italy. This was presided over by the bishop of Aquileia, but Ambrose, bishop of Milan, "was the most active member and soul of the whole affair." The object of this council was, in unison with the Council of Constantinople, to establish the unity of the faith throughout the whole world. There happened to be three bishops in all the West who were accused of being Arians. They would not acknowledge that they were such; but the accusation of heresy was sufficient foundation upon which to call a council.

46. The council met in August, and after several preliminary meetings, met in formal session the third of September. A letter which Arius had written to his bishop, Alexander, about sixty years before, was read, and the three accused bishops were required to say "yes" or "no," as to whether or not they agreed to "these blasphemies against the Son." They would not give a direct answer, choosing rather to speak for themselves than to answer by an emphatic "yes" or "no," questions that were framed by their accusers. The

council next spun out a string of curses upon all the leading points of the Arian doctrine; and because the three bishops would not join in these curses, the council, at the proposal of Ambrose, and as early as one o'clock on the afternoon of the first day, pronounced its curse upon the three bishops as heretics, declaring them deposed from office, and immediately sent a circular letter to this effect to all the bishops of the West.

47. They sent a full account of their proceedings, according to their own view, "to the emperors Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius,

554

and prayed them to lend the aid of the secular arm in the actual deposition of the condemned, and the appointment of orthodox bishops in their stead." They also asked the emperor Theodosius to make it impossible for the teacher of one of these condemned bishops any "further to disturb the peace of the church, or to travel about from one town to another." -- Hefele.²⁰

48. Damasus, bishop of Rome, and this council disagreed with the Council of Constantinople as to the dispute between the Eustathians and Meletians. A letter was therefore sent to the emperor, asking for another general council to be held at Alexandria to decide this with other disputes among the Catholics themselves.

49. The condemned bishops complained that they were misrepresented in the letters of the council, and protested against being confounded with the Arians. They likewise demanded another council, to be held at Rome. When these letters reached Theodosius, the Council of Constantinople was over, and the bishops had gone home. But instead of calling the council to meet in Alexandria, he recalled the bishops to Constantinople. He sent two special invitations to Gregory Nazianzen to attend the council, but Gregory, still retaining the wisdom he had acquired at the preceding council, positively refused, with the words, "I never yet saw a council of bishops come to a good end. I salute them from afar off, since I know how troublesome they are."²¹

50. By the time the bishops were again got together at Constantinople, it was early in the summer of 382. They there received another letter from a council which had just been held under the presidency of Ambrose, at Milan, asking them to attend a general council at Rome. The bishops remained at Constantinople; but sent three of their number as their representatives, and also a letter affirming their strict adherence to the Nicene Creed. Lack of time and space alike forbid that the proceedings of these councils should be followed in detail. Council after council followed; another one at Constantinople in 383, at Bordeaux in 384, at Treves in 385, at Rome in 386, at Antioch in 388, at Carthage in 389, Rome again

555

in 390, Carthage again in 390, Capua in 391, at Hippo in 393, at Nimes in 394, and at Constantinople again in 394.

51. On his part Theodosius was all this time doing all he could to second the efforts of the church to secure unanimity of faith, and to blot out all heresy. "In the space of fifteen years he promulgated at least fifteen severe edicts against the heretics, more especially against those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity." -- Gibbon.²² In these edicts it was enacted that any of the heretics who should usurp the title of bishop or presbyter, should suffer the penalty of exile and confiscation of goods, if they attempted either to preach the doctrine or practise the rites of their "accursed" sects. A fine of about twenty thousand dollars was pronounced upon every person who should dare to confer, or receive, or promote, the ordination of a heretic. Any religious meetings of the heretics, whether public or private, whether by day or by night, in city or country, were absolutely prohibited; and if any such meeting was held, the building, or even the ground which should be used for the purpose, was declared confiscated. "The anathemas of the church were fortified by a sort of civil excommunication," which separated the heretics from their fellow citizens by disqualifying them from holding any public office, trust, or employment. The heretics who made a distinction in the nature of the Son from that of the Father, were declared incapable of either making wills or receiving legacies. The Manichaean heretics were to be punished with death, as were also the heretics "who should dare to perpetrate the atrocious crime" of celebrating Easter on a day not appointed by the Catholic Church.²³

52. That these laws might not be vain, the office of "inquisitor of the faith" was instituted, and it was not long before capital punishment was inflicted upon "heresy," though not exactly under Theodosius himself. Gratian was killed in A. D. 383, by command of a certain Maximus, who had been declared emperor by the troops in Britain, and acknowledged by the troops in Gaul. A treaty of peace was formed between him and Theodosius, and the new

556

emperor Maximus stepped into the place both in church and State which had been occupied by Gratian.

53. A certain Priscillian and his followers were condemned as heretics by the Council of Bordeaux in A. D. 384. They appealed to the emperor Maximus, under whose civil jurisdiction they were; but by the diligence of three bishops -- Ithacius, Magnus, and Rufus -- as prosecutors, they were there likewise condemned. Priscillian himself, two presbyters, two deacons, Latronian, a poet, and Euchrocia, the widow of an orator of Bordeaux, -- seven in all, -- were beheaded, while others were banished.

54. Thus the union of church and State, the clothing of the church with civil power, bore its inevitable fruit. It is true that there were some bishops who condemned the execution of the Priscillianists; but the others fully justified it. Those who condemned it, however, did so more at the sight of actual bloodshed than for any other reason; because they fully justified, and in fact demanded, every penalty short of actual death. And those who

persecuted the Priscillianists, and who advocated and secured and justified their execution, were never condemned by the church nor by any council.

55. In fact, their course was actually endorsed by a council; for "the synod at Treves, in 385, sanctioned the conduct of Ithacius" (Hefele²⁴), who was the chief prosecutor in the case. Even the disagreement as to whether it was right or not was silenced when, twenty years afterward, Augustine set forth his principles, asserting the righteousness of whatever penalty would bring the incorrigible to the highest grade of religious development; and the matter was fully set at rest for all time when, in A. D. 447, Leo, bishop of Rome, justified the execution of Priscillian and his associate heretics, and declared the righteousness of the penalty of death for heresy.

56. In re-establishing the unity of the Catholic faith, Theodosius did not confine his attention to professors of Christianity only. In his original edict, it will be remembered that all his subjects should be Catholic Christians. A good many of his subjects were pagans, and still conformed to the pagan ceremonies and worship. In 382 Gratian, at the instance of Ambrose, had struck a blow at the pagan

557

religion by rejecting the dignity of pontifex maximus, which had been borne by every one of his predecessors; and had also commanded that the statue and altar of Victory should be thrown down. Maximus was killed in 388, and on account of the youth of Valentinian II, Theodosius, as his guardian, became virtually ruler of the whole empire; and at Rome the same year, he assembled the Senate and put to them the question whether the old or the new religion should be that of the empire.

57. By the imperial influence, the majority of the Senate, as in the church councils, adopted the will of the emperor, and "the same laws which had been originally published in the provinces of the East, were applied, after the defeat of Maximus, to the whole extent of the Western Empire A special commission was granted to Cynegius, the praetorian perfect of the East, and afterward to the counts Jovius and Gaudentius, two officers of distinguished rank in the West, by which they were directed to shut the temples, to seize or destroy the instruments of idolatry, to abolish the privileges of the priests, and to confiscate the consecrated property for the benefit of the emperor, of the church, or of the army." -- Gibbon.²⁵

58. Thus was the Catholic faith finally established as that of the Roman Empire; thus was that empire "converted;" and thus was pagan Rome made papal Rome.

1[Page 540] "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 29.

2[Page 541] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. vi. par. 2.

3[Page 541] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. 1, part 1, A, par. 74.

4[Page 542] "Ecclesiastical History," book iii, chap. xxv.

5[Page 542] Id.

6[Page 543] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxv. par. 9.

7[Page 543] Id., par. 13.

8[Page 544] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. viii. par. 28.

9[Page 545] Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap xxvii, par. 6.

10[Page 545] History of Christianity," book iii, chap. ix. par. 1.

11[Page 547] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxvii, par. 3.

12[Page 549] "History of the Popes." Damasus, par. 26.

13[Page 549] Id., par. 19.

14[Page 550] Id., par. 20.

15[Page 551] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxvii, par. 9; Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii. sec. lxxv, last paragraph but one; Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," lect ii. par. 10 from end.

16[Page 552] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. xcvi.

17[Page 552] Id., sec. xcvi.

18[Page 552] Id., sec. xcix.

19[Page 553] Id.

20[Page 554] "History of the Church Councils," sec, ci, pars. 1, 2.

21[Page 554] Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," lect. ii, par. 10 from end.

22[Page 555] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxvii, par. 11.

23[Page 555] Id.

24[Page 556] "History of the Church Councils," sec. civ.

25[Page 557] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxviii. par. 5.

36. ROME -- CHURCH USURPS THE CIVIL AUTHORITY.

THE events related in the three chapters immediately preceding this, abundantly demonstrate that the promise of the unity of the faith, which the bishops made to Constantine, was a fraud; and that the blessings which were promised and expected to accrue to the State by the union with the church, proved a continual and horrible curse to the State and to society in general.

2. So far, it has been necessary to deal most largely with society and the State in the East. But bad as it was in the East, it was worse in the West. The reason is that in the Eastern empire the imperial authority held its place above the church -- the civil power remained superior to the ecclesiastical; whereas in the Western empire, the church exalted itself above the State -- the ecclesiastical was made superior to the civil power. To trace the course, and to discover the result, of the workings of the Western system, that is, of the papacy in fact, is the purpose of the present chapter.

3. There was a curious train of political events which conspired to confer dignity upon the bishop of Rome, which opened the way for the church to usurp the civil power, and for the bishop of Rome to encroach upon the imperial authority.

4. Diocletian established his capital at Nicomedia, and Maximian his at Milan, A. D. 304; and with the exception of Maxentius and Constantine, during brief periods, never afterward was there an emperor who made Rome his capital. Even while Constantine made Rome his capital, instead of detracting from the dignity of the bishop of Rome, it added to it. For, as we have seen, the bishop of Rome bore a leading part in the formation of the union of church and State; and the moment that that union was consummated, "the

559

bishop of Rome rises at once to the rank of a great accredited functionary. . . . So long as Constantine was in Rome, the bishop of Rome, the head of the emperor's religion, became in public estimation, . . . in authority and influence, immeasurably the superior to all of sacerdotal rank. . . . As long as Rome is the imperial residence, an appeal to the emperor is an appeal to the bishop of Rome." -- Milman.¹

5. Thus the presence of Constantine in Rome redounded to the importance and dignity of the bishopric of Rome. But it was not until Constantine had moved his capital to Constantinople that the way was opened for the full play of that arrogant spirit that has ever been the chief characteristic of that dignitary. "The absence of a secular competitor allowed the papal authority to grow up and to develop its secret strength"; (Milman²); and under the blandishments of necessitous imperial favor he did as he pleased, and his power grew more rapidly than ever.

6. In the sketch of the hierarchy given on page 546, it will be noticed that in the gradation of the church dignitaries the ascent was only so far as corresponded to the four prefects in the State. There was not, above the four patriarchs, a bishop over all, as above the prefects the emperor was over all. The one great reason for this is that Constantine was not only emperor, but bishop. And as "bishop of externals" in the church, he held the place of chief "bishop, -- supreme pontiff, -- over the four patriarchs, precisely as he held, as emperor, the chief authority over the four prefects.

7. Yet in the nature of things it was inevitable, and only a question of time, that the bishop of Rome should assert, as a matter of right, his supremacy over all others. And when this should be accomplished, the matter of the supremacy would then lie between him and the emperor alone, which would open the way for the bishop of Rome to encroach upon the civil and imperial authority. This spirit showed itself in the action of the bishop of Rome in studiously avoiding the title of "patriarch," "as placing him on a level with other patriarchs." He always preferred the title of "papa," or

560

"pope" (Schaff³); and this because "patriarch" bespeaks an oligarchical church government, that is, government by a few; whereas "pope" bespeaks a monarchical church government, that is, government by one.

8. Again: in all the West there was no rival to the bishop of Rome. Whereas in the East there were three rivals to one another, whose jealousies not only curbed the encroachments of one upon another, but built up the influence and authority of the bishop of Rome.

9. In addition to all these things, both the weakness and the strength of the imperial influence and authority were made to serve the ambitious spirit of the bishopric of Rome. After Constantine's death, with the exception of Valentinian I, there never was a single able emperor of the West; and even Valentinian I was the servant of the bishop of Rome to the extent that he "enacted a law empowering the bishop of Rome to examine and judge other bishops." -- Bower.⁴ When Constantius exercised authority over the West, the bishop of Rome openly defied his authority; and although Liberius afterward changed his views and submitted, the example was never forgotten. And when Theodosius for a brief period exercised authority in the West, it was not only as the servant of the bishop of Rome, but as the subject of the bishop of Milan. It is true that the power of Ambrose in that particular case (the Thessalonian massacre by order of Theodosius) was exercised in a just cause. But a power that could be carried to such extremes in a cause that was just, could as easily be carried to the same extreme in a cause that was unjust. So it had been exercised before this on several occasions, and so it was exercised afterward on numberless occasions, and by others than Ambrose.

10. All these things conspired to open the way for the exaltation of the ecclesiastical above the civil power; and the ecclesiastics walked diligently in the way thus opened.

The seed which directly bore this evil fruit, was also sown in that dark intrigue between Constantine and the bishops, which formed the union of church and

561

State, and created the papacy. That seed was sown when Constantine bestowed upon the bishops the right of judgment in civil matters.

11. It is a doctrine of Christianity, first, that there shall be no disputes among Christians; and, secondly, that if any such do arise, then Christians must settle such differences among themselves, and not go to law before unbelievers.⁵

12. This order was faithfully followed in the church at the beginning; but as the power and influence of the bishopric grew, this office was usurped by the bishop, and all such cases were decided by him alone. Until the union of church and State, however, every man had the right of appeal from the decision of the bishop to the civil magistrate.

13. Very shortly after the establishment of the Catholic Church, "Constantine likewise enacted a law in favor of the clergy, permitting judgment to be passed by the bishops when litigants preferred appealing to them rather than to the secular court. He enacted that their decree should be valid, and as far superior to that of other judges as if pronounced by the emperor himself; that the governors and subordinate military officers should see to the execution of these decrees; and that sentence, when passed by them, should be irreversible." -- Sozomen.⁶

14. This was only in cases, however, where the disputants voluntarily appeared and submitted their causes to the decision of the bishops. Yet as the bishops were ever ready to "extend their authority far beyond their jurisdiction, and their influence far beyond their authority" (Milman⁷), they so manipulated this power as to make their business as judges occupy the principal portion of their time. "To worldly-minded bishops it furnished a welcome occasion for devoting themselves to any foreign and secular affairs, rather than to the appropriate business of their spiritual calling; and the same class might also allow themselves to be governed by impure motives in the settlement of these disputes." -- Neander.⁸

562

15. Some bishops extended this right into what was known as the right of intervention, that is, the right of interceding with the secular power in certain cases. "The privilege of interceding with the secular power for criminals, prisoners, and unfortunates of every kind, had belonged to the heathen priests, and especially to the vestals, and now passed to the Christian ministry, above all to the bishops, and thenceforth became an essential function of their office. -- Schaff.⁹

16. This office was first assumed by the heathenized bishops for this purpose, but soon instead of interceding they began to dictate; instead of soliciting they began to command;

and instead of pleading for deserving unfortunates, they interfered with the genuine administration of the civil magistrates. As early as the Council of Arles, A. D. 314, the second council that was held by the direction of Constantine, the church power began to encroach in this matter upon the jurisdiction of the State. Canon 7 of this council charged the bishops to take the oversight of such of the civil magistrates within their respective sees as were church-members; and if the magistrates acted inconsistently with their Christian duties, they should be turned out of the church.¹⁰

17. This was at once to give to the bishops the direction of the course of civil matters. And the magistrates who were members of the church -- and it was not long before the great majority of them were such, -- knowing that their acts were to be passed upon for approval or disapproval by the bishop, chose to take counsel of him beforehand so as to be sure to act according to "discipline," and avoid being excommunicated. Thus by an easy gradation and extension of power, the bishopric assumed jurisdiction over the jurisprudence of the State.

18. Further, as the empire was now a religious State, a "kingdom of God," the Bible was made the code of civil procedure as well as of religion. More this, it was the Bible as interpreted by the bishops. Yet more than this, it was the Bible as interpreted

563

by the bishops according to the Fathers. "The Bible, and the Bible interpreted by the Fathers, became the code, not of religion only, but of every branch of knowledge." -- Milman.¹¹ And as the Fathers themselves, necessarily, had to be interpreted, the bishops became the sole interpreters of the code, as well as the censors of the magistracy, in all the jurisprudence of the empire.

19. The advice which one of the model bishops in the church -- in the estimation of some, a model even to this day¹² -- gave upon a certain occasion to a magistrate who had consulted him in regard to the performance of his duty, well illustrates the workings of this system as a system. A certain officer consulted Ambrose, bishop of Milan, as to what he had better do in a certain criminal case. Ambrose told him that according to Romans 13, he was authorized to use the sword in punishment of the crime; yet at the same time advised him to imitate Christ, in his treatment of the woman mentioned in John 8, who had been taken in adultery, and forgive the criminal. Because if the criminal had never been baptized, he might yet be converted and obtain forgiveness of his sin; and if he had been baptized, it was proper to give him an opportunity to repent and reform.¹³

20. With the Bible as the code, this was the only thing that could be done, and this the only proper advice that could be given. For Christ distinctly commands; "Judge not;" "Condemn not." And he does directly command that when a brother offends and is reproved, if he repents, he is to be forgiven; and if he does it seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turns and says, "I repent," so often is he to be forgiven.

21. Therefore, with the Bible as the code, the advice which Ambrose gave was the only advice which could properly be given. But it was destructive of civil government. And this is only to say that it was an utter perversion of the Bible to make it the code of civil procedure. Such procedure in civil government, where there was no possible means of knowing that repentance was genuine or

564

reformation sure, was to destroy civil government, and substitute for it only a pretense at moral government which was absolutely impotent for any good purpose, either moral or civil. In other words, it was only to destroy the State, and to substitute for it, in everything, the church.

22. This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only exposing the awful perversion of its principles by the church in exalting her authority above the State. God's government is moral, and He has made provision for maintaining His government with the forgiveness of transgression. But He has made no such provision for civil government. No such provision can be made, and civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God's method of saving those who sin against His moral government. Civil government is man's method of preserving order; and has nothing to do with sin, nor the salvation of sinners. Civil government prosecutes a man and finds him guilty. If, before the penalty is executed, he repents, God forgives him; but the government must execute the penalty.

23. And this authority of the church was carried much further than merely to advise. The monks and clergy went so far at last as actually to tear away from the civil authorities, criminals and malefactors of the worst sort, who had been justly condemned. To such an extent was this carried that a law had to be enacted in 398 ordering that "the monks and the clergy should not be permitted to snatch condemned malefactors from their merited punishment." -- Neander.¹⁴ Yet they were still allowed the right of intercession.

24. This evil led directly to another, or rather only deepened and perpetuated itself. Ecclesiastical offices, especially the bishoprics, were the only ones in the empire that were elective. As we have seen, all manner of vile and criminal characters had been brought into the church. Consequently these had a voice in the Episcopal elections. It became, therefore, an object for the unruly, violent, and criminal classes to secure the election of such men as would use the episcopal influence in their interests, and shield them from justice.

565

25. "As soon as a bishop had closed his eyes, the metropolitan issued a commission to one of his suffragans to administer the vacant see, and prepare, within a limited time, the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merit of the candidates; in the senators or nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally in the whole body of

the people who, on the appointed day, flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the diocese, and sometimes silenced, by their tumultuous acclamations, the voice of reason and the laws of discipline. These acclamations might accidentally fix on the head of the most deserving competitor of some ancient presbyter, some holy monk, or some layman conspicuous for his zeal and piety.

26. "But the episcopal chair was solicited, especially in the great and opulent cities of the empire, as a temporal rather than as a spiritual dignity., The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles. While one of the candidates boasted the honors of his family, a second allured his judges by the delicacies of a plentiful table, and a third, more guilty than his rivals, offered to share the plunder of the church among the accomplices of his sacrilegious hopes." -- Gibbon.¹⁵

27. The offices of the church, and especially the bishopric, thus became virtually political, and were made subject to all the strife of political methods. As the logical result, the political schemers, the dishonest men, the men of violent and selfish dispositions, pushed themselves to the front in every place; and those who might have given a safe direction to public affairs were crowded to the rear, and in fact completely shut out of office, by the very violence of those who would have office at any cost.

28. Thus by the very workings of the wicked elements which had been brought into the church by the political methods of Constantine and the bishops, genuine Christianity was separated from

566

this whole Church-and-State system, as it had been before from the pagan system. The genuine Christians, who loved the quiet and the peace which belong with the Christian profession, were reproached by the formal, hypocritical, political religionists who represented both the church and State, or rather the church and the State in one, -- the real Christians were reproached by these with being "righteous overmuch."

29. "It was natural, however, that the bad element, which had outwardly assumed the Christian garb, should push itself more prominently to notice in public life. Hence it was more sure to attract the common gaze, while the genuinely Christian temper loved retirement, and created less sensation.

30. "At the present time, the relation of vital Christianity to the Christianity of mere form, resembled that which, in the preceding period, existed between the Christianity of those to whom religion was a serious concern, and paganism, which constituted the prevailing rule of life. As in the earlier times, the life of genuine Christians had stood out in strong contrast with the life of the pagan world, so now the life of such as were Christians not merely by outward profession, but also in the temper of their hearts,

presented a strong contrast with the careless and abandoned life of the ordinary nominal Christians. By these latter, the others . . . were regarded in the same light as, in earlier times, the Christians had been regarded by the pagans. They were also reproached by these nominal Christians, just as the Christians generally had been taunted before by the pagans, with seeking to be righteous overmuch."-- Neander.¹⁶

31. In the episcopal elections, "Sometimes the people acted under outside considerations and the management of demagogues, and demanded unworthy or ignorant men for the highest offices. Thus there were frequent disturbances and collisions, and even bloody conflicts, as in the election of Damasus in Rome. In short, all the selfish passions and corrupting influences which had spoiled the freedom of the popular political elections in the Grecian

567

and Roman republics, and which appear also in the republics of modern times, intruded upon the elections of the church. And the clergy likewise often suffered themselves to be guided by impure motives." -- Schaff.¹⁷

32. It was often the case that a man who had never been baptized, and was not even a member of the church, was elected a bishop, and hurried through the minor offices to this position. Such was the case with Ambrose, bishop of Milan in A. D. 374; Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople in 381; and many others. In the contention for the bishopric, there was as much political intrigue, strife, contention, and even bloodshed, as there had formerly been for the office of consul in the republic in the days of Pompey and Caesar.

33. It often happened that men of fairly good character were compelled to step aside and allow low characters to be elected to office, for fear they would cause more mischief, tumult, and riot if they were not elected than if they were. Instances actually occurred, and are recorded by Gregory Nazianzen, in which certain men who were not members of the church at all, were elected to the bishopric in opposition to others who had every churchly qualification for the office, because "they had the worst men in the city on their side."¹⁸ And Chrysostom says that "many are elected on account of their badness, to prevent the mischief they would otherwise do."¹⁹ With such characters as these elected to office by such characters as those, the office representing such authority as that did, nothing but evil of the worst kind could accrue either to the civil government or to society at large.

34. More than this, as the men thus elected were the dispensers of doctrine and the interpreters of Scripture in all points, both religious and civil, and as they owed their position to those who elected them, it was only the natural consequence that they should adapt their interpretations to the character and wishes of those who had placed them in their positions. For "when once a political aspirant has

568

bidden with the multitude for power, and still depends on their pleasure for effective support, it is no easy thing to refuse their wishes, or hold back from their demands." -- Draper.²⁰

35. Nectarius, who has already been mentioned, after he had been taken from the praetorship and made bishop by such a method of election as the above, -- having been elected bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized, -- wished to ordain his physician as one of his own deacons. The physician declined on the ground that he was not morally fit for the office. Nectarius endeavored to persuade him by saying, "Did not I, who am now a priest, formerly live much more immorally than thou, as thou thyself well knowest, since thou wast often an accomplice of my many iniquities?" -- Schaff.²¹ The physician still refused, but for a reason that was scarcely more honorable than that by which he was urged. The reason was that although he had been baptized, he had continued to practise his iniquities, while Nectarius had quit his when he was baptized.

36. The bishops' assumption of authority over the civil jurisprudence did not allow itself to be limited to the inferior magistrates. It asserted authority over the jurisdiction of the emperor himself. "In Ambrose the sacerdotal character assumed a dignity and an influence as yet unknown; it first began to confront the throne, not only on terms of equality, but of superior authority, and to exercise a spiritual dictatorship over the supreme magistrate. The resistance of Athanasius of the imperial authority had been firm but deferential, passive rather than aggressive. In his public addresses, he had respected the majesty of the empire; at all events, the hierarchy of that period only questioned the authority of the sovereign in matters of faith. But in Ambrose the episcopal power acknowledged no limits to its moral dominion, and admitted no distinction of persons." -- Milman.²²

37. As the church and the State were identical, and as whoever refused to submit to the dictates of the bishopric was excommunicated

569

from the church, this meant that the certain effect of disobedience to the bishop was to become an outcast in society, if not an outlaw in the State. And more than this, in the state of abject superstition which now prevailed, excommunication from the church was supposed to mean direct consignment to perdition. "The hierarchical power, from exemplary, persuasive, amiable, was now authoritative, commanding, awful. When Christianity became the most powerful religion, when it became the religion of the many, of the emperor, of the State, the convert or the hereditary Christian had no strong pagan party to receive him back into its bosom when outcast from the church. If he ceased to believe, he no longer dared cease to obey. No course remained but prostrate submission, or the endurance of any penitential duty which might be enforced upon him." -- Milman.²³

38. When the alliance was made between the bishops and Constantine, it was proposed that the jurisdiction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities should remain separate, as

being two arms of the same responsible body. This was shown in that saying of Constantine in which he represented himself as a "bishop of externals" of the church, that which pertained more definitely to its connection with civil society and conduct; while the regular bishops were bishops of the internal, or those things pertaining to the sacraments, ordinations, etc. "Constantine . . . was the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, or of a system of policy which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights, and regards church and State as the two arms of one and the same divine government on earth. This idea was more fully developed by his successors; it animated the whole Middle Age, and is yet working under various forms in these latest times." -- Schaff.²⁴

39. To those who conceived it, this theory might have appeared good enough; and simply in theory it might have been imagined that it could be made to work. But when it came to be put into practise, the all-important question was, Where is the line which

570

defines the exact limits between the jurisdiction of the magistrate and that of the bishop? between the authority of the church and that of the State? The State was now a theocracy. The government was held to be moral, a government of God; the Bible, the supreme code of morals, was the code of the government; there was no such thing as civil government - all was moral. But the subject of morals is involved in every action, yea, in every thought of man. The State, then, being allowed to be moral, it was inevitable that the church, being the arbiter of morals, and the dispenser and interpreter of the code regulating moral action, would interpose in all questions of human conduct, and spread her dominion over the whole field of human action.

40. "In ecclesiastical affairs, strictly so called, the supremacy of the Christian magistracy, it has been said, was admitted. They were the legislators of discipline, order, and doctrine. The festivals, the fasts, the usages, and canons of the church, the government of the clergy, were in their exclusive power. The decrees of particular synods and councils possessed undisputed authority, as far as their sphere extended. General councils were held binding on the whole church. But it was far more easy to define that which did belong to the province of the church than that which did not. Religion asserts its authority, and endeavors to extend its influence over the whole sphere of moral action, which is, in fact, over the whole of human life, its habits, manners, conduct.

41. "Christianity, as the most profound moral religion, exacted the most complete and universal obedience; and as the acknowledged teachers and guardians of Christianity, the clergy continued to draw within their sphere every part of human life which man is actuated by moral or religious motives. The moral authority, therefore, of the religion, and consequently of the clergy, might appear legitimately to extend over every transaction of life, from the legislation of the sovereign, which ought, in a Christian king, to be guided by Christian motive, to the domestic duties of the peasant, which ought to be fulfilled on the principle of Christian love. . . .

42. "But there was another prolific source of difference. The clergy, in one sense, from being the representative body, had begun

571

to consider themselves the church: but, in another and more legitimate sense, the State, when Christian, as comprehending all the Christians of the empire, became the church. Which was the legislative body, -- the whole community of Christians, or the Christian aristocracy, who were in one sense the admitted rulers?" Milman.²⁵

43. To overstep every limit and break down every barrier that seemed in theory to be set between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, was the only consequence that could result from such a union. And when it was attempted to put the theory into practice, every step taken, in any direction, only served to demonstrate that which the history everywhere shows, that "the apparent identification of the State and church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction." -- Milman.²⁶

44. The State, as a body distinct from the church, was gone, As a distinct system of law and government, the State was destroyed; and its machinery existed only as the tool of the church to accomplish her arbitrary will and to enforce her despotic decrees.

1[Page 559] "History of Latin Christianity," book i, chap. ii, par. 1.

2[Page 559] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iii. par. 1.

3[Page 560] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. iv, par. 1, note.

4[Page 560] "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 8.

5[Page 561] 1 Cor. 6:1-7.

6[Page 561] "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. ix, par. 2.

7[Page 561] "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. 1, par. 49.

8[Page 561] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. 1, par. 12.

9[Page 562] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xvi, par. 5.

10[Page 562] Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div i, par. 14; and the canon itself in Hefele's "History of the Church Councils."

- 11[Page 563] "History of Christianity," book iv. chap. v, par. 17.
- 12[Page 563] See Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. clxxv.
- 13[Page 563] Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. i, par. 14.
- 14[Page 564] Id., par. 17, note.
- 15[Page 565] "Decline and Fall," chap. xx, par. 22.
- 16[Page 566] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iii, part i, div. 1, pars. 5, 6.
- 17[Page 567] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xlix, par. 2.
- 18[Page 567] Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. ii, par. 9, note.
- 19[Page 567] Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xlix, par. 2, note 5.
- 20[Page 568] "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. i, chap. x, par. 6.
- 21[Page 568] "History of Christianity Church," Vol. iii, sec. lix, par. 2.
- 22[Page 568] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. x, par. 2.
- 23[Page 569] Id., book iv, chap. i, par. 35.
- 24[Page 569] "History of the Christianity Church," Vol. iii, sec. ii, par. 3.
- 25[Page 571] "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. i. pars. 53-56.
- 26[Page 571] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap iii, par. 40.

37. ROME -- THE RUIN OF THE EMPIRE.

WE have seen the church secure the enactment of laws by which she could enforce church discipline upon all the people, whether in the church or not. We have seen her next extend her encroachments upon the civil power, until the whole system of civil jurisprudence, as such, was destroyed by being made religious. We shall now see how the evils thus engendered, and like dragons' teeth sown broadcast, with another element of the monstrous evil planted by Constantine and the bishops, caused the final and fearful ruin of the Roman Empire.

2. Among the first of the acts of Constantine in his favors to the church was, as has been shown on page 463 of this book, the appropriation of money from the public treasury for the bishops. Another enactment, A. D. 321, of the same character, but which was of vastly more importance, was his granting to the church the right to receive legacies. "This was a law which expressly secured to the churches a right which, perhaps, they had already now and then tacitly exercised; namely, the right of receiving legacies, which, in the Roman Empire, no corporation whatever was entitled to exercise, unless it had been expressly authorized to do so by the State." -- Neander.¹

3. Some estimate of the value of this enactment may be derived from the statement that "the law of Constantine which empowered the clergy of the church to receive testamentary bequests, and to hold land, was a gift which would scarcely have been exceeded if he had granted them two provinces of the empire." That which made this a still more magnificent gift to the church was the view which prevailed, especially among the rich, that they could live as they pleased all their lives, and then at their death give their property to

573

the church, and be assured a safe conduct to eternal bliss. "It became almost a sin to die without some bequest to pious uses." -- Milman. ²

4. We have seen in the previous chapter what kind of characters were chosen to the bishopric in those times; and when a law was now made bestowing such privileges upon such characters, it is easy to understand what use would be made of the privilege. Not content with simply receiving bequests that might voluntarily be made, they brought to bear every possible means to induce persons to bestow their goods upon the churches. They assumed the protectorship of widows and orphans, and had the property of such persons left to the care of the bishop.

5. Now into the coffers of the bishops, as into the coffers of the republic after the fall of Carthage, wealth came in a rolling stream of gold, and the result in this case was the same as in that. With wealth came luxury and magnificent display. The bishopric assumed a stateliness and grandeur that transcended that of the chief ministers of the empire; and

that of the bishopric of Rome fairly outshone the glory of the emperor himself. He was the chief beneficiary in all these favors of Constantine.

6. As already related, when the emperors in the time of Diocletian began habitually to absent themselves from Rome, the bishop of Rome became the chief dignitary in the city. And by the time that Constantine moved the capital permanently from Rome, through these imperial favors the bishop of that city had acquired such a dignity that it was easy for him to step into the place of pomp and magnificent display that had before been shown by the emperor. "The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus.

7. "The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than

574

imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed." -- Eugene Lawrence. 3

8. The offices of the church were the only ones in the empire that were elective. The bishopric of Rome was the chief of these offices. As that office was one which carried with it the command of such enormous wealth and such display of imperial magnificence, it became the object of the ambitious aspiration of every Catholic in the city; and even a heathen exclaimed, "Make me bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian!"

9. Here were displayed all those elements of political strife and chicanery which were but referred to in the previous chapter. The scenes which occurred at the election of Damasus as bishop of Rome, A. D. 366, will illustrate the character of such proceedings throughout the empire, according as the particular bishopric in question compared with that of Rome. There were two candidates, -- Damasus and Ursicinus, -- and these two men represented respectively two factions that had been created in the contest between Liberius, bishop of Rome and Constantius, emperor of Rome.

10. "The presbyters, deacons, and faithful people who had adhered to Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus, who was consecrated by Paul, bishop of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed by the followers of Felix, in S. M. Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome.

11. "Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to the Lateran; their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of Liberius. Damasus, at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and laborers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church; a

575

hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus was obliged to withdraw, vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections.

12. "So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the prefect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighborhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the Basilica of Sisinnius. . . . Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus; he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled.

13. "Another frightful massacre took place in the Church of St. Agnes. The emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Praetextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see." "But Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favor; and the Council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at last to give up the contest." -- Milman.⁴

14. Of the bishop of Rome at this time we have the following sketch written by one who was there at the time, and had often seen him in his splendor: "I must own that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder that those who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments." -- Ammianus Marcellinus.⁵

576

15. The example of the bishop of Rome was followed by the whole order of bishops, each according to his degree and opportunities. Chrysostom boasted that "the heads of the empire and the governors of provinces enjoy no such honor as the rulers of the church. They are first at court, in the society of ladies, in the houses of the great. No one has precedence of them." By them were worn such titles as, "Most Holy," "Most Reverend," and "Most Holy Lord." They were addressed in such terms as, "Thy Holiness" and "Thy Blessedness." "Kneeling, kissing of the hand, and like tokens of reverence, came to be shown them by all classes, up to the emperor himself." -- Schaff. ⁶

16. The manners of the minor clergy of Rome are described by one who was well acquainted with them. "His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed; that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is crisped with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic." -- Jerome. 7

17. Such an example being set by the dignitaries in the church, these, too, professing to be the patterns of godliness, their example was readily followed by all in the empire who were able. Consequently, "the aristocratical life of this period seems to have been characterized by gorgeous magnificence without grandeur, inordinate luxury without refinement, the pomp and prodigality of a high state of civilization with none of its ennobling or humanizing effects. The walls of the palaces were lined with marbles of all colors, crowded with statues of inferior workmanship, mosaics of which the merit consisted in the arrangement of the stones; the cost, rather than the beauty and elegance, was the test of excellence, and the object of admiration. The nobles were surrounded with hosts of parasites or servants. 'You reckon up,' Chrysostom thus addressed a patrician, 'so many acres of land, ten or twenty palaces, as many baths, a thousand or two thousand slaves, chariots plated with silver or overlaid with gold.'

577

18. "Their banquets were merely sumptuous, without social grace or elegance. The dress of the females, the fondness for false hair -- sometimes wrought up to an enormous height, and especially affecting the golden dye -- and for paint, from which irresistible propensities they were not to be estranged even by religion, excite the stern animadversion of the ascetic Christian teacher. 'What business have rouge and paint on a Christian cheek? Who can weep for her sins when her tears wash her face bare and mark furrows on her skin? With what trust can faces be lifted up toward heaven, which the Maker can not recognize as his own workmanship?' Their necks, heads, arms, and fingers were loaded with golden chains and rings; their persons breathed precious odors; their dresses were of gold stuff and silk; and in this attire they ventured to enter the church.

19. "Some of the wealthier Christian matrons gave a religious air to their vanity: while the more profane wore their thin silken dresses embroidered with hunting pieces, wild beasts, or any other fanciful device; the more pious had the miracles of Christ, the marriage in Cana of Galilee, or the paralytic carrying his bed. In vain the preacher urged that it would be better to emulate these acts of charity and love than to wear them on their garments. . . . The provincial cities, according to their natural character, imitated the old and new Rome; and in all, no doubt, the nobility or the higher order were of the same character and habits." -- Milman.⁸

20. As in the republic of old, in the train of wealth came luxury, and in the train of luxury came vice; and as the violence now manifested in the election of the bishops was but a reproduction of the violence by which the tribunes and the consuls of the later republic were chosen, so the vices of these times were but a reproduction of the vices of

the later republic and early empire -- not indeed manifested so coarsely and brutally, more refined and polished; yet essentially the same iniquitous practise of shameful vice.

21. Another phase of the evil was that under the law empowering the church to receive legacies, the efforts of some of the clergy to persuade people, and especially women, to bestow their wealth upon the church, took precedence of everything else.

578

22. "Some of the clergy made it the whole business and employment of their lives to learn the names of the ladies, to find out their habitations, to study their humor. One of these, an adept in the art, rises with the sun, settles the order of his visits, acquaints himself with the shortest ways, and almost breaks into the rooms of the women before they are awake. If he sees any curious piece of household furniture, he extols, admires, and handles it; and, sighing that he, too, should stand in need of such trifles, in the end rather extorts it by force than obtains it by good-will, the ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old fellow that is always running about from house to house." -- Jerome. 9

23. Because of the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and because of the shameful corruption that was practised with the means thus acquired, a law was enacted, A. D. 370, by Valentinian I, forbidding any ecclesiastics to receive any inheritance, donation, or legacy from anybody. And to let the world know that he did not complain of this hardship, the great bishop of Milan exclaimed: "We are excluded by laws lately enacted, from all inheritances, donations, and legacies; yet we do not complain. And why should we? By such laws we only lose wealth; and the loss of wealth is no loss to us. Estates are lawfully bequeathed to the ministers of the heathen temples; no layman is excluded, let his condition be ever so low, let his life be ever so scandalous; clerks alone are debarred from a right common to the rest of mankind. Let a Christian widow bequeath her whole estate to a pagan priest, her will is good in law; let her bequeath the least share of it to a minister of God, her will is null. I do not mention these things by way of complaint, but only to let the world know that I do not complain." -- Ambrose. 10

24. The fact that such a law as this had to be enacted -- a law applying only to the clergy -- furnishes decisive proof that the ecclesiastics were more vicious and more corrupt in their use of wealth than was any other class in the empire. This in fact is plainly stated by another who was present at the time: "I am

579

ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols, the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates and receiving legacies; from this common privilege clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law, debarred not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes." -- Jerome. 11

25. Nor was this all. The same pagan rites and heathen superstitions and practises which were brought into the church when the Catholic religion became that of the empire, not

only still prevailed, but were enlarged. The celebration of the rites of the mysteries still continued, only with a more decidedly pagan character, as time went on, and as the number of pagans multiplied in the church. To add to their impressiveness, the mysteries in the church, as in the original Eleusinia, were celebrated in the night. As the catechumen came to the baptismal font, he "turned to the west, the realm of Satan, and thrice renounced his power; he turned to the east to adore the Sun of Righteousness, and to proclaim his compact with the Lord of Life." -- Milman. 12

26. About the middle of the fourth century there was added another form and element of sun-worship. Among the pagans for ages, December 25 had been celebrated as the birthday of the sun. In the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, Rome formally adopted from Persia the feast of the Persian sun-god, Mithras, as the birth festival of the unconquered sun -- natales invicti solis. The church of Rome adopted this festival, and made it the birthday of Christ. And within a few years the celebration of this festival of the sun had spread throughout the whole empire east and west; the perverseminded bishops readily sanctioning it with the argument that the pagan festival of the birth of the real sun, was a type of the festival of the birth of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. Thus was established the church festival of Christmas.13

27. This custom, like the forms of sun-worship -- the day of the sun, worshiping toward the east, and the mysteries -- which had

580

already been adopted, was so closely followed that it was actually brought "as a charge against the Christians of the Catholic Church that they celebrated the Solstitia with the pagans." -- Neander. 14 The worship of the sun itself was also still practised. Pope Leo I testifies that in his time many Catholics had retained the pagan custom of paying "obeisance from some lofty eminence to the sun." And that they also "first worshiped the rising sun, paying homage to the pagan Apollo, before repairing to the Basilica of St. Peter." -- Schaff. 15

28. The images and pictures which had formerly represented the sun were adopted and transformed into representations of Christ. And such was the origin of the "pictures of Christ;" and especially of the nimbus, or halo round the heads of them.

29. The martyrs, whether real or imaginary, were now honored in the place of the heathen heroes. The day of their martyrdom was celebrated as their birthday, and these celebrations were conducted in the same way that the heathen celebrated the festival days of their heroes. "The festivals in honor of the martyrs were avowedly instituted, or at least conducted, on a sumptuous scale, in rivalry of the banquets which formed so important and attractive a part of the pagan ceremonial. Besides the earliest Agapae, which gave place to the more solemn Eucharist, there were other kinds of banquets, at marriages and funerals, called likewise Agapae." -- Milman. 16

30. These festivals were celebrated either at the sepulchers of the martyrs or at the churches, and the day began with hymns. The histories or fables of their lives and martyrdom were given; and eulogies were pronounced. "The day closed with an open banquet, in which all the worshipers were invited to partake. The wealthy heathen had been accustomed to propitiate the manes of their departed friends by these costly festivals; the banquet was almost an integral part of the heathen religious ceremony. The custom passed into the church; and with the pagan feeling the festival assumed a pagan character of gaiety and joyous excitement, and even of luxury. In

581

some places the confluence of worshipers was so great that, as in the earlier and indeed the more modern religions of Asia, the neighborhood of the more celebrated churches of the martyrs became marts for commerce, and fairs were established on those holidays.

31. "As the evening drew in, the solemn and religious thoughts gave way to other emotions; the wine flowed freely, and the healths of the martyrs were pledged, not unfrequently, to complete inebriety. All the luxuries of the Roman banquet were imperceptibly introduced. Dances were admitted, pantomimic spectacles were exhibited, the festivals were prolonged till late in the evening, or to midnight, so that other criminal irregularities profaned, if not the sacred edifice, its immediate neighborhood. The bishops had for some time sanctioned these pious hilarities with their presence; they had freely partaken of the banquets." -- Milman. 17

32. So perfectly were the pagan practises duplicated in these festivals of the martyrs, that the Catholics were charged with practising pagan rites, with the only difference that they did it apart from the pagans. This charge was made to Augustine: "You have substituted your Agapae for the sacrifices of the pagans; for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You appease the shades of the dead with wines and feasts; you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them." -- Draper. 18 And the only defense that Augustine could make was in a blundering casuistical effort to show a distinction in the nature of the two forms of worship.

33. In the burial of their dead, they still continued the pagan practise of putting a piece of money in the mouth of the corpse, with which the departed was to pay the charges of Charon for ferrying him over the river Styx. 19

34. Another most prolific source of general corruption was the

582

church's assumption of authority to regulate, and that by law, the whole question of the marriage relation, both in the church and in the State. "The first aggression . . . which the

church made on the State, was assuming the cognizance over all questions and causes relating to marriage." -- Milman. 20

35. Among the clergy she attempted to enforce celibacy; that is , to prohibit marriage altogether. Monkeny had arisen to a perfect delirium of popularity; and " a characteristic trait of monasticism in all its forms is a morbid aversion to female society, and a rude contempt of married life. . . . Among the rules of Basil is a prohibition of speaking with a woman, touching one, or even looking on one, except in unavoidable cases." -- Schaff.²¹ As monkeny was so universally and so extremely popular among all classes from the height of imperial dignity to the depths of the monkish degradation itself, it became necessary for the clergy to imitate the monks in order to maintain popularity with the people. And as monkeny is only an ostentatious display of self-righteousness, the contempt of married life was the easiest way for the clergy to advertise most loudly their imitation of monkish virtue.

36. In their self-righteousness some of the monks attained to such a "pre-eminence" of "virtue" that they could live promiscuously with women, or like Jerome,, write "letters to a virgin" that were unfit to be written to a harlot. The former class, in the estimation of an admirer, "bore away the pre-eminence from all others."

37. The first decretal ever issued, namely, that by Pope Siricius, A. D. 385, commanded the married clergy to separate from their wives, under sentence of expulsion from the clerical order upon all who dared to offer resistance; yet promising pardon for such as had offended through ignorance, and suffering them to retain their positions, provided they would observe complete separation from their wives: though even then they were to be held forever incapable of promotion. The clergy finding themselves forbidden by the pope to marry, and finding it necessary, in order to maintain a standing of

583

popularity, to imitate the monks, practised this peculiar sort of monkish "virtue." "The clerks, who ought to instruct and awe the women with a grave and composed behavior, first kiss their heads, and then stretching out their hands, as it were, to bestow a blessing, slyly receive a fee for their salutation. The women in the meantime, elated with pride in feeling themselves thus courted by the clergy, prefer the freedom of widowhood to the subjection attending the state of matrimony." -- Jerome.²²

38. As these associations differed from those of real matrimony "only in the absence of the marriage ceremony," it was not an uncommon thing for men to gain admission to "holy orders" "on account of the superior opportunities which clericature gave of improper intercourse with women." This practise became so scandalous that in A. D. 370 Valentinian I enacted a law "which denounced severe punishment on ecclesiastics who visited the houses of widows and virgins." -- Lea.²³ The law, however, had really no effect in stopping the wickedness. And "with the disappearance of legitimate marriage in the priesthood, the already prevalent vice of the cohabitation of unmarried ecclesiastics with pious widows and virgins 'secretly brought in,' became more and more common.

This spiritual marriage, which had begun as a bold ascetic venture, ended only too often in the flesh, and prostituted the honor of the church." -- Schaff.²⁴

39. Again: in accordance with the rest of the theocratical legislation of Constantine and the bishops, the precepts of the Scripture in relation to marriage and divorce were adopted, with heavy penalties, as the laws of the empire. As the church had assumed "cognizance over all questions relating to marriage," it followed that marriage not celebrated by the church was held to be but little better than an illicit connection. Yet the weddings of the church were celebrated in the pagan way. Loose hymns were sung to Venus, and "the bride was borne by drunken men to her husband's house among choirs of dancing harlots with pipes, and flutes, and songs of

584

offensive license." And when the marriage had been thus celebrated, and even consummated, the marriage bond was held so loosely that it amounted to very little; for "men changed their wives as quickly as their clothes, and marriage chambers were set up as easily as booths in a market." -- Milman.²⁵

40. Of course there were against all these evils, laws abundant with penalties terrible, as in the days of the Caesars. And also as in those days, the laws were utterly impotent; not only for the same great reason that then existed, that the iniquity was so prevalent that there were none to enforce the laws; but for an additional reason that now existed; that is, the bishops were the interpreters of the code, and by this time, through the interminable and hair-splitting distinctions drawn against heresies, the bishops had so sharpened their powers of interpretation that they could easily evade the force of any law, Scriptural, canonical, or statutory, that might be produced.

41. There is yet one other element of general corruption to be noticed. As we have seen, the means employed by Constantine in establishing the Catholic religion and church, and in making that the prevalent religion, were such as to win only hypocrites. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws, and by the ministration of Theodosius, the church received control of the civil power to compel all, without distinction, who were not Catholics, to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and every person who was not voluntarily a church-member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church council, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith. And as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

42. In the then existing order of things it was impossible that it

585

should be otherwise. Right faith is essential to right morals. Purity of faith is essential to purity of heart and life. But there the faith was wrong and utterly corrupt, and nothing but corruption could follow. More than this, the faith was essentially pagan, and much more guilty than had been the original pagan; because it was professed under the name of Christianity and the gospel, and because it was in itself a shameful corruption of the true faith of the gospel. As the faith of the people was essentially pagan, or rather worse, the morality of the people could be nothing else. And such in fact it was.

43. "There is ample evidence to show how great had been the reaction from the simple genuineness of early Christian belief, and how nearly the Christian world had generally associated itself, in thought and temper, not to say in superstitious practise, with the pagan. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that much of the apparent success of the new religion had been gained by its actual accommodation of itself to the ways and feelings of the old. It was natural it should be so. Once set aside, from doubt, distaste, or any other feeling, the special dogmas of the gospel, . . . and men will naturally turn to compromise, to eclecticism, to universalism, to indifference, to unbelief

44. "If the great Christian doctors had themselves come forth from the schools of the pagans, the loss had not been wholly unrequited; so complacently had even Christian doctors again surrendered themselves to the fascinations of pagan speculations; so fatally, in their behalf, had they extenuated Christian dogma, and acknowledged the fundamental truth and sufficiency of science falsely so called.

45. "The gospel we find was almost eaten out from the heart of the Christian society. I speak not now of the pride of spiritual pretensions, of the corruption of its secular politics, of its ascetic extravagances, its mystical fallacies; of its hollowness in preaching, or its laxity in practise; of its saint-worship, which was a revival of hero-worship; its addiction to the sensuous in outward service, which was a revival of idolatry. But I point to the fact, less observed by our church historians, of the absolute defect of all distinctive Christianity

586

in the utterances of men of the highest esteem as Christians, -- men of reputed wisdom, sentiment, and devotion.

46. "Look, for instance, at the remains we possess of the Christian Boethius, a man whom we know to have been a professed Christian and churchman, excellent in action, steadfast in suffering, but in whose writings, in which he aspires to set before us the true grounds of spiritual consolation on which he rested himself in the hour of his trial, and on which he would have his fellows rest, there is no trace of Christianity whatever, nothing but pure, unmingled naturalism.

47. "This marked decline of distinctive Christian belief was accompanied with a marked decline of Christian morality. Heathenism reasserted its empire over the carnal affections of the natural man. The pictures of abounding wickedness in the high places and the low

places of the earth, which are presented to us by the witnesses of the worst pagan degradation, are repeated, in colors not less strong, in lines not less hideous, by the observers of the gross and reckless iniquity of the so-called Christian period now before us. It becomes evident that as the great mass of the careless and indifferent have assumed, with the establishment of the Christian church in authority and honor, the outward garb and profession of Christian believers, so, with the decline of belief, the corruption of the visible church, the same masses, indifferent and irreligious as of old, have rejected the moral restraints which their profession should have imposed upon them." -- Merivale.²⁶

48. In short, the same corruptions that had characterized the former Rome were reproduced in the Rome of the fifth century. "The primitive rigor of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of Pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eye-witness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the

587

poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian." -- Bower.²⁷ "Everything was determined by auguries and auspices; the wild orgies of the Bacchanalians, with all their obscene songs and revelry, were not wanting." -- Merivale.²⁸

49. And now all the evils engendered in that evil intrigue which united the State with a professed Christianity, hurried on the doomed empire to its final and utter ruin. "The criminal and frivolous pleasures of a decrepit civilization left no thought for the absorbing duties of the day nor the fearful trials of the morrow. Unbridled lust and unblushing indecency admitted no sanctity in the marriage tie. The rich and powerful established harems, in the recesses of which their wives lingered, forgotten, neglected, and despised. The banquet, theater, and the circus exhausted what little strength and energy were left by domestic excesses. The poor aped the vices of the rich and hideous depravity reigned supreme, and invited the vengeance of heaven." -- Lea.²⁹

50. The pagan superstitions, the pagan delusions, and the pagan vices, which had been brought into the church by the apostasy, and clothed with a form of godliness, had wrought such corruption that the society of which it was a part could no longer exist. From it no more good could possibly come, and it must be swept away. "The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater-going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians." -- Schaff.³⁰

51. And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. For a hundred years the dark cloud had been hanging threateningly over the borders of the empire, encroaching slightly upon the West and breaking occasionally upon the East. But at the close of the fourth century the tempest burst in all its fury, and the flood was flowing ruinously. Wherever these savages went, they

588

carried fire and slaughter; and whenever they departed, they left desolation and ruin in their track, and carried away multitudes of captives. Thus was the proud empire of Western Rome swept from the earth; and that which Constantine and his ecclesiastical flatterers had promised one another should be the everlasting salvation of the State, proved its speedy and everlasting ruin.

52. It was impossible that it should be otherwise. We have seen to what a fearful depth of degradation pagan Rome had gone in the days of the Caesars, yet the empire did not perish then. There was hope for the people. The gospel of Jesus Christ carried in earnestness, in simplicity, and in its heavenly power, brought multitudes to its saving light, and to a knowledge of the purity of Jesus Christ. This was their salvation. And the gospel of Christ, by restoring the virtue and integrity of the individual, was the preservation of the Roman State.

53. But by apostasy that gospel had lost its purity and its power in the multitudes who professed it. It was now used only as a cloak to cover the same old pagan wickedness. This form of godliness practised not only without the power but in defiance of it, permeated the great masses of the people, and the empire had thereby become a festering mass of corruption. When thus the only means which it was possible for the Lord himself to employ to purify the people, had been taken and made only the cloak under which to increase unto more ungodliness, there was no other remedy; destruction must come.

54. And it did come, by a host, wild and savage, it is true, but whose social habits were so far above those of the people which they destroyed, that, savage as they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome.

55. A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions, and who wrote as a Christian, exclaims: "The church, which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she but provoke Him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end?

589

It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people to be less vicious.' From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and

offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes."³¹

56. "You, Romans, Christians, and Catholics, are defrauding your brethren, are grinding the faces of the poor, are frittering away your lives over the impure and heathenish spectacles of the amphitheater, you are wallowing in licentiousness and inebriety. The barbarians, meanwhile, heathen or heretics though they may be, and however fierce toward us, are just and fair in their dealings with one another. The men of the same clan, and following the same king, love one another with true affection. The impurities of the theater are unknown amongst them. Many of their tribes are free from the taint of drunkenness, and among all, except the Alans and the Huns, chastity is the rule.

57. "Not one of these tribes is altogether vicious. If they have their vices, they have also their virtues, clear, sharp, and well defined. Whereas you, my beloved fellow provincials, I regret to say, with the exception of a few holy men among you, are altogether bad. Your lives from the cradle to the grave are a tissue of rottenness and corruption, and all this notwithstanding that you have the sacred Scriptures in your hands.

58. "In what other race of men would you find such evils as these which are practised among the Romans? Where else is there such injustice as ours? The Franks know nothing of this villainy. The Huns are clear of crimes like these. None of these exactions are practised among the Vandals, none among the Goths. So far are the barbarian Goths from tolerating frauds like these, that not even the Romans who live under the Gothic rule are called upon to

590

endure them, and hence the one wish of all the Romans in those parts is that it may never be necessary for them to pass under the Roman jurisdiction. With one consenting voice the lower orders of Romans put up the prayer that they may be permitted to spend their life, such as it is, alongside of the barbarians. And then we marvel that our arms should not triumph over the arms of the Goths, when our own countrymen would rather be with them than with us." -- Salvian.³²

59. "He compares the Christians, especially of Rome, with the Arian Goths and Vandals, to the disparagement of the Romans, who add to the gross sins of nature the refined vices of utilization, passion for the theaters, debauchery, and unnatural lewdness. Therefore has the just God given them into the hands of the barbarians, and exposed them to the ravages of the migrating hordes." Schaff.³³

60. This description, says the same author, "is in general not untrue." And he confirms it in his own words by the excellent observation that "nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen, world, could open the

way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization, prepared in the old Roman Empire, was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit."³⁴

61. These new, fresh nations came, planted themselves upon the ruins of the old. Out of these came the faithful Christians of the Dark Ages, and upon them broke the light of the Reformation. And out of these, and by this means, God produced the civilization of the nineteenth century and the new republic of the United States of America, from which there should go once more in its purity, as in the beginning, the everlasting gospel to every nation and kindred and tongue and people.

1[Page 572] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. 1, par. 7.

2[Page 573] "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. i, par. 30.

3[Page 574] "Historical Studies," Bishops of Rome, par. 13.

4[Page 575] "History of Latin Christianity," book i, chap. ii, par. 18, and note.

5[Page 575] Book xxvii, chap. iii. par. 12-15, Bower's translation in "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 6.

6[Page 576] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. liii, par. 3.

7[Page 576] Quoted and translated by Milman. "History of Latin Christianity," book i, chap. ii, par. 20, note 1.

8[Page 577] "History of Christianity," book iv. chap. i. pars. 12, 13, 15.

9[Page 578] Quoted by Bower, "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 12.

10[Page 578] Id.

11[Page 579] Id.

12[Page 579] "History of Christianity," book iv. chap. ii, par 8.

13[Page 579] Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. lxxvii, pars 3, 4, and the notes; Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap xxii, par. 8, note. Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, pars. 21-23, and the notes.

14[Page 580] Id.

- 15[Page 580] "History of the Christian Church," sec. lxxiv, par. 4.
- 16[Page 580] "History of Christianity," par. 14.
- 17[Page 581] Id., pars. 15, 16.
- 18[Page 581] "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. 1, chap. x. par. 5.
- 19[Page 581] Milman's "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. ii, par. 13, note.
- 20[Page 582] Id., book iv, chap. i, par. 58.
- 21[Page 582] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec; xxxii, par. 15.
- 22[Page 583] Quoted by Bower, "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 12.
- 23[Page 583] "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," chap. v. par. 17, and chap. iv, par. 7.
- 24[Page 583] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. i, par.8.
- 25[Page 584] "History of Christianity," book iv, chap. i, par. 58, note; and 60.
- 26[Page 586] "Conversion of the Northern Nations," lect. iv, pars. 10, 12, 13.
- 27[Page 587] "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 14.
- 28[Page 587] "Conversion of the Northern Nations," notes and illustrations, E.
- 29[Page 587] "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," chap. v. par. 20.
- 30[Page 587] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xxiii, par. 2.
- 31[Page 589] Quoted by Schaff, Id., sec. xii, par. 3.
- 32[Page 590] Quoted in "Italy and Her Invaders," book i, chap. xx, pars, 4, 6, 13.
- 33[Page 590] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii. sec. xxiv, par. 2.
- 34[Page 590] Id.

38. ROME DIVIDED.

ALTHOUGH the "iron monarchy of Rome," in the greatness of its strength, broke in pieces all kingdoms, yet the time was to come when it should itself be broken. At the same time that Daniel spoke of the fourth kingdom breaking in pieces and bruising all, he also said: "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken."¹

2. We must now inquire, Of what should this division consist? Into how many parts should Rome be divided? As it is the feet and toes, and particularly the toes, of the image that are spoken of in connection with the division, it would seem that that division is suggested by the number of toes of the image; and as this was the image of a man, there were certainly ten toes. Therefore this would suggest that Rome should be divided into ten parts.

3. However, if any one should distrust this suggestion, the point is plainly stated in another part of the book. In the seventh chapter of Daniel, this same series of kingdoms is gone over again under the symbols of "four great beasts," the fourth one of which was declared by the angel to be the fourth kingdom, which shows it to be identical with the iron -- the fourth kingdom of the great image. This fourth beast had also ten horns, which exactly correspond to the ten toes of the image. Further, the angel said plainly of these ten horns that they "are ten kings" that should arise.² Therefore we

592

know of a certainty that ten kingdoms were to arise upon the ruins of the Roman power.

4. Now we may ask, Where should these ten kingdoms arise? In other words, Are there any clearly defined limits within which the ten kingdoms should be expected to establish themselves? -- There are.

5. From the accession of Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the world, these four kingdoms are the only ones that should ever bear universal sway. And each of these in its turn occupied territory peculiar to itself, from which it spread its power over the others. Although the four kingdoms were successive, and although each one in succession spread its power over all the territory of those that had preceded it, yet each one retained its own peculiar distinction from all the others. And this distinction is kept up throughout the book of Daniel, and is even recognized in the book of Revelation, which was written in the time of the supremacy of the fourth kingdom, in a prophecy that was not to be fulfilled till after the establishment of the ten kingdoms.

6. The fact of the matter is, these were not only the four universal empires, but they also represent the four divisions of the civilized world at that time, each one of which occupied territory peculiar to itself, and was never confounded with any of the others. Thus, Babylonia was first, and when it was overturned, it was by the united power of Media and Persia, which occupied entirely distinct territory from that of Babylonia proper. Then when the Medo-Persian power was destroyed, it was by the power of Grecia, which arose from a territory entirely distinct from that of Babylon or of Medo-Persia. So likewise, when the Grecian ascendancy was destroyed, it was by a power that arose still farther to the west, entirely beyond the territory of Grecia, -- in a territory entirely its own, and distinct from all the others.

7. This is all expressed in a single verse in the seventh chapter of Daniel. After the description of the four great beasts which represent these four kingdoms, he says of the fourth beast, that he beheld till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame; then he says of the others: "As concerning the rest

593

of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." (Margin: Chaldee, "A prolonging in life was a given them.")³

8. This passage, with the point which we here make, is aptly and well illustrated by a passage from Rawlinson. Speaking of the Babylonian monarchy, he says: "Even when this monarchy met its death at the hands of Cyrus the Great, the nationality of the Chaldeans was not swept away. We find them recognized under the Persians, and even under the Parthians, as a distinct people."⁴

9. Thus it was with each and with all, -- the dominion was taken away, but the nationality remained; the ruling power was transferred, but the national life continued. It follows, therefore, that, as it was Rome that was to be divided, the division must pertain to the territory that was peculiar to the fourth kingdom, and which had not belonged to any of the three that preceded it. Where was that? We can easily learn.

(1) Media and Persia occupied the territory east of the Tigris and the Persian Gulf.

(2) Babylonia, the territory from the Tigris to the Arabian Desert.

(3) Grecia, from the Hellespont to the Adriatic Sea and northward to about the forty-fifth parallel of latitude.

(4) The territory of Rome proper occupied all west of the Danube and the Rhine to the Atlantic and the Frith of Forth; and all of the northern coast of Africa, nearly as far east as to the twentieth degree of longitude.

10. Within the boundaries thus marked lay the territory of Rome proper. It was this territory that was peculiar to the fourth kingdom. And it is within the limits drawn under

(4) that we are to look for the ten divisions of the fourth kingdom -- the establishment of the ten kingdoms.

11. We propose to trace the history of these ten kingdoms from their tribal relations as savages in the forests of Germany, through their devastating incursions into the rich and civilized provinces of

594

Rome, and down to their own establishment within these provinces, and their development into civilized and influential kingdoms there. Rome, once so powerful, once so great, now through luxury and indulgence, guilt and hypocrisy, grown corrupt, effeminate, and weak, perished. We shall see the movements of the nations coming into fill up with a new and vigorous people the place that Rome was no longer worthy to fill.

12. It was "the warlike Germans who first resisted, then invaded, and at length overturned, the western monarchy of Rome." "The most civilized nations of modern Europe issued from the woods of Germany, and in the rude institutions of those barbarians we may still distinguish the original principles of our present laws and manners."

13. "Ancient Germany, excluding from its independent limits the province westward of the Rhine, which had submitted to the Roman yoke, extended itself over a third part of Europe. Almost the whole of modern Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Livonia, Prussia, and the greater part of Poland, were peopled by the various tribes of one great nation, whose complexion, manners, and language denoted a common origin, and preserved a striking resemblance.

14. "On the west, ancient Germany was divided by the Rhine from the Gallic, and on the south by the Danube from the Illyrian, provinces of the empire. A ridge of hills, rising from the Danube, and called the Carpathian Mountains, covered Germany on the side of Dacia, or Hungary. The eastern frontier was faintly marked by the mutual fears of the Germans and the Sarmatians, and was often confounded by the mixture of warring and confederating tribes of the two nations. In the remote darkness of the North, the ancients imperfectly descried a frozen ocean that lay beyond the Baltic Sea, and beyond the peninsula, or islands, of Scandinavia.

15. "Tacitus asserts, as a well-known fact, that the Germans, in his time [A. D. 56-135] had no cities; and that they affected to despise the works of Roman industry as places of confinement rather than of security. Their edifices were not even contiguous, or formed into regular villas; each barbarian fixed his independent dwelling on

595

the spot to which a plain, a wood, or a stream of fresh water, had induced him to give the preference. Neither stone, nor brick, nor tiles were employed in these slight habitations.

They were indeed no more than low huts of a circular figure, built of rough timber, thatched with straw, and pierced at the top to leave a free passage for the smoke.

16. "In the most inclement weather, the hardy German was satisfied with a scanty garment made of the skin of some animal. The nations who dwelt toward the north clothed themselves in furs; and the women manufactured for their own use a coarse kind of linen. The game of various sorts with which the forests of Germany were plentifully stocked, supplied its inhabitants with food and exercise. Their monstrous herds of cattle, less remarkable, indeed, for their beauty than for their utility, formed the principal object of their wealth. A small quantity of corn was the only produce exacted from the earth; the use of orchards or artificial meadows was unknown to the Germans; nor can we expect any improvements in agriculture from a people whose property every year experienced a general change by a new division of the arable lands, and who, in that strange operation, avoided disputes by suffering a great part of their territory to lie waste and without tillage.

17. "The sound that summoned the German to arms was grateful to his ear. It roused him from his uncomfortable lethargy, gave him an active pursuit, and by strong exercise of the body and violent emotions of the mind, restored him to a more lively sense of his existence. In the dull intervals of peace, these barbarians were immoderately addicted to deep gaming and excessive drinking; both of which, by different means, the one by inflaming the passions, the other by extinguishing their reason, alike relieved them from the pain of thinking. They gloried in passing whole days and nights at the table; and the blood of friends and relations often stained their numerous and drunken assemblies. Their debts of honor (for in that light they have transmitted to us those of play) they discharged with the most romantic fidelity. The desperate gamester who had staked his person and liberty on a last throw of the dice, patiently submitted to the decision of fortune, and suffered himself to be

596

bound, chastised, and sold into remote slavery, by his weaker but more lucky antagonist.

18. "Strong beer, a liquor extracted with very little art from wheat or barley, and corrupted (as it is strongly expressed by Tacitus) into a certain semblance of wine, was sufficient for the gross purposes of German debauchery. But those who had tasted the rich wines of Italy and afterward of Gaul, sighed for that more delicious species of intoxication. They attempted not, however (as has since been executed with so much success), to naturalize the vine on the banks of the Rhine and Danube; nor did they endeavor to procure by industry the materials of an advantageous commerce. To solicit by labor what might be ravished by arms, was esteemed unworthy of the German spirit. The intemperate thirst of strong liquors often urged the barbarians to invade the provinces on which art or nature had bestowed those much-envied presents."

19. "A general of the tribe was elected on occasions of danger; and if the danger was pressing and extensive, several tribes concurred in the choice of the same general. The

bravest warrior was named to lead his countrymen into the field, by his example rather than by his commands. But this power, however limited, was still invidious. It expired with the war; and in time of peace the German tribes acknowledged not any supreme chief. Princes were, however, appointed in the general assembly, to administer justice, or rather to compose differences, in their respective districts.

20. "In the hour of danger it was shameful for the chief to be surpassed in valor by his companions; shameful for the companions not to equal the valor of their chief. To survive his fall in battle was indelible infamy. To protect his person, and to adorn his glory with the trophies of their own exploits, were the most sacred of their duties. The chiefs combated for victory, the companions for the chief.

21. "The Germans treated their women with esteem and confidence, consulted them on every occasion of importance, and fondly believed that in their breasts resided a sanctity and wisdom more than human. Some of these interpreters of fate, such as Velleda, in the Batavian War, governed, in the name of the Deity, the fiercest

597

nations of Germany. The rest of the sex, without being adored as goddesses, were respected as the free and equal companions of soldiers, associated even by the marriage ceremony to a life of toil, of danger, and of glory. In their great invasions, the camps of the barbarians were filled with a multitude of women, who remained firm and undaunted amidst the sound of arms, the various forms of destruction, and the honorable wounds of their sons and husbands.

22. "Fainting armies of Germans have, more than once, been driven back upon the enemy by the generous despair of the women, who dreaded death much less than servitude. If the day was irrecoverably lost, they well knew how to deliver themselves and their children, with their own hands, from an insulting victor. Heroines of such a cast may claim our admiration; but they were most assuredly neither lovely nor very susceptible of love. While they affected to emulate the stern virtues of man, they must have resigned that attractive softness in which principally consist the charm and the weakness of woman. Conscious pride taught the German females to suppress every tender emotion that stood in competition with honor, and the first honor of the sex has ever been that of chastity. The sentiments and conduct of these high-spirited matrons may at once be considered as a cause, as an effect, and as a proof of the general character of the nation.

23. "Germany was divided into more than forty independent States; and, even in each State, the union of the several tribes was extremely loose and precarious. The barbarians were easily provoked; they knew not how to forgive an injury, much less an insult; their resentments were bloody and implacable. The casual disputes that so frequently happened in their tumultuous parties of hunting or drinking were sufficient to inflame the minds of whole nations; the private feud of any considerable chieftains diffused itself among their followers and allies. To chastise the insolent, or to plunder the defenseless, were alike

causes of war. The most formidable States of Germany affected to encompass their territories with a wide frontier of solitude and devastation. The awful distance preserved by their neighbors attested the terror of their arms, and in some measure defended them from the danger of unexpected incursions."

598

24. The general location of the tribes and nations of Germany and the East, at the close of the fourth century, was this: The right bank of the middle and upper Rhine was inhabited by the Franks and the Alemanni. The Angles dwelt in what is now southern Denmark; and the Saxons upon the lower Elbe. Eastward of the Elbe, and on the Oder, dwelt the Lombards; on the coast of the Baltic, between the Oder and the Vistula, were the Vandals, south of the Vandals, on the Vistula, were the Burgundians; east of the Vistula, toward the Baltic, were the Suevi; and over the whole country east of the Suevi, and stretching away to the river Volga, were spread the Sarmatians. In the southern country below the Sarmatians, from the Danube through the valley of the Dnieper to the coasts of the Caspian Sea, was the dominion of the Huns ruled by Rugilas.

25. "Such was the situation, and such were the manners, of the ancient Germans. Their climate, their want of learning, of arts, and of laws; their notions of honor, of gallantry, and of religion; their sense of freedom, impatience of peace, and thirst of enterprise, -- all contributed to form a people of military heroes. And yet we find, that, during more than two hundred and fifty years that elapsed from the defeat of Varus [September, A. D. 9] to the reign of Decius [A. D. 249], these formidable barbarians made few considerable attempts, and not any material impression, on the luxurious and enslaved provinces of the empire. Their progress was checked by their want of arms and discipline, and their fury was diverted by the intestine divisions of ancient Germany." -- Gibbon.⁵

26. But when we reach the last quarter of the fourth century, it seems almost as though the very elements were employed in hurling the barbarous nations in multitudes upon the doomed empire, sunken in iniquity beyond all remedy.

1[Page 591] Dan. 2: 41, 42; chap. i. par. 30, of this book.

2[Page 591] Dan. 7: 24; chap. ii, par. 15, of this book.

3[Page 593] Dan. 7: 12, chap. ii, par. 12, of this book.

4[Page 593] "Seven Great Monarchies," First Monarchy, chap. viii, last paragraph.

5[Page 598] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. ix, pars. 1-26.

599

39. ROME DIVIDED -- THE ALEMANNI AND THE FRANKS.

OF all the barbarian nations that divided the Roman Empire, the Alemanni "were the first who removed the veil that covered the feeble majesty of Italy."

2. "In the reign of the emperor Caracalla [A. D. 211-217], an innumerable swarm of Suevi appeared on the banks of the Main, and in the neighborhood of the Roman provinces, in quest either of food, of plunder, or of glory. The hasty army of volunteers gradually coalesced into a great and permanent nation, and as it was composed from so many different tribes, assumed the name of Alemanni or Allmen, to denote at once their various lineage and their common bravery. The latter was soon felt by the Romans in many a hostile inroad. The Alemanni fought chiefly on horseback; but their cavalry was rendered still more formidable by a mixture of light infantry, selected from the bravest and most active of the youth, whom frequent exercise had inured to accompany the horsemen in the longest march, the most rapid charge, or the most precipitate retreat.

3. "This warlike people of Germans had been astonished by the immense preparations of Alexander Severus [A. D. 234]; they were dismayed by the arms of his successor [Maximin, A. D. 235], a barbarian equal in valor and fierceness to themselves. But still hovering on the frontiers of the empire, they increased the general disorder that ensued after the death of Decius [A. D. 250]. They inflicted severe wounds on the rich provinces of Gaul; they were the first who removed the veil that covered the feeble majesty of Italy. A numerous body of the Alemanni penetrated across the Danube and through the Rhaetian Alps into the plains of Lombardy, advanced as far as Ravenna, and displayed the victorious banners of barbarians

600

almost in sight of Rome [cir. A. D. 260]. And then, "laden with spoil, they retired into Germany; and their retreat was esteemed as a victory by the unwarlike Romans." -- Gibbon.¹

4. In the reign of Aurelian, A. D. 270, again, a hundred and twenty thousand of "the Alemanni traced a line of devastation from the Danube to the Po," and even as far as Fano in Umbria, "with a design of sacking the defenseless mistress of the world." Aurelian met them in three hard-fought battles. In the first "the Romans received so severe a blow that, according to the expression of a writer extremely partial to Aurelian, the immediate dissolution of the empire was apprehended." In the third, however, the Romans inflicted upon them "a total and irretrievable defeat. The flying remnant of their host was exterminated, and Italy was delivered from the inroads of the Alemanni."²

5. In January, A. D. 275, Aurelian was assassinated. Two emperors followed in quick succession, -- Tacitus for two hundred days, and Florianus for about three months, -- and Aug. 3, A. D. 276, Probus succeeded to the purple, and held the imperial authority till he was murdered in August, A. D. 282. "Instead of reducing the warlike natives of Germany to the condition of subjects, Probus contented himself with the humble expedient of raising a bulwark against their inroads."

6. About the time of Hadrian, A. D. 117-134, a strong barrier of trees and palisades had been built from the Danube to the Rhine, as the boundary of the empire and a check to the marauding Germans. In the place of so rude a bulwark, the emperor Probus constructed a stone wall of a considerable height, and strengthened it by towers at convenient distances. From the neighborhood of Newstadt and Ratisbon on the Danube, it stretched across hills, valleys, rivers, and morasses, as far as Wimpfen on the Neckar, and at length terminated on the banks of the Rhine, after a winding course of nearly two hundred miles.

7. "This important barrier, uniting the two mighty streams that

601

protected the provinces of Europe, seemed to fill up the vacant space through which the barbarians, and particularly the Alemanni, could penetrate with the greatest facility into the heart of the empire. But the experience of the world, from China to Britain, has exposed the vain attempt of fortifying any extensive tract of country. The fate of the wall which Probus erected may confirm the general observation. Within a few years after his death, it was overthrown by the Alemanni. Its scattered ruins, universally ascribed to the power of the Demon, now serve only to excite the wonder of the Swabian peasant."³

8. The overthrow of the wall of Probus opened to the Alemanni the country of Vindelicia, which they soon overran, and established themselves on the right of the Rhine, from the Main to the Lake of Constance, in possession of the country known first by the name of Alemannia and afterward by the name of Swabia, which they and their lineal descendants have held till this day. They afterward extended their power over other provinces, of some of which they were in later times deprived, but this they never lost. From their permanent seat in this territory, they constantly made inroads over the Rhine into Gaul until they had secured to themselves a goodly portion of that province also.

9. From this time onward the Franks are so intimately connected with the advances of the Alemanni, that, to avoid repetition, they will be considered together.

10. "About the year 240 A. D., a new confederacy was formed under the name of Franks, by the old inhabitants of the Lower Rhine and the Weser. The love of liberty was the ruling passion of these Germans; the enjoyment of it, their best treasure; the word that expressed that enjoyment, the most pleasing to their ear. They deserved, they assumed,

they maintained, the honorable epithet of FRANKS, or Freeman, which concealed, though it did not extinguish, the peculiar names of the several States of the confederacy.

11. "The Rhine, though dignified with the title of safeguard of the provinces, was an imperfect barrier against the daring spirit of enterprise with which the Franks were actuated. Their rapid devastations

602

stretched from the river to the foot of the Pyrenees; nor were they stopped by those mountains. Spain, which had never dreaded, was unable to resist, the inroads of the Germans. During twelve years [A. D. 256-268], the greatest part of the reign of Gallienus, that opulent country was the theater of unequal and destructive hostilities. Tarragona, the flourishing capital of a peaceful province, was sacked and almost destroyed; and so late as the days of Orosius, who wrote in the fifth century [cir. A. D. 415], wretched cottages, scattered amidst the ruins of magnificent cities, still recorded the rage of the barbarians. When the exhausted country no longer supplied a variety of plunder, the Franks seized on some vessels in the ports of Spain, and transported themselves into Mauritania. The distant province was astonished with the fury of these barbarians, who seemed to fall from a new world, as their name, manners, and complexion were equally unknown on the coast of Africa."⁴

12. "The most important service which Probus rendered to the republic was [A. D. 277] the deliverance of Gaul, and the recovery of seventy flourishing cities oppressed by the barbarians of Germany, who, since the death of Aurelian [January, A. D. 275] had ravaged that great province with impunity. Among the various multitude of those fierce invaders, we may distinguish, with some degree of clearness, three great armies, or rather nations, successively vanquished by the valor of Probus. He drove back the Franks into their morasses; a descriptive circumstance from whence we may infer that the confederacy known by the manly appellation of Free, already occupied the flat maritime country, intersected and almost overflowed by the stagnating waters of the Rhine, and that several tribes of the Frisians and the Batavians had acceded to their alliance."⁵

13. Probus was succeeded by Carus, who reigned till Dec. 25, A. D. 283, and was then, at his death, succeeded by his two sons Carinus and Numerian. Numerian died, or was murdered, Sept. 12, A. D. 284, and was succeeded by Diocletian September 17, and Carinus was murdered in the following May. And through Diocletian's divided power arose Constantine. While Constantine reigned as Caesar in Gaul (A. D. 306-312), a body of Franks and Alemanni

603

invaded that province. Constantine defeated them, and "several of their princes" and "a great number of their youth" "were exposed by his order to the wild beasts in the amphitheater of Treves."⁶ After this, both Franks and Alemanni seem to have remained

on their own side of the Rhine till the time of Constantius, the son of Constantine, about A. D. 350-351.

14. Constans, the surviving brother of Constantius, was murdered February, A. D. 350, by the command of Magnentius, an ambitious soldier, who had usurped the purple. This left Magnentius and Constantius to dispute the sole reign of the empire. The dispute was soon brought to a close, however, at the battle of Mursa (Essek) on the river Drave. Magnentius was defeated, and "throwing away the imperial ornaments, escaped with some difficulty from the pursuit of the light horse, who incessantly followed his rapid flight from the banks of the Drave to the foot of the Julian Alps." He managed to escape into Gaul, where he gathered some forces, but was defeated the second time, and to escape being given up to Constantius, he killed himself by falling on his sword, Aug. 10, A. D. 353, leaving Constantius in undisputed possession of the empire.

15. "In the blind fury of civil discord, Constantius had abandoned to the barbarians of Germany the countries of Gaul which still acknowledged the authority of his rival. A numerous swarm of Franks and Alemanni were invited [A. D. 351] to cross the Rhine, by presents and promises, by the hopes the spoil, and by a perpetual grant of all the territories which they should be able to subdue. But the emperor, who for a temporary service had thus imprudently provoked the rapacious spirit of the barbarians, soon discovered and lamented the difficulty of dismissing these formidable allies, after they had tasted the richness of the Roman soil. Regardless of the nice distinction of loyalty and rebellion, these undisciplined robbers treated as their natural enemies all the subjects of the empire who possessed any property which they were desirous of acquiring. Forty-five flourishing cities, -- Tongres, Cologne, Treves, Worms, Spires, Strasburgh, etc., -- besides a far greater number of towns and villages, were pillaged, and for the most part reduced of ashes.

604

16. "The barbarians of Germany, still faithful to the maxims of their ancestors, abhorred the confinement of walls, to which they applied the odious names of prisons and sepulchers; and, fixing their independent habitations on the banks of rivers, the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Meuse, they secured themselves against the danger of a surprise, by a rude and hasty fortification of large trees, which were felled and thrown across the roads. The Alemanni were established in the modern countries of Alsace and Lorraine; the Franks occupied the island of the Batavians, together with an extensive district of Brabant, which was then known by the appellation of Toxandria, and may deserve to be considered as the original seat of their Gallic monarchy."

17. In a note Gibbon fixes the date of this permanent entrance of the Franks into Gaul: "The paradox of P. Daniel, that the Franks never obtained any permanent settlement on this side of the Rhine before the time of Clovis, is refuted with much learning and good sense by M. Biet, who has proved, by a chain of evidence, their uninterrupted possession of Toxandria one hundred and thirty years before the accession of Clovis." The accession

of Clovis was in A. D. 481; and one hundred and thirty years carry us back to A. D. 351, as dated above.

18. "From the sources to the mouth of the Rhine, the conquests of the Germans extended above forty miles to the west of that river, over a country peopled by colonies of their own name and nation; and the scene of their devastations was three times more extensive than that of their conquests. At a still greater distance the open towns of Gaul were deserted, and the inhabitants of the fortified cities, who trusted to their strength and vigilance, were obliged to content themselves with such supplies of corn as they could raise on the vacant land within the enclosure of their walls. The diminished legions, destitute of pay and provisions, of arms and discipline, trembled at the approach, and even at the name, of the barbarians."⁷

19. Nov. 6, A. D. 355, Constantius associated Julian with himself in the rule of the empire, and appointed to his administration the provinces of the West, with the immediate task of driving out

605

these barbarians whom Constantius had invited in with the promise of a grant in perpetuity of all the lands which they should subdue, and "which they claimed as their own by the right of conquest and treaties." In five campaigns, A. D. 356-359, by terrible fighting, and with much loss, Julian did succeed in delivering Gaul from both peoples, for a while; though the Salian Franks "were permitted to possess their new establishment of Toxandria, as the subjects and auxiliaries of the Roman Empire."⁸

20. The deliverance of Gaul by the defeat of the Alemanni and the Franks established the military fame of Julian; but "unless he had been able to revive the martial spirit of the Romans, or to introduce the arts of industry and refinement among their savage enemies, he could not entertain any rational hopes of securing the public tranquillity, either by the peace or conquest of Germany. Yet the victories of Julian suspended, for a short time, the inroads of the barbarians, and delayed the ruin of the Western Empire."⁹

21. Valentinian (A. D. 366) and Gratian (A. D. 378), each in turn, were obliged to defend Gaul against the Alemanni; for "the subjects of the empire often experienced that the Alemanni could neither be subdued by arms nor restrained by treaties."¹⁰ "The barbarians by whom the safety of Gaul had been chiefly threatened during the century preceding the accession of Valentinian, were the two great confederacies of the Franks and the Alemanni, the former of whom were settled along the right bank of the Rhine from Rotterdam to Mentz; while the latter, having broken down the feeble barrier whose ruins are now called the Pfahlgraben [ditch fortified with stakes], settled themselves in the fertile Agri Decumates, where for something like two centuries the Roman civilization had been dominant.

22. "Thus the Alemanni filled up that southwestern corner of Germany and Switzerland which is naturally bounded by the Rhine, as it flows westward to Basel, and then makes a sudden turn, at right angles, northward to Strasburg, Worms, and Mentz." -- Hodgkin.¹¹

606

23. After the time of Gratian the power of both the Alemanni and the Franks steadily grew until at the death of Valentinian III, A. D. 455, "the Alemanni and the Franks advanced from the Rhine to the Seine."¹²

24. This gave to the Franks all of northeastern Gaul north of the river Moselle; for "the humble colony which they so long maintained in the district of Toxandria, in Brabant, insensibly multiplied along the banks of the Meuse and Scheldt till their independent power filled the whole extent of the Second, or Lower, Germany."¹³ "As the Roman power declined along that district, their authority increased; early in the fifth century they had spread from the Rhine to the Somme."¹⁴

25. It gave to the Alemanni all the country of Gaul south of the Moselle from the Seine to the bend of the Rhine at Basel, in addition to their original possession between the wall of Probus and Winterthur in what is now Switzerland. And they had such prestige as a nation that a victory which Majorian, master-general of the cavalry and infantry of the empire, gained over nine hundred of them, who had crossed the Alps, about A. D. 457, was considered sufficiently meritorious to be rewarded with the imperial power and office.

26. Defeats by the Romans "did not break the power of the Alemanni, who, being pressed on by other barbarians in the North, were forced to advance southward and westward to conquer new countries for themselves. Hence, after the middle of the fifth century, we find them established, not only in the country now called Swabia, but also in a part of Switzerland and in Alsace. In these countries the Alemanni have maintained themselves ever since, and the greater part of the modern Swabians and the northern Swiss are descendants of that ancient race."¹⁵

27. "The territory of these two great confederacies [the Franks and the Alemanni] is constantly spoken of by contemporary writers as Francia and Alemannia. We feel that we are standing on the verge of modern history when we recognize in these two names the

607

France and the Allemagne of the French newspaper of to-day. Though other elements have been abundantly blended with each confederacy, it is not altogether forbidden us to recognize in these two barbarous neighbors of the Roman Empire in the fourth century, the ancestors of the two mighty nations which in our own day met in thunder on the plains of Gravelotte." -- Hodgkin.¹⁶

28. The later history of the Franks is easily suggested in the name of France. So also to the French is the later history of the Alemanni easily suggested in their name for Germany -- Allemagne. But in the word Germany this is not so easily understood. However, the Alemanni were not only one of the principal roots of the mighty German nation of to-day, but they played no small part in the history of Europe in the Middle Ages, and even to our own time. Under the rule of the Alemannian House of Hohenstaufen was the most glorious and prosperous period of medieval German history. With but a short interval, after the end of the Hohenstaufen dynasty the Alemannian House of Hapsburg held the imperial office in the "Holy Roman Empire," as long as that empire existed; and when it ceased to exist, still ruled in Austria; and does yet rule the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Alemannian House of Guelf furnished to England the House of Hanover and by it her present and most illustrious Queen Victoria. Spain in her glory was ruled by princes from the Alemanni. The Alemannian House of Hohenzollern made of Prussia one of the strongest States of Europe, and accomplished what had been the wish of ages, -- the vital union of all the little States into which the German people had been separated, -- and now rules the German Empire. The present emperor of Germany is directly descended from a prince of the Alemanni.

1 [Page 600] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. x, pars. 26, 27. All the quotations on this subject of Rome Divided and the Ten Kingdoms are from Gibbon, unless otherwise credited.

2 [Page 600] Chap. xi, pars. 18-22.

3 [Page 601] Chap. xii, par. 20.

4 [Page 602] Chap. x. pars. 22, 25.

5 [Page 602] Chap. xii, par. 18.

6 [Page 603] Chap. xiv, par. 18.

7 [Page 604] Chap. xix, pars. 20, 21.

8 [Page 605] Chap. xix, par. 25.

9 [Page 605] Id., par. 28.

10 [Page 605] Chap. xxvi, par. 10.

11 [Page 605] "Italy and Her Invaders." Vol. i, chap. iii, par. 6.

12 [Page 606] Chap. xxxvi, par. 5.

13 [Page 606] Chap. xxxi, par. 39.

14 [Page 606] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. France, History, par. 13.

15 [Page 606] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Alemanni.

16 [Page 607] "Italy and Her Invaders," Vol. i, part i, chap. iii, par. 6.

40. ROME DIVIDED -- THE SUEVI, THE VANDALS, AND THE BURGUNDIANS.

THE wide-extended name of Suevi filled the interior countries of Germany, from the banks of the Oder too those of the Danube. They were distinguished from the other Germans by their peculiar mode of dressing their long hair, which they gathered into a rude knot on the crown of the head; and they delighted in an ornament that showed their ranks more lofty and terrible in the eyes of the enemy. Jealous as the Germans were of military renown, they all confessed the superior valor of the Suevi."¹

2. "The numerous tribes of the Vandals were spread along the banks of the Oder and the seacoast of Pomerania and Mecklenburgh."² "The home of the Vandals, when we first meet with them in history, appears to correspond with the central and eastern part of Prussia. . . . As the Roman Empire grew weaker, the Vandals pressed southward, and eventually gave their name (Vandalici Montes) to the Riesen-Gebirge (Giant Mountains) between Silesia and Bohemia. They were conspicuous even among the chaste Teutonic warriors for their chastity." -- Hodgkin.³

3. "About the middle of the fourth century, the countries, perhaps of Lusace and Thuringia, on either side of the Elbe, were occupied by the vague dominion of the Burgundians; a warlike and numerous people of the Vandal race, whose obscure name insensibly swelled into a powerful kingdom, and has finally settled on a flourishing province.

4. "In the year A. D. 405 the haughty Rhodogast, or Radagaisus, marched from the northern extremities of Germany almost to the gates of Rome, and left the remains of his army to achieve the

609

destruction of the West. The Vandals, the Suevi, and the Burgundians formed the strength of this mighty host; but the Alani, who had found a hospitable reception in their new seats, added their active cavalry to the heavy infantry of the Germans, and the Gothic adventurers crowded so eagerly to the standard of Radagaisus, that, by some historians, he has been styled the king of the Goths. Twelve thousand warriors, distinguished above the vulgar by their noble birth or their valiant deeds, glittered in the van; and the whole multitude, which was not less than two hundred thousand fighting men, might be increased, by the accession of women, of children, and of slaves, to the amount of four hundred thousand persons. This formidable emigration issued from the same coast of the Baltic which had poured forth the myriads of the Cimbri and the Teutons, to assault Rome and Italy in the vigor of the republic."⁴

5. "The king of the confederate Germans, passed, without resistance, the Alps, the Po, and the Apennines, leaving on one hand the inaccessible palace of Honorius, securely buried among the marshes of Ravenna; and on the other the camp of Stilicho, who had fixed his headquarters at Ticinum or Pavia, but who seems to have avoided a decisive battle till he had assembled his distant forces. Many cities of Italy were pillaged or destroyed; and the siege of Florence, by Radagaisus, is one of the earliest events in the history of that celebrated republic, whose firmness checked and delayed the unskilful fury of the barbarians.

6. "Florence was reduced to the last extremity; and the fainting courage of the citizens was supported only by the authority of St. Ambrose, who had communicated, in a dream, the promise of a speedy deliverance. On a sudden they beheld, from their walls, the banners of Stilicho, who advanced with his united force to the relief of the faithful city, and who soon marked that fatal spot for the grave of the barbarian host [A. D. 406.] . . . The method of

610

surrounding the enemy with strong lines of circumvallation, which he had twice employed against the Gothic king, was repeated on a larger scale and with more considerable effect. . . .

7. "The imprisoned multitude of horses and men was gradually destroyed by famine, rather than by the sword; but the Romans were exposed, during the progress of such an extensive work, to the frequent attacks of an impatient enemy. . . . A seasonable supply of men and provisions had been introduced into the walls of Florence; and the famished host of Radagaisus was in its turn besieged. The proud monarch of so many warlike nations, after the loss of his bravest warriors, was reduced to confide either in the faith of a capitulation, or in the clemency of Stilicho. But the death of the royal captive, who was ignominiously beheaded, disgraced the triumph of Rome and of Christianity; and the short delay of his execution was sufficient to brand the conqueror with the guilt of cool and deliberate cruelty.

8. "After the defeat of Radagaisus, two parts of the German host, which must have exceeded the number of one hundred thousand men, still remained in arms between the Apennines and the Alps, or between the Alps and the Danube. It is uncertain whether they attempted to revenge the death of their general; but their irregular fury was soon diverted by the prudence and firmness of Stilicho, who opposed their march and facilitated their retreat; who considered the safety of Rome and Italy as the great object of his care; and who sacrificed, with too much indifference, the wealth and tranquillity of the distant provinces. The barbarians acquired, from the junction of some Pannonian deserters, the knowledge of the country, and of the roads; and the invasion of Gaul, which Alaric had designed, was executed [A. D. 406, Dec. 31] by the remains of the great army of Radagaisus.

9. "The victorious confederates pursued their march, and on the last day of the year [406], in a season when the waters of the Rhine were most probably frozen, they entered, without opposition, the defenseless provinces of Gaul. This memorable passage of the Suevi, the Vandals, the Alani, and the Burgundians, who never afterward retreated, may be considered as the fall of the Roman

611

Empire in the countries beyond the Alps; and the barriers which had so long separated the savage and the civilized nations of the earth, were from that fatal moment leveled with the ground."

10. "While the peace of Germany was secured by the attachment of the Franks and the neutrality of the Alemanni, the subjects of Rome, unconscious of their approaching calamities, enjoyed the state of quiet and prosperity, which had seldom blessed the frontiers of Gaul. Their flocks and herds were permitted to graze in the pastures of the barbarians; their huntsmen penetrated without fear or danger, into the darkest recesses of the Hercynian wood. The banks of the Rhine were crowned, like those of the Tiber, with elegant houses and well-cultivated farms; and if a poet descended the river, he might express his doubt on which side was situated the territory of the Romans.

11. "This scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert; and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolation of man. The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed; and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished after a long and obstinate siege; Strasburg, Spire, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread [A. D. 407] from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the barbarians, who drove before them, in a promiscuous crowd, the bishop, the senator, and the virgin, laden with the spoils of their houses and altars. . . . And in less than two years, the divided troops of the savages of the Baltic, whose numbers, were they fairly stated, would appear contemptible, advanced, without a combat, to the foot of the Pyrenean Mountains."⁵

12. "In the southeast of Gaul, the Burgundians, after many wars and some reverses, established themselves, with the consent of the Romans, in the district then called Sapaudia and now Savoy. Their territory was somewhat more extensive than the province

612

which was the cradle of the present royal house of Italy, since it stretched northward beyond the Lake of Neufchatel, and southward as far as Grenoble. . . . The lands they divided by lot, each one receiving half the estate of a Roman host or hospes." -- Hodgkin.⁶ They "soon conquered from the Romans the whole valley of the Rhone, in which they henceforth settled."⁷ Their conquests continued to spread until they occupied

"the whole of the Saone and the Lower Rhone from Dijon to the Mediterranean, and included also the western half of Switzerland." -- Hallam.⁸ And in 476, when the last vestige of the Western Empire vanished, the Burgundian kingdom included all of Switzerland that lies west of that part of the Rhine that flows from the south into the Lake of Constance.

13. "The Vandals and the Suevi went on to Spain." "The gates of Spain were treacherously betrayed to the public enemy" Oct. 13, A. D. 409. The consciousness of guilt, and the thirst of rapine, prompted the mercenary guards of the Pyrenees to desert their station, to invite the arms of the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Alani, and to swell the torrent which was poured with irresistible violence from the frontiers of Gaul to the sea of Africa. The misfortunes of Spain may be described in the language of its most eloquent historian, who has concisely expressed the passionate, and perhaps exaggerated, declamations of contemporary writers.

14. "The irruption of these nations was followed by the most dreadful calamities; as the barbarians exercised their indiscriminate cruelty on the fortunes of the Romans and the Spaniards, and ravaged with equal fury the cities and the open country. The progress of famine reduced the miserable inhabitants to feed on the flesh of their fellow creatures; and even the wild beasts, which multiplied without control in the desert, were exasperated by the taste of blood and the impatience of hunger, boldly to attack and devour their human prey. Pestilence soon appeared, the inseparable companion of famine; a large proportion of the people was swept away; and the groans of the dying excited only the envy of their surviving friends.

613

15. "At length the barbarians, satiated with carnage and rapine, and afflicted by the contagious evils which they themselves had introduced, fixed their permanent seats in the depopulated country. The ancient Galicia, whose limits included the kingdom of Old Castile, was divided between the Suevi and the Vandals; the Alani were scattered over the provinces of Carthagera and Lusitania, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean; and the fruitful territory of Boetica was allotted to the Silingi, another branch of the Vandalic nation. After regulating this partition, the conquerors contracted with their new subjects some reciprocal engagements of protection and obedience; the lands were again cultivated, and the towns and villages were again occupied by a captive people. The greatest part of the Spaniards was even disposed to prefer this new condition of poverty and barbarism to the severe oppressions of the Roman government; yet there were many who still asserted their native freedom, and who refused, more especially in the mountains of Galicia, to submit to the barbarian yoke.'⁹

16. "In the province of Galicia, the Suevi and the Vandals had fortified their camps, in mutual discord and hostile independence. The Vandals prevailed; and their adversaries were besieged in the Nervasian hills, between Leon and Oviedo, till the approach of Count Asterius compelled, or rather provoked, the victorious barbarians to remove [A. D. 428] the scene of the war to the plains of Boetica.

17. "The rapid progress of the Vandals soon required a more effectual opposition" than that of their fellow invaders; "and the master-general Castinus marched against them with a numerous army of Romans and Goths." This army was totally defeated, and "Seville and Carthage became the reward, or rather the prey, of the ferocious conquerors." The vessels which they found in the harbor of Carthage easily transported the Vandals to the islands of Majorca and Minorca, "where the Spanish fugitives, as in a secure recess, had vainly concealed their families and their fortunes." This experience on the sea encouraged them; and they promptly

614

accepted the invitation of Count Boniface,¹⁰ the military governor of Africa, to invade that country. The terrible Genseric was now king of the Vandals. The Alani had lost their king in battle, about A. D. 417, "and the remains of these Scythian wanderers, who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were afterward confounded."¹¹

18. "The vessels which transported [May, A. D. 429] the Vandals over the modern Strait of Gibraltar, a channel only twelve miles in breadth, were furnished by the Spaniards, who anxiously wished their departure, and by the African general, who had implored their formidable assistance. . . . The Vandals, who, in twenty years, had penetrated from the Elbe to Mount Atlas, were united under the command of their warlike king; and he reigned with equal authority over the Alani, who had passed, within the term of human life, from the cold of Scythia to the excessive heat of an African climate.

19. "The hopes of the bold enterprise had executed many brave adventurers of the Gothic nation; and many desperate provincials were tempted to repair their fortunes by the same means which had occasioned their ruin. Yet this various multitude amounted only to fifty thousand effective men; and though Genseric artfully magnified his apparent strength, by appointing eighty chiliarchs or commanders of thousands, the fallacious increase of old men, of children, and of slaves, would scarcely have swelled his army to the number of fourscore thousand persons. But his own dexterity and the discontents of Africa soon fortified the Vandal powers by the accession of numerous and active allies.

20. "The parts of Mauritania which border on the Great Desert and the Atlantic Ocean, were filled with a fierce and untractable race of men, whose savage temper had been exasperated, rather than reclaimed, by their dread of the Roman arms. The wandering Moors, as they gradually ventured to approach the seashore and

615

the camp of the Vandals, must have viewed with terror and astonishment the dress, the armor, the martial pride and discipline, of the unknown strangers who had landed on their coast; and the fair complexions of the blue-eyed warriors of Germany formed a very singular contrast with the swarthy or olive hue which is derived from the neighborhood of

the torrid zone. After the first difficulties had in some measure been removed, which arose from the mutual ignorance of their respective languages, the Moors, regardless of any future consequence, embraced the alliance of the enemies of Rome; and a crowd of naked savages rushed from the woods and valleys of Mount Atlas, to satiate their revenge on the polished tyrants who had injuriously expelled them from the native sovereignty of the land.

21. "The persecution of the Donatists was an event not less favorable to the designs of Genseric. Seventeen years before he landed in Africa, a public conference was held at Carthage, by the order of the magistrate. The Catholics were satisfied that, after the invincible reasons which they had alleged, the obstinacy of the schismatics must be inexcusable and voluntary; and the emperor Honorius was persuaded to inflict the most rigorous penalties on a faction which had so long abused his patience and clemency. Three hundred bishops, with many thousands of the inferior clergy, were torn from their churches, stripped of their ecclesiastical possessions, banished to the islands, and proscribed by the laws, if they presumed to conceal themselves in the provinces of Africa. Their numerous congregations, both in cities and in the country, were deprived of the rights of citizens, and of the exercise of religious worship. A regular scale of fines, from ten to two hundred pounds of silver, was curiously ascertained, according to the distinctions of rank and fortune, to punish the crime of assisting at a schismatic conventicle; and if the fine had been levied five times, without subduing the obstinacy of the offender, his future punishment was referred to the discretion of the imperial court.

22. "By these severities, which obtained the warmest approbation of St. Augustine, great numbers of Donatists were reconciled to the Catholic Church; but the fanatics who still persevered in their opposition were provoked to madness and despair; the distracted

616

country was filled with tumult and bloodshed; the armed troops of Circumcellions alternately pointed their rage against themselves, or against their adversaries; and the calendar of martyrs received on both sides a considerable augmentation. Under these circumstances, Genseric, a Christian, but an enemy of the orthodox communion, showed himself to the Donatists as a powerful deliverer, from whom they might reasonably expect the repeal of the odious and oppressive edicts of the Roman emperors. The conquest of Africa was facilitated by the active zeal, or the secret favor, of a domestic faction; the wanton outrages against the churches and the clergy of which the Vandals are accused, may be fairly imputed to the fanaticism of their allies; and the intolerant spirit which disgraced the triumph of Christianity contributed to the loss of the most important province of the West.

23. "The long and narrow tract of the African coast was filled with frequent monuments of Roman art and magnificence; and the respective degrees of improvement might be accurately measured by the distance from Carthage and the Mediterranean. A simple reflection will impress every thinking mind with the clearest idea of fertility and cultivation. The country was extremely populous; the inhabitants reserved a liberal

subsistence for their own use; and the annual exportation, particularly of wheat, was so regular and plentiful that Africa deserved the name of the common granary of Rome and of mankind. On a sudden the seven fruitful provinces, from Tangier to Tripoli, were overwhelmed by the invasion of the Vandals, whose destructive rage has perhaps been exaggerated by popular animosity, religious zeal, and extravagant declamation.

24. "War, in its fairest form, implies a perpetual violation of humanity and justice; and the hostilities of barbarians are inflamed by the fierce and lawless spirit which incessantly disturbs their peaceful and domestic society. The Vandals, where they found resistance, seldom gave quarter; and the deaths of their valiant countrymen were expiated by the ruin of the cities under whose walls they had fallen. Careless of the distinctions of age, or sex, or rank, they employed every species of indignity and torture to force from the captives a discovery of their hidden wealth. The

617

stern policy of Genseric justified his frequent examples of military execution; he was not always the master of his own passions, or of those of his followers; and the calamities of war were aggravated by the licentiousness of the Moors and the fanaticism of the Donatists."

25. The intrigue that had driven Count Boniface into unwilling rebellion was soon discovered. Both the sovereign and the count had been deceived. Boniface was forgiven, "his repentance was fervent and sincere;" but the calamity of having invited the Vandals into Africa could not be undone. "The inexorable king of the Vandals, disdaining all terms of accommodation, sternly refused to relinquish the possession of his prey. The band of veterans who marched under the standard of Boniface, and his hasty levies of provincial troops, were defeated with considerable loss; the victorious barbarians insulted the open country; and Carthage, Corta, and Hippo Regius were the only cities that appeared to rise above the general inundation.

26. "The generous mind of Count Boniface was tortured by the exquisite distress of beholding the ruin which he had occasioned, and whose rapid progress he was unable to check. After the loss of a battle, he retired into Hippo Regius, where [May, A. D. 430] he was immediately besieged by an enemy who considered him as the real bulwark of Africa. . . . The military labors and anxious reflections of Count Boniface were alleviated by the edifying conversation of his friend St. Augustine, till that bishop, the light and pillar of the Catholic Church, was gently released [Aug. 28, A. D. 430], in the third month of the siege, and in the seventy-sixth year of his age, from the actual and the impending calamities of his country.

27. "By the skill of Boniface, and perhaps by the ignorance of the Vandals, the siege of Hippo was protracted above fourteen months [A. D. 431]; the sea was continually open; and when the adjacent country had been exhausted by irregular rapine, the besiegers themselves were compelled by famine to relinquish their enterprise. The importance and danger of Africa were deeply felt by the regent of the West. Placidia implored the

assistance of her Eastern ally; and the Italian fleet and army were re-enforced by Asper, who sailed from Constantinople with a powerful armament. As soon as

618

the force of the two empires was united under the command of Boniface, he boldly marched against the Vandals; and the loss of a second battle irretrievably decided the fate of Africa. He embarked with the precipitation of despair; and the people of Hippo were permitted, with their families and effects, to occupy the vacant place of the soldiers, the greatest part of whom were either slain or made prisoners by the Vandals."

28. It was eight years after the capture of Hippo, before Carthage, the capital of the country, was taken. At this time Carthage stood as the second city in the Western Empire. In every respect the city deserved the title that was given it, -- "the Rome of the African world." "The reputation of the Carthaginians was not equal to that of their country, and the reproach of Punic faith still adhered to their subtle and faithless character. The habits of trade and the abuse of luxury had corrupted their manners; but their impious contempt of monks, and the shameless practise of unnatural lusts, are the two abominations which excite the pious vehemence of Salvian, the preacher of the age."

29. Oct. 9, A. D. 439, "Carthage was at length surprised by the Vandals, five hundred and eighty-five years after the destruction of the city and republic by the younger Scipio," -- "Carthage, which had risen again from the dust to be the rival of the towers of Rome; Carthage, rich in all the appliances of the highest civilization, in schools of art, in schools of rhetoric, in schools of philosophy; Carthage, the focus of law and government for the continent of Africa, the headquarters of the troops, the seat of the proconsul. In this city were to be found all the nicely graduated orders of the Roman official hierarchy, so that it was scarcely too much to say that every street, every square, had its own proper governor.

30. "Yet this was the city of which the great African, Augustine, had said: 'I came from my native town to Carthage, and everywhere around me roared the furnace of unholy love.' And too plainly does the language of Salvian, after all allowance made for rhetorical exaggeration, show what Augustine was thinking of when he wrote these words. Houses of ill fame swarming in each street and square, and haunted by men of the highest rank, and what should

619

have been venerable age; chastity outside the ranks of the clergy a thing unknown and unbelieved, and by no means universal within that enclosure; the darker vices, the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah, practised, avowed, gloried in, -- such is the picture which the Gaulish presbyter draws of the capital of Africa.

31. "Into this City of Sin marched the Vandal army, one might almost say, when one reads the history of their doings, the army of the Puritans. With all their cruelty and all their greed, they kept themselves unspotted by the licentiousness of the splendid city.

They banished the men who were earning their living by ministering to the vilest lusts. They rooted out prostitution with a wise, yet not a cruel, hand. In short, Carthage, under the rule of the Vandals, was a city transformed, barbarous but moral." -- Hodgkin.¹²

32. "The king of the Vandals severely reformed the vices of a voluptuous people; and the ancient, noble, ingenuous freedom of Carthage (these expressions of Victor are not without energy) was reduced by Genseric to a state of ignominious servitude. After he had permitted his licentious troops to satiate their rage and avarice, he instituted a more regular system of rapine and oppression. An edict was promulgated which enjoined all persons, without fraud or delay, to deliver their gold, silver, jewels, and valuable furniture or apparel to the royal officers; and the attempt to secrete any part of their patrimony was inexorably punished with death and torture, as an act of treason against the State. The lands of the proconsular province, which formed the immediate district of Carthage, were accurately measured and divided among the barbarians; and the conqueror reserved for his peculiar domain the fertile territory of Byzacium and the adjacent parts of Numidia and Getulia."¹³

33. Thus the kingdom of the Vandals was permanently fixed in Africa, where it remained as long as it was a kingdom at all, and as long as the Vandals were a nation. The terrible Genseric became "the tyrant of the sea;" and "before he died, in the fulness of years and of glory, he beheld the final extinction of the empire of the West."¹⁴

620

34. And of the three nations, the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians, "the Vandals, as we know, ruled Africa from Carthage; . . . the Burgundians were settled in the valley of the Rhone, and their chief capital was Lyons; the Suevi held the greater part of southern and western Spain, and their capital was Astorga."¹⁵

35. In A. D. 466 the Suevi "held the kingdom of Galicia," and not long afterward the "small part of the peninsula which now forms Portugal."¹⁶ And in the histories of Portugal, Africa, western Switzerland, and the duchy and county of Burgundy in France, is to be found the future story of the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians.

1 [Page 608] Chap. x, par. 25.

2 [Page 608] Chap. x, par. 8.

3 [Page 608] "Italy and Her Invaders." book iii, chap. ii, pars. 5, 6.

4 [Page 609] Chap. xxv, par. 20. The Alani here mentioned, were a part of that nation who had dwelt between the Volga and the Don, and when the Huns swept over their country in A. D. 375, these escaped and "advanced with intrepid courage toward the shores of the Baltic, associated themselves with the northern tribes of Germany, and

shared the spoil of the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain." -- Decline and Fall." chap. xxvi, par. 11.

5 [Page 611] Chap. xxx, pars. 15-19.

6 [Page 612] "Italy and Her Invaders," book ii, chap. iii, par. 14.

7 [Page 612] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Germany, part. ii, Confederation of Tribes, par. 2.

8 [Page 612] "Middle Ages," chap. i, part i, sec. ix, note viii.

9 [Page 613] Id., chap. xxxi, par. 36.

10 [Page 614] Count Boniface had been driven into unwilling rebellion by a court intrigue. See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxiii, par. 4.

11 [Page 614] Chap. xxxi, par. 38.

12 [Page 619] "Italy and Her Invaders," book i, chap. xx, par. 22, fourth from end.

13 [Page 619] Chap. xxxiii, pars. 5-13.

14 [Page 619] Chap. xxxvi, par. 22.

15 [Page 620] "Italy and Her Invaders," book iii, chap. iv, par. 7.

16 [Page 620] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Germany, Confederation of Tribes, par. 2

41. ROME DIVIDED -- THE VISIGOTHS.

It was reserved for the Goths, whose fortunes we are now about to trace, to deal the first mortal blow at the Roman State; to be the first to stand in the Forum of Roma Invicta, and prove to the amazed world (themselves half terrified with the greatness of their victory) that she who had stricken the nations with a perpetual stroke was now herself laid low."

2. "The information which Jordanes gives us as to the earliest home and first migration of the Goths, is as follows: --

"The island of Scanzia [peninsula of Norway and Sweden] lies in the Northern Ocean, opposite the mouths of the Vistula, in shape like a cedar-leaf. In this island, this manufactory of nations (officina gentium), dwelt the Goths, with other tribes.

"From this island the Goths, under their king Berig, set forth in search of new homes. They had but three ships, and as one of these, during their passage, always lagged behind, they called her Gepanta -- "the torpid one." Their crew, who ever after showed themselves more sluggish and clumsy than their companions, when they became a nation, bore a name derived from this quality -- Gepidae, the Loiterers.

"However, all came safely to land at a place which was called ever after, Gothi-scandza. From thence they moved forward to the dwellings of the Ulmerugi by the shores of the ocean. These people they beat in pitched battle and drove from their habitations, and then, subduing their neighbors the Vandals, they employed them as instruments of their own subsequent victories" -- Hodgkin.¹

3. A province of the southern part of Sweden is even yet called Gothland. And "the Swedes, who might well be satisfied with their own fame in arms, have in every age claimed the kindred glory of the Goths. To cross the Baltic was an easy and natural attempt. The inhabitants of Sweden were masters of a sufficient

622

number of large vessels with oars; and the distance is little more than one hundred miles from Carlsrona to the nearest ports of Pomerania and Prussia. Here, at length, we land on firm and historic ground. At least as early as the Christian era, and as late as the age of the Antonines [A. D. 138-180], the Goths were established toward the mouth of the Vistula, and in that fertile province where the commercial cities of Thorn, Elbing, Konigsberg, and Dantzic were long afterward founded.

4. "In the age of the Antonines the Goths were still seated in Prussia. About the reign of Alexander Severus [A. D. 222-235], the Roman province of Dacia had already experienced their proximity by frequent and destructive inroads. In this interval,

therefore, of about seventy years, we must place the second migration of the Goths from the Baltic to the Euxine; but the cause that produced it lies concealed among the various motives which actuate the conduct of unsettled barbarians.

5. "The first motions of the emigrants carried them to the banks of the Prypec, a river universally conceived by the ancients to be the southern branch of the Borysthenes [Dnieper]. The windings of that great stream through the plains of Poland and Russia gave a direction to their line of march, and a constant supply of fresh water and pasturage to their numerous herds of cattle. They followed the unknown course of the river, confident in their valor, and careless of whatever power might oppose their progress. The Bastarnae and the Venedi were the first who presented themselves; and the flower of their youth, either from choice or compulsion, increased the Gothic army. . . . As the Goths advanced near the Euxine [Black] Sea, they encountered a purer race of Sarmatians, the Jazyges, the Alani, and the Roxolani; and they were probably the first Germans who saw the mouths of the Borysthenes and of the Tanais[Don].

6. "The Goths were now in possession of the Ukraine, a country of considerable extent and uncommon fertility, intersected with navigable rivers which from either side discharge themselves into the Borysthenes, and interspersed with large and lofty forests of oak. The plenty of game and fish, the innumerable beehives, deposited in the hollows of old trees and in the cavities of rocks, and forming,

623

even in that rude age, a valuable branch of commerce, the size of the cattle, the temperature of the air, the aptness of the soil for every species of grain, and the luxuriance of the vegetation, all displayed the liberality of nature, and tempted the industry of man. But the Goths withstood all these temptations, and still adhered to a life of idleness, of poverty, and of rapine." -- Gibbon.²

7. In the reign of Philip, A. D. 244-49, the Goths overran Dacia, crossed the Danube, and made their way as far into the Roman Empire as the city of Marcianopolis, capital of the province of Moesia. "The inhabitants consented to ransom their lives and property by the payment of a large sum of money, and the invaders retreated back into their deserts, animated rather than satisfied with the first success of their arms against an opulent but feeble country."

8. In the reign of Decius, A. D. 250, they again crossed the Danube, and "scattered devastation over the province of Moesia. This is the first considerable occasion in which history mentions that great people, who afterward broke the Roman power, sacked the capital, and reigned in Gaul, Spain, and Italy. So memorable was the part which they acted in the subversion of the Western Empire, that the name of Goths is frequently, but improperly, used as a general appellation of rude and warlike barbarism."³

9. In the following hundred and twenty-five years the Goths made four naval expeditions round the Black Sea, through the Bosphorus, and over the Aegean Sea to

Greece, carrying devastation everywhere they went, and returning laden with untold wealth from the despoiled cities and provinces of the Eastern Empire of Rome. During this time the Goths had been steadily extending their power in the north, until in A. D. 375 the great Hermanric, between the eightieth and the hundred and tenth years of his age, had established the Gothic dominion over all the country and tribes between the river Danube and the Baltic Sea, and eastward to the river Don.

10. In the native seats of the Goths in Sweden, there were two divisions of them, named from their respective localities, Ostro, or East-Goths; and Visi-, or West-Goths; and in their camps, their

624

locations, and all their marches, this distinction was always preserved -- the Ostrogoths always pitching to the east, the Visigoths always to the west.

11. We now approach the time when this division leads to a final and wide separation. In 376 a mighty horde of Huns, having made their way from the borders of China, invaded the Gothic dominions on the east, and "precipitated on the provinces of the west the Gothic nation, which advanced in less than forty years from the Danube to the Atlantic, and opened a way by the success of their arms to the inroads of so many hostile tribes more savages than themselves."

12. The Huns drove the Ostrogoths upon the Visigoths, who, being hemmed in by the Danube, were compelled to seek some way of escape. In 376, the emperor Valens was informed "that the suppliant multitudes of that warlike nation whose pride was now humbled in the dust, covered a space of many miles along the banks of the river. With outstretched arms and pathetic lamentations, they loudly deplored their past misfortunes and their present danger; acknowledged that their only hope of safety was in the clemency of the Roman government; and most solemnly protested that if the gracious liberality of the emperor would permit them to cultivate the waste lands of Thrace, they should ever hold themselves bound, by the strongest obligations of duty and gratitude, to obey the laws, and to guard the limits, of the republic."⁴

13. Valens listened to their entreaties and agreed to receive them within the empire, provided they would deliver up their arms, and allow their children to be dispersed among the families of the Romans, both to serve as hostages and to be taught the ways of civilization. To this the Visigoths, in their distress, agreed. "The imperial mandate was at length received for transporting over the Danube the whole body of the [Visi] Gothic nation; but the execution of this order was a task of labor and difficulty.

14. "The stream of the Danube, which in those parts is above a mile broad, had been swelled by incessant rains; and in the tumultuous passage many were swept away, and drowned, by the

625

rapid violence of the current. A large fleet of vessels, of boats, and of canoes was provided; many days and nights they passed and repassed with indefatigable toil; and the most strenuous diligence was exerted by the officers of Valens that not a single barbarian of those who were reserved to subvert the foundations of Rome, should be left on the opposite shore. It was thought expedient that an accurate account should be taken of their numbers; but the persons who were employed soon desisted, with amazement and dismay, from the prosecution of the endless and impracticable task; and the principal historian of the age most seriously affirms that the prodigious armies of Darius and Xerxes, which had so long been considered as the fables of vain and credulous antiquity, were now justified, in the eyes of mankind, by the evidence of fact and experience.

15. "A probable testimony has fixed the number of the Gothic warriors at two hundred thousand men; and if we can venture to add the just proportion of women, of children, and of slaves, the whole mass of people which composed this formidable emigration must have amounted to near a million of persons, of both sexes and of all ages. The children of the Goths, those at least of a distinguished rank, were separated from the multitude. They were conducted, without delay, to the distant seats assigned for their residence and education; and as the numerous train of hostages or captives passed through the cities, their gay and splendid apparel, their robust and martial figure, excited the surprise and envy of the provincials."⁵

16. The officers appointed to receive the weapons of the Goths willingly received bribes instead; and when the task of transporting them over the Danube had been completed, the Visigoths stood a fully armed nation within Roman territory. The officers also who were appointed to deal out provisions to them conspired with the contractors, and "the vilest food was sold at an extravagant price; and in the room of wholesome and substantial provision, the market was filled with the flesh of dogs and unclean animals which had died of disease.

626

17. "To obtain the valuable acquisition of a pound of bread, the Goths resigned the possession of an expensive, though serviceable slave; and a small quantity of meat was greedily purchased with ten pounds of a precious, but useless, metal. When their property was exhausted, they continued this necessary traffic by the sale of their sons and daughters; and notwithstanding the love of freedom which animated every Gothic breast, they submitted to the humiliating maxim that it was better for their children to be maintained in a servile condition, than to perish in a wretched and helpless independence."⁶

18. The result was that the Visigoths broke loose and inflicted a terrible revenge upon the provinces of the Roman Empire. "In the course of their depredations a great number of the children of the Goths who had been sold into captivity, were restored to the embraces of their afflicted parents; but these tender interviews, which might have revived and cherished in their minds some sentiments of humanity, tended only to stimulate their

native fierceness by the desire of revenge. They listened, with eager attention to the complaints of their captive children, who had suffered the most cruel indignities from the lustful or angry passions of their masters; and the same cruelties, the same indignities, were severely retaliated on the sons and daughters of the Romans.

19. "The imprudence of Valens and his ministers had introduced into the heart of the empire a nation of enemies; but the Visigoths might even yet have been reconciled, by the manly confession of past errors, and the sincere performance of former engagements. These healing and temperate measures seemed to concur with the timorous disposition of the sovereign of the East; but, on this occasion alone, Valens was brave, and his unreasonable bravery was fatal to himself and to his subjects. He declared [A. D. 377] his intention of marching from Antioch to Constantinople to subdue this dangerous rebellion; and as he was not ignorant of the difficulties of the enterprise, he solicited the assistance of his nephew, the emperor Gratian, who commanded the forces of the West.

627

20. "On the 9th of August , 378, a day which has deserved to be marked among the most inauspicious of the Roman calendar, the emperor Valens, leaving under a strong guard his baggage and military treasure, marched from Adrianople to attack the Goths, who were encamped about twelve miles from the city." The Roman army was defeated, the emperor Valens and a "great number of brave and distinguished officers perished," and about two thirds of the Roman army were destroyed.⁷

21. Five months after the death of Valens, Jan. 19, A. D. 379, the emperor Gratian chose Theodosius as his associate in the imperial power; and Theodosius was successful in securing "the final capitulation of the Goths (Oct. 3, A. D. 382), four years, one month and twenty-five days after the defeat and death of the emperor Valens." Theodosius "died in the month of January, 395, and before the end of the winter of the same year, the Gothic nation was in arms.

22. "The Goths, instead of being impelled by the blind and headstrong passions of their chiefs, were now directed by the bold and artful genius of Alaric. That renowned leader was descended from the noble race of the Balti, which yielded only to the royal dignity of the Amali he had solicited the command of the Roman armies; and the imperial court provoked him to demonstrate the folly of their refusal and the importance of their loss. . . . Alaric disdained to trample any longer on the prostrate and ruined countries of Thrace and Dacia, and he resolved to seek a plentiful harvest of fame and riches in a province which had hitherto escaped the ravages of war."⁸

23. That province was Achaia, composed of the State of Greece. "The troops which had been posted to defend the Straits of Thermopylae retired, as they were directed, without attempting to disturb the secure and rapid passage of Alaric; and the fertile fields of Phocis and Boeotia were instantly covered by a deluge of barbarians, who massacred the males of an age to bear arms, and drove away the beautiful females with the spoil and

cattle of the flaming villages. The travelers who visited Greece several years afterward could easily discover the deep and bloody traces of the march of the Goths.

628

24. "The whole territory of Attica, from the promontory of Sunium to the town of Megara, was blasted by his baleful presence; and if we may use the comparison of a contemporary philosopher, Athens itself resembled the bleeding and empty skin of a slaughtered victim. The confidence of the cities of Peloponnesus in their natural rampart, had tempted them to neglect the care of their antique walls; and the avarice of the Roman governors had exhausted and betrayed the unhappy province. Corinth, Argos, Sparta, yielded without resistance to the arms of the Goths; and the most fortunate of the inhabitants were saved by death from beholding the slavery of their families and the conflagrations of their cities. The vases and statues were distributed among the barbarians, with more regard to the value of the materials than to the elegance of the workmanship; the female captives submitted to the laws of war; the enjoyment of beauty was the reward of valor; and the Greeks could not reasonably complain of an abuse which was justified by the example of the heroic times."⁹

25. Stilicho, the chief officer of Honorius, was sent with a powerful army into Greece to chastise Alaric and his Visigoths. The Roman army landed on the isthmus near Corinth. A great and stubborn battle was fought, in which the Romans at length prevailed. As the isthmus was held by the Romans, Alaric retreated to the mountain of Pholoe on the borders of Elis. There the Roman army surrounded the Visigoths; and Stilicho was so certain of their complete destruction in a short time, that he left his army, and went away "to enjoy his triumph in the theatrical games and lascivious dances of the Greeks." His soldiers turned their attention to robbing the country rather than watching the Visigoths; and Alaric with his army slipped away to Corinth, thirty miles distant, seized transports there, and conveyed his whole army across the gulf to the opposite shore, and Stilicho was "confounded by the intelligence that the Goths, who had eluded his efforts, were in full possession of the important province of Epirus."

26. Alaric then concluded a treaty of peace and alliance with the emperor of the East. Greece belonged to the Eastern Empire,

629

and Stilicho and his army belonged to the Western. As Alaric was now the ally of the emperor of the East, the western army was ordered to withdraw from the territory of the East. About this time Synesius, a Greek philosopher who was at Constantinople, delivered an oration before the emperor Areadius, in which the emperor was exhorted to banish luxury from the court and camp, and in the place of his barbarian mercenaries, to enlist an army of citizens of the empire, put himself at their head, and drive the whole host of barbarians back to Scythia, or reduce them to slavery.

27. Instead of acting upon this advice, "an edict was published at Constantinople which declared the promotion of Alaric to the rank of master-general of the Eastern Illyricum. The Roman provincials, and the allies, who had respected the faith of the treaties, were justly indignant that the ruin of Greece and Epirus should be so liberally rewarded. The Gothic conqueror was received as a lawful magistrate in the cities which he had so lately besieged. The fathers whose sons he had massacred, the husbands whose wives he had violated, were subject to his authority; and the success of his rebellion encouraged the ambition of every leader of the foreign mercenaries.

28. "The use to which Alaric applied his new command distinguishes the firm and judicious character of his policy. He issued his orders to the four magazines and manufacturers of offensive and defensive arms, Margus, Ratiaria, Naissus, and Thessalonica, to provide his troops with an extraordinary supply of shields, helmets, swords, and spears; the unhappy provincials were compelled to forge the instruments of their own destruction; and the barbarians removed the only defect which had sometimes disappointed the efforts of their courage. The birth of Alaric, the glory of his past exploits, and the confidence in his future designs insensibly united the body of the nation under his victorious standard; and with the unanimous consent of the barbarian chieftains, the master-general of Illyricum was elevated, according to ancient custom, on a shield, and solemnly proclaimed king of the Visigoths.

29. "Armed with this double power, seated on the verge of the two empires, he alternately sold his deceitful promises to the court

630

of Arcadius and of Honorius, till he declared and executed his resolution of invading the dominions of the west. The provinces of Europe which belonged to the Eastern emperor were already exhausted; those of Asia were inaccessible; and the strength of Constantinople had resisted his attack. But he was tempted by the fame, the beauty, the wealth of Italy, which he had twice visited; and he secretly aspired to plant the Gothic standard on the walls of Rome, and to enrich his army with the accumulated spoils of three hundred triumphs."¹⁰

30. In the years 400-403 A.D. Alaric led his Visigothic host through Pannonia, round the northern end of the Adriatic Sea, and spread devastation to Milan. "The emperor Honorius was distinguished above his subjects by the pre-eminence of fear, as well as of rank. The pride and luxury in which he was educated, had not allowed him to suspect that there existed on the earth any power presumptuous enough to invade the repose of the successor of Augustus. The arts of flattery concealed the impending danger, till Alaric approached the palace of Milan." At Milan, however, Alaric was checked, defeated, and obliged to retreat, by Stilicho, the general of the Roman legions that had been gathered from Britain, Gaul, and Italy. Although Alaric was thus defeated and compelled to retreat to his camp on the confines of Italy, and although his retreat "was considered as the deliverance of Italy," yet it was only a seeming deliverance; and his retreat was only for a season.

31. Shortly after Alaric had retired into Illyricum, he renounced the service and alliance of Arcadius, and concluded with Honorius "a treaty of peace and alliance, by which he was declared master-general of the Roman armies throughout the prefecture of Illyricum as it was claimed, according to the true and ancient limits, by the minister of Honorius." He was also granted a subsidy of four thousand pounds of gold. The office of master-general empowered him to enlist and organize the best army that he possibly could. "The fame of his valor invited to the Gothic standard the bravest of the barbarian warriors, who, from the Euxine to the Rhine, were agitated

631

by the desire of rapine and conquest;" and in five years Alaric and his Visigoths were again ready to invade the Western Empire.

32. And now, A. D. 408, the court of Honorius took a course which fully prepared the way for the sweeping success of such an invasion when it should again occur. Stilicho, the faithful minister of the emperor, and of the empire, who had twice delivered from the barbarians both the emperor and Italy, and who was still the only stay of falling Rome, was sacrificed to the treacherous ambition of a crafty rival. "The crafty Olympius," who exercised a splendid office, and "who concealed his vices under the mask of Christian piety, had secretly undermined the benefactor by whose favor he was promoted to the honorable offices of the imperial palace."

33. By representing to Honorius that Stilicho "already meditated the death of his sovereign, with the ambitious hope of placing the diadem on the head of his son Eucherius," Olympius succeeded in supplanting Stilicho in the mind of the emperor, and "the respectful attachment of Honorius was converted [May, A. D. 408] into fear, suspicion, and hatred." At the instigation of Olympius there were massacred of the friends of Stilicho, "the most illustrious officers of the empire: two praetorian prefects, of Gaul and of Italy; two masters-general of the cavalry and infantry; the masters of the offices; the quaestor, the treasurer, and the domestics; besides Stilicho himself.

34. "If Alaric himself had been introduced [September, A. D. 408] into the council of Ravenna, he would probably have advised the same measures which were actually pursued by the ministers of Honorius. The king of the Goths would have conspired, perhaps with some reluctance, to destroy the formidable adversary by whose arms, in Italy as well as in Greece, he had been twice overthrown. Their active and interested hatred laboriously accomplished the disgrace and ruin the great Stilicho. The Gothic prince would have subscribed with pleasure the edict which the fanaticism of Olympius dictated to the simple and devout emperor. Honorius excluded all persons who were adverse to the Catholic Church, from holding any office in the State, obstinately rejected the service of all those who dissented from his religion, and rashly disqualified many

632

of his bravest and most skilful officers who adhered to the pagan worship or who had imbibed the opinions of Arianism.

35. "These measures, so advantageous to an enemy, Alaric would have approved, and might perhaps have suggested; but it may perhaps seem doubtful whether the barbarian would have promoted his interest at the expense of the inhuman and absurd cruelty which was perpetrated by the direction, or at least with the connivance, of the imperial ministers. The foreign auxiliaries, who had been attached to the person of Stilicho, lamented his death; but the desire of revenge was checked by a natural apprehension for the safety of their wives and children, who were detained as hostages in the strong cities of Italy, where they had likewise deposited their most valuable effects. At the same hour, and as if by a common signal, the cities of Italy were polluted by the same horrid scenes of universal massacre and pillage, which involved in promiscuous destruction the families and fortunes of the barbarians.

36. "Exasperated by such an injury, which might have awakened the tamest and most servile spirit, they cast a look of indignation and hope toward the camp of Alaric, and unanimously swore to pursue, with just and implacable war, the perfidious nation that had so basely violated the laws of hospitality. By the imprudent conduct of the ministers of Honorius, the republic lost the assistance, and deserved the enmity, of thirty thousand of her bravest soldiers; and the weight of that formidable army, which alone might have determined the event of the war, was transferred from the scale of the Romans into that of the Goths."

37. In the month of October, A. D. 408, "Alaric, with bold and rapid marches, passed the Alps and the Po, hastily pillaged the cities of Aquileia, Altinum, Concordia, and Cremona, which yielded to his arms, increased his forces by the accession of thirty thousand auxiliaries, and, without meeting a single enemy in the field, advanced as far as the edge of the morass which protected the impregnable residence of the emperor of the West. Instead of attempting the hopeless siege of Ravenna, the prudent leader of the Goths proceeded to Rimini, stretched his ravages along the seacoast of the Adriatic, and meditated the conquest of the ancient mistress of the world.

633

38. "An Italian hermit, whose zeal and sanctity were respected by the barbarians themselves, encountered the victorious monarch, and boldly denounced the indignation of Heaven against the oppressors of the earth; but the saint himself was confounded by the solemn asseveration of Alaric that he felt a secret and preternatural impulse, which directed, and even compelled, his march to the gates of Rome.

39. "He felt that his genius and his fortune were equal to the most arduous enterprises, and the enthusiasm which he communicated to the Goths insensibly removed the popular, and almost superstitious, reverence of the nations for the majesty of the Roman name. His troops, animated by the hopes of spoil, followed the course of the Flaminian Way, occupied the unguarded passes of the Apennines, descended into the rich plains of

Umbria; and as they lay encamped on the banks of the Clitumnus, might wantonly slaughter and devour the milk-white oxen which had been so long reserved for the use of Roman triumphs. A lofty situation, and a seasonable tempest of and lightning,thunder preserved the little city of Narni; but the king of the Goths, despising the ignoble prey, still advanced with unabated vigor; and after he had passed through the stately arches, adorned with the spoils of barbaric victories, he pitched his camp under the walls of Rome [A. D. 408]

40. "By a skilful disposition of his numerous forces, who impatiently watched the moment of an assault, Alaric encompassed the walls, commanded the twelve principal gates, intercepted all communication with the adjacent country, and vigilantly guarded the navigation of the Tiber, from which the Romans derived the surest and most plentiful supply of provisions. The first emotions of the nobles and of the people were those of surprise and indignation that a vile barbarian should dare to insult the capital of the world: but their arrogance was soon humbled by misfortune.

41. "That unfortunate city gradually experienced the distress of scarcity, and at length the horrid calamities of famine. The daily allowance of three pounds of bread was reduced to one-half, to one-third, to nothing; and the price of corn still continued to rise in a rapid and extravagant proportion. The poorer citizens, who were unable to purchase the necessaries of life, solicited the precarious

634

charity of the rich; and for a while the public misery was alleviated by the humanity of Laeta, the widow of the emperor Gratian, who had fixed her residence at Rome, and consecrated to the use of the indigent the princely revenue which she annually received from the grateful successors of her husband. But these private and temporary donatives were insufficient to appease the hunger of a numerous people; and the progress of famine invaded the marble palaces of the senators themselves.

42. "The persons of both sexes who had been educated in the enjoyment of ease and luxury, discovered how little is requisite to supply the demands of nature, and lavished their unavailing treasures of gold and silver to obtain the coarse and scanty sustenance which they would formerly have rejected with disdain. The food the most repugnant to sense or imagination, the aliments the most unwholesome and pernicious to the constitution, were eagerly devoured, and fiercely disputed, by the rage of hunger. A dark suspicion was entertained that some desperate wretches fed on the bodies of their fellow creatures, whom they had secretly murdered; and even mothers (such was the horrid conflict of the two most powerful instincts implanted by nature in the human breast), even mothers are said to have tasted the flesh of their slaughtered infants!

43. "Many thousands of the inhabitants of Rome expired in their houses or in the streets for want of sustenance; and as the public sepulchers without the walls were in the power of the enemy, the stench which arose from so many putrid and unburied carcasses,

infected the air; and the miseries of famine were succeeded and aggravated by the contagion of a pestilential disease.

44. "The last resource of the Romans was in the clemency, or at least in the moderation, of the king of the Goths. The senate, who in this emergency assumed the supreme powers of government, appointed two ambassadors to negotiate with the enemy. This important trust was delegated [A. D. 409] to Basilius, a senator of Spanish extraction, and already conspicuous in the administration of provinces; and to John, the first tribune of the notaries, who was peculiarly qualified by his dexterity in business as well as by his former intimacy with the Gothic prince.

635

45. "When they were introduced into his presence, they declared, perhaps in a more lofty style than became their abject condition, that the Romans were resolved to maintain their dignity, either in peace or war; and that, if Alaric refused them a fair and honorable capitulation, he might sound his trumpets, and prepare to give battle to an innumerable people, exercised in arms, and animated by despair. 'The thicker the hay, the easier it is mowed,' was the concise reply of the barbarian; and this rustic metaphor was accompanied by a loud and insulting laugh, expressive of his contempt for the menaces of an unwarlike populace, enervated by luxury before they were emaciated by famine. He then condescended to fix the ransom which he would accept as the price of his retreat from the walls of Rome; all the gold and silver in the city, whether it were the property of the State, or of individuals; all the rich and precious movables; and all the slaves who could prove their title to the name of barbarians.

46. "The ministers of the senate presumed to ask, in a modest and suppliant tone, 'If such, O king, are your demands, what do you intend to leave us?' -- 'YOUR LIVES!' replied the haughty conqueror. They trembled, and retired. Yet, before they retired, a short suspension of arms was granted, which allowed some time for a more temperate negotiation. The stern features of Alaric were insensibly relaxed; he abated much of the rigor of his terms, and at length consented to raise the siege, on the immediate payment of five thousand pounds of gold, of thirty thousand pounds of silver, of four thousand robes of silk, of three thousand pieces of fine scarlet cloth, and of three thousand pounds' weight of pepper.

47. "As soon as the Romans had satisfied the rapacious demands of Alaric, they were restored, in some measure, to the enjoyment of peace and plenty. Several of the gates were cautiously opened; the importation of provisions from the river and the adjacent country was no longer obstructed by the Goths; the citizens resorted in crowds to the free market, which was held during three days in the suburbs; and while the merchants who undertook this gainful trade made a considerable profit, the future subsistence of

636

the city was secured by the ample magazines which were deposited in the public and private granaries."

48. Alaric withdrew his army into Tuscany, where he established "his winter quarters, and the Gothic standard became the refuge of forty thousand barbarian slaves, who had broken their chains, and aspired, under the command of their great deliverer, to revenge the injuries and the disgrace of their cruel servitude. About the same time, he received a more honorable re-enforcement of Goths and Huns, whom Adolphus, the brother of his wife, had conducted, at his pressing invitation, from the banks of the Danube to those of the Tiber, and who had cut their way, with some difficulty and loss, through the superior numbers of the imperial troops. A victorious leader, who united the daring spirit of a barbarian with the art and discipline of a Roman general, was at the head of a hundred thousand fighting men; and Italy pronounced, with terror and respect, the formidable name of Alaric." 49. About eighteen months were next spent in efforts, real or affected, at negotiations between the court of Honorius and Alaric. In this time Rome was again reduced, and again spared. "But the court and councils of Honorius still remained a scene of weakness and distraction, of corruption and anarchy;" and "the crime and folly of the court of Ravenna were expiated a third time by the calamities of Rome.

50. "The king of the Goths, who no longer dissembled his appetite for plunder and revenge, appeared in arms under the walls of the capital; and the trembling senate, without any hopes of relief, prepared, by a desperate resistance, to delay the ruin of their country. But they were unable to guard against the secret conspiracy of their slaves and domestics; who, either from birth or interest, were attached to the cause of the enemy. At the hour of midnight [Aug. 24, A. D. 410] the Salarian gate was silently opened, and the inhabitants were awakened by the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet. Eleven hundred and sixty-three years after the foundation of Rome, the imperial city, which had subdued and civilized so considerable a part of mankind, was delivered to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia.

637

51. "The writers, the best disposed to exaggerate their clemency, have freely confessed that a cruel slaughter was made of the Romans; and that the streets of the city were filled with dead bodies, which remained without burial during the general consternation. The despair of the citizens was sometimes converted into fury; and whenever the barbarians were provoked by opposition, they extended the promiscuous massacre to the feeble, the innocent, and the helpless. The private revenge of forty thousand slaves was exercised without pity or remorse; and the ignominious lashes which they had formerly received were washed away in the blood of the guilty or obnoxious families.

52. "In the pillage of Rome, a just preference was given to gold and jewels, which contain the greatest value in the smallest compass and weight; but after these portable riches had been removed by the more diligent robbers, the palaces of Rome were rudely stripped of their splendid and costly furniture. The side-boards of massy plate, and the variegated wardrobes of silk and purple, were irregularly piled in the wagons that always

followed the march of a Gothic army. The most exquisite works of art were roughly handled or wantonly destroyed; many a statue was melted for the sake of the precious materials; and many a vase, in the division of the spoil, was shattered into fragments by the stroke of a battle-ax.

53. "The acquisition of riches served only to stimulate the avarice of the rapacious barbarians, who proceeded by threats, by blows, and by tortures, to force from their prisoners the confession of hidden treasure. Visible splendor and expense were alleged as the proof of a plentiful fortune; the appearance of poverty was imputed to a parsimonious disposition; and the obstinacy of some misers, who endured the most cruel torments before they would discover the secret object of their affection, was fatal to many unhappy wretches, who expired under the lash for refusing to reveal their imaginary treasures."

54. Flames added their terrors to those of robbery and slaughter; and even "the wrath of Heaven supplied the imperfections of hostile rage," for "the proud Forum of Rome, decorated with the

638

statues of so many gods and heroes, was leveled in the dust by the stroke of lightning." Nor is it "easy to compute the multitudes who, from an honorable station and a prosperous fortune, were suddenly reduced to the miserable condition of captives and exiles."

"This awful catastrophe of Rome filled the astonished empire with grief and terror. So interesting a contrast of greatness and ruin disposed the fond credulity of the people to deplore, and even to exaggerate, the afflictions of the queen of cities. The clergy, who applied to recent events the lofty metaphors of Oriental prophecy, were sometimes tempted to confound the destruction of the capital and the dissolution of the globe."

55. On the sixth day after entering Rome, Alaric again took up his march, Aug. 29, A. D. 410, "at the head of an army encumbered with rich and weighty spoils, along the Appian Way into the southern provinces of Italy, destroying whatever dared to oppose his passage, and contenting himself with the plunder of the unresisting country.

56. "No sooner had he reached the extreme land of Italy than he was attracted by the neighboring prospect of a fertile and peaceful island. Yet even the possession of Sicily he considered only as an intermediate step to the important expedition which he already meditated against the continent of Africa. The Straits of Rhegium and Messina are twelve miles in length, and in the narrowest passage, about one mile and a half broad; and the fabulous monsters of the deep, the rocks of Scylla, and the whirlpool of Charybdis, could terrify none but the most timid and unskilful mariners.

57. "Yet as soon as the first division of the Goths had embarked, a sudden tempest arose, which sunk or scattered many of the transports; their courage was daunted by the terrors of a new element; and the whole design was defeated by the premature death of Alaric [A. D. 410], which fixed, after a short illness, the fatal term of his conquests. The ferocious character of the barbarians was displayed in the funeral of a hero, whose valor and fortune they celebrated with mournful applause. By the labor of a captive multitude, they forcibly diverted the course of the Busentinus, a small river that

639

washes the walls of Consentia. The royal sepulcher, adorned with the splendid spoils and trophies of Rome, was constructed in the vacant bed; the waters were then restored to their natural channel: and the secret spot where the remains of Alaric had been deposited, was forever concealed by the inhuman massacre of the prisoners who had been employed to execute the work.

58. "Above four years [A. D. 408-412] elapsed from the successful invasion of Italy by the arms of Alaric to the voluntary retreat of the Goths under the conduct of his successor, Adolphus; and during the whole time, they reigned without control over a country which, in the opinion of the ancients, had united all the various excellences of nature and art. The prosperity, indeed, which Italy had attained in the auspicious age of the Antonines, had gradually declined with the decline of the empire. The fruits of a long peace perished under the rude grasp of the barbarians; and they themselves were incapable of tasting the more elegant refinements of luxury, which had been prepared for the use of the soft and polished Italians.

59. "Each soldier, however, claimed an ample portion of the substantial plenty, the corn and cattle, oil and wine, that was daily collected and consumed in the Gothic camp; and the principal warriors insulted the villas and gardens, once inhabited by Lucullus and Cicero, along the beautiful coast of Campania. Their trembling captives, the sons and daughters of Roman senators, presented in goblets of gold and gems, large draughts of Falernian wine to the haughty victors, who stretched their huge limbs under the shade of plane-trees, artificially disposed to exclude the scorching rays, and to admit the genial warmth, of the sun. These delights were enhanced by the memory of past hardships; the comparison of their native soil, the bleak and barren hills of Scythia, and the frozen banks of the Elbe and Danube, added new charms to the felicity of the Italian climate."

60. Adolphus "the successor of Alaric, suspended the operations of war; and seriously negotiated with the imperial court a treaty of friendship and alliance. It was the interest of the ministers of Honorius, who were now released from the obligation of their extravagant

640

oath to deliver Italy from the intolerable weight of the Gothic powers; and they readily accepted their service against the tyrants and barbarians who infested the provinces

beyond the Alps. Adolphus, assuming the character of a Roman general, directed his march [A. D. 412] from the extremity of Campania to the southern provinces of Gaul. His troops, either by force or agreement, immediately occupied the cities of Narbonne, Toulouse, and Bordeaux; and though they were repulsed by Count Boniface from the walls of Marseilles, they soon extended their quarters from the Mediterranean to the ocean."

61. When Alaric first invested Rome, in 408, he by some means obtained possession of Placidia, the sister of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius; and, though respectfully treated, she had been held ever since by the Goths either as a hostage or a captive. She was, in 408, about twenty years of age. Before leaving Italy, Adolphus proposed to make Placidia his wife and queen. Honorius rejected with disdain the proposal of an alliance so injurious to every sentiment of Roman pride; but Placidia received with favor the proposal. "The marriage of Adolphus and Placidia was consummated before the Goths retired from Italy; and the solemn, perhaps the anniversary, day of their nuptials was afterward celebrated in the house of Ingenus, one of the most illustrious citizens of Narbonne in Gaul.

62. "The bride, attired and adorned like a Roman empress, was placed on a throne of state; and the king of the Goths, who assumed, on this occasion, the Roman habit, contented himself with a less honorable seat by her side. The nuptial gift which, according to the custom of his nation, was offered to Placidia, consisted of the rare and magnificent spoils of her country. Fifty beautify youths in silken robes carried a basin in each hand; and one of these basins was filled with pieces of gold, the other with precious stones of an inestimable value. . . . The barbarians enjoyed the insolence of their triumph; and the provincials rejoiced in this alliance, which tempered, by the mild influence of love and reason, the fierce spirit of their Gothic lord."

63. In A. D. 414, Adolphus invaded Spain, and took the city of Barcelona. At that city, in August, A. D. 415, Adolphus was assassinated,

641

and Singeric took the Visigothic throne. "The first act of his reign was the inhuman murder of the six children of Adolphus, the issue of a former marriage, whom he tore without pity from the feeble arms of a venerable bishop. The unfortunate Placidia, instead of the respectful compassion which she might have excited in the most savage breasts, was treated with cruel and wanton insult. The daughter of the emperor Theodosius, confounded among a crowd of vulgar captives, was compelled to march on foot about twelve miles before the horse of a barbarian, the assassin of a husband whom Placidia loved and lamented. But Placidia soon obtained the pleasure of revenge; and the view of her ignominious sufferings might rouse an indignant people against the tyrant, who was assassinated on the seventh day of his usurpation.

64. "After the death of Singeric, the free choice of the nation bestowed the Gothic scepter on Wallia[A. D. 415-419], whose warlike and ambitious temper appeared, in the

beginning of his reign, extremely hostile to the republic. He marched in arms from Barcelona to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, which the ancients revered and dreaded as the boundary of the world. But when he reached the southern promontory of Spain, and, from the rock now covered by the fortress of Gibraltar, contemplated the neighboring and fertile coast of Africa, Wallia resumed the designs of conquest which had been interrupted by the death of Alaric. The winds and waves again disappointed the enterprise of the Goths; and the minds of a superstitious people were deeply affected by the repeated disasters of storms and shipwrecks.

65. "In this disposition, the successor of Adolphus no longer refused to listen to a Roman ambassador, whose proposals were enforced by the real, or supposed, approach of a numerous army. A solemn treaty was stipulated and observed; Placidia was honorably restored to her brother; six hundred thousand measures of wheat were delivered to the hungry Goths, and Wallia engaged to draw his sword in the service of the empire. A bloody war was instantly excited among the barbarians of Spain, and the contending princes are said to have addressed their letters, their ambassadors, and their hostages, to the throne of the Western emperor, exhorting

642

him to remain a tranquil spectator of their contest, the events of which must be favorable to the Romans, by the mutual slaughter of their common enemies.

66. "The Spanish War was obstinately supported, during three campaigns, with desperate valor and various success; and the martial achievements of Wallia diffused through the empire the superior renown of the Gothic hero. He exterminated the Silingi, who had irretrievably ruined the elegant plenty of the province of Boetica. He slew, in battle, the king of the Alani; and the remains of those Scythian wanderers who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were ever afterward confounded.

67. "The Vandals themselves and the Suevi yielded to the efforts of the invincible Goths. The promiscuous multitude of barbarians, whose retreat had been intercepted, were driven into the mountains of Galicia, where they still continued, in a narrow compass, and on a barren soil, to exercise their domestic and implacable hostilities. In the pride of victory, Wallia was faithful to his engagements; he restored his Spanish conquests to the obedience of Honorius; and the tyranny of the imperial officers soon reduced an oppressed people to regret the time of their barbarian servitude.

68. "His victorious Goths, forty-three years after they had passed the Danube, were established [A. D. 419], according to the faith of treaties, in the possession of the second Aquitaine, a maritime province between the Garonne and the Loire, under the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bordeaux. That metropolis, advantageously situated for the trade of the ocean, was built in a regular and elegant form; and its numerous inhabitants were distinguished among the Gauls by their wealth, their learning, and the politeness of their manners. The adjacent province, which has been fondly compared to the garden of

Eden, is blessed with a fruitful soil and a temperate climate; the face of the country displayed the arts and the rewards of industry; and the Goths, after their martial toils, luxuriously exhausted the rich vineyards of Aquitaine. The Gothic limits were enlarged by the additional gift of some neighboring dioceses; and the successors of Alaric fixed their royal residence at Toulouse,

643

which included five populous quarters, or cities, within the spacious circuit of its walls."

69. In A. D. 419, Wallia was succeeded by Theodoric, the son of Alaric, who had reigned thirty-two years when he was killed in the battle of Chalons, A. D. 451. He was succeeded by his eldest son Torismond, who was murdered in A. D. 453 by his brother Theodoric II, who reigned till A. D. 466. "The design of extinguishing the Roman Empire in Spain and Gaul was conceived, and almost completed, in the reign of Euric, who assassinated his brother Theodoric [A. D. 466], and displayed, with a more savage temper, superior abilities, both in peace and war. He passed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, subdued the cities of Saragossa and Pampeluna, vanquished in battle the martial nobles of the Tarragonese province, carried his victorious arms into the heart of Lusitania, and permitted the Suevi to hold the kingdom of Galicia under the Gothic monarchy of Spain. The efforts of Euric were not less vigorous or less successful in Gaul; and throughout the country that extends from the Pyrenees to the Rhone and the Loire, Berry and Auvergne were the only cities, or dioceses, which refused to acknowledge him as their master."

70. Later the Visigoths yielded to the Franks "the greatest part of their Gallic Possessions; but their loss was amply compensated by the easy conquest and secure enjoyment of the provinces of Spain. From the monarchy of the Goths, which soon involved the Suevic kingdom of Galicia, the modern Spaniards still derive some national vanity."¹¹

71. "In Spain the Goth supplies an important element in the modern nation. And that element has been neither forgotten nor despised. Part of the unconquered region of northern Spain, the land of Asturia, kept for a while the name of Gothia, as did the Gothic possessions in Gaul and Crim. The name of the people who played so great a part in all southern Europe, and who actually ruled over so large a part of it, has now wholly passed away; but it is in Spain that its historical impress is to be looked for."¹²

1 [Page 621] "Italy and Her Invaders," book 1. pars 1, 4. The name which Hodgkingives as Jordanes, is given by Gibbon and others as Jornandes. He was a Goth.

2 [Page 623] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Chap. x. pars. 3,4,8-11.

3 [Page 623] Id., pars. 3,12.

- 4 [Page 624] Chap xxvi, par. 13.
- 5 [Page 625] Chap xxvi. par.14.
- 6 [Page 626] Id., par. 15.
- 7 [Page 627] Id. pars. 16,17,21.
- 8 [Page 627] Chap xxx, par, 1.
- 9 [Page 628] Chap xxx, pars. 1,2.
- 10 [Page 630] Chap xxx. Pars 3,4.
- 11 [Page 643] Chaps. xxx, pars. 23-25; xxxi, pars. 7-39; xxxvi, par. 22; xxxviii, par. 29.
- 12 [Page 643] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Goths, par. 18.

42. ROME DIVIDED -- THE ANGLES AND SAXONS.

THE Angles and Saxons, the freedom-loving progenitors of the English race, were the next barbarians to plant themselves on the territory of what had been the majestic empire of Rome.

2. "For the fatherland of the English race we must look far away from England itself. In the fifth century after the birth of Christ the one country which we know to have borne the name of Angeln, or England, lay within the district which is now called Sleswick, a district in the heart of the peninsula that parts the Baltic from the Northern seas. Its pleasant pastures, its black-timbered homesteads, its prim little townships looking down on inlets of purple water, were then but a wild waste of heather and sand, girt along the coast with a sunless woodland, broken here and there by meadows that crept down to the marshes and the sea.

3. "The dwellers in this district, however, seem to have been merely an outlying fragment of what was called the Engle, or English folk, the bulk of whom lay probably in what is now Lower Hanover and Oldenburg. On one side of them the Saxons of Westphalia held the land from the Weser to the Rhine; on the other, the Eastphalian Saxons stretched away to the Elbe. North again of the fragment of the English folk in Sleswick lay another kindred tribe, the Jutes, whose name is still preserved in their district of Jutland. Engle, Saxon, and Jute all belonged to the same low German branch of the Teutonic family; and at the moment when history discovers them they were being drawn together by the ties of a common blood, common speech, common social and political institutions. There is little ground indeed for believing that the three tribes looked on themselves as one people, or that we can as yet apply to them, save by anticipation, the common name of Englishmen.

645

But each of them was destined to share in the conquest of the land in which we live [England], and it is from the union of all of them, when its conquest was complete, that the English people has sprung.

4. "Of the temper and life of the folk in this older England we know little. But from the glimpses that we catch of it when conquest had brought them to the shores of Britain, their political and social organization must have been that of the German race to which they belonged. In their villages lay ready formed the social and political life which is round us in the England of to-day. A belt of forest or waste parted each from its fellow villages, and within this boundary or mark the 'township,' as the village was then called, from the 'tun' or rough fence and trench that served as its simple fortification, formed a complete and independent body, though linked by ties which were strengthening every day, to the townships about it and the tribe of which it formed a part. Its social center was

the homestead where the aetheling or eorl, a descendant of the first English settlers in the waste, still handed down the blood and traditions of his fathers.

5. "Around this homestead or aethel, each in its little croft, stood the lowlier dwellings of freelings or ceorls . . . The eorl was distinguished from his fellow villagers by his wealth and his nobler blood; he was held by them in a hereditary reverence; and it was from him and his fellow aethelings that host leaders, whether of the village or the tribe, were chosen in times of war. But this claim to precedence rested simply on the free recognition of his fellow villagers. Within the township every freeman or ceorl was equal. It was the freeman who was the base of village society. He was the 'free-necked man,' whose long hair floated over a neck which had never bowed to a lord. He was the 'weaponed man,' who alone bore spear and sword, and who alone preserved that right of selfredress or private war which in such a state of society formed the main check upon lawless outrage."

6. "The religion of these men was the same as that of the rest of the German peoples . . . The common god of the English people was Woden, the war god, the guardian of ways and boundaries,

646

to whom his worshipers attributed the invention of letters, and whom every tribe held to be the first ancestor of its kings. Our own names for the days of the week still recall to us the gods whom our fathers worshiped in their German home land. Wednesday is Woden's-day, as Thursday is the day of Thunder, the god of air and storm and rain. Friday is Frea's-day, the deity of peace and joy and fruitfulness, whose emblems, borne aloft by dancing maidens, brought increase to every field and stall they visited. Saturday commemorates an obscure god, Saetere; Tuesday, the dark god, Tiw, to meet whom was death. Eostre, the god of the dawn or of the spring, lends his name to the Christian festival of the resurrection. Behind these floated the dim shapes of an older mythology: 'Wyrd,' the death-goddess, whose memory lingered long in the 'Weird' of Northern superstition; or the Shield-Maidens, the 'mighty women,' who, an old rhyme tells us, 'wrought on the battle-field their toil, and hurled the thrilling javelins.' Nearer to the popular fancy lay deities of wood and fell, or hero-gods of legend and song: Nicor, the water-sprite who survives in our nixies and 'Old Nick;' Weland, the forger of weighty shields and sharp-biting swords, who found a later home in the 'Weyland's smithy' of Berkshire; Egil, the hero-archer, whose legend is one with that of Cloudesly or Tell.

7. "The energy of these people found vent in a restlessness which drove them to take part in the general attack of the German race on the empire of Rome. For busy tillers and busy fishers as Englishmen were, they were at heart fighters, and their world was a world of war. Tribe warred with tribe, and village with village; even within the township itself feuds parted household from household, and passions of hatred and vengeance were handed on from father to son. Their mood was above all a mood of fighting men, venturesome, self-reliant, proud, with a dash of hardness and cruelty in it, but ennobled by the virtues which spring from war, -- by personal courage and loyalty to plighted

word, by a high and stern sense of manhood and the worth of man. A grim joy in hard fighting was already a characteristic of the race. War was the Englishman's 'shield-play' and 'sword-game;' the gleeman's verse took fresh fire as he sang of the rush o the host and the crash of the shield line. . .

647

8. "And next to their love of war came their love of the sea. Everywhere throughout Beowulf's song, as everywhere throughout the life that it pictures, we catch the salt whiff of the sea. The Englishman was as proud of his sea-craft as of his war-craft; sword in teeth, he plunged into the sea to meet walrus and sea-lion; he told of his whale-chase amid the icy waters of the North. Hardly less than his love for the sea was the love he bore to the ship that traversed it. In the fond playfulness of English verse the ship was 'the wave-floater,' the 'foam-necked,' 'like a bird' as it skimmed the wave-crest, 'like a swan' as its curved prow breasted the 'swan-road' of the sea.

9. "Their passion for the sea marked out for them their part in the general movement of the German nations. While Goth and Lombard were slowly advancing over the mountain and plain, the boats of the Englishmen pushed faster over the sea. Bands of English rovers, outdriven by stress of fight, had long found a home there, and lived as they could by sack of vessel or coast. Chance has preserved for us in a Sleswick peat-bog one of the war keels of these early pirates. The boat is flat-bottomed, seventy feet long and eight or nine feet wide, its sides of oak boards fastened with bark ropes and iron bolts. Fifty oars drove it over the waves with a freight of warriors whose arms, axes, swords, lances, and knives were found heaped together in its hold.

10. "Like the galleys of the Middle Ages, such boats could only creep cautiously along from harbor to harbor in rough weather; but in smooth water their swiftness fitted them admirably for the piracy by which the men of these tribes were already making themselves dreaded. Its flat bottom enabled them to beach the vessel on any fitting coast; and a step on shore at once transformed the boatmen into a war-band. From the first the daring of the English race broke out in the secrecy and suddenness of the pirate's swoop, in the fierceness of their onset, in the careless glee with which they seized either sword or oar. 'Foes are they,' sang a Roman poet of the time, 'fierce beyond other foes, and cunning as they are fierce; the sea is their school of war, and the storm their friend; they are sea-wolves that prey on the pillage of the world!'

11. "Of the three English tribes the Saxons lay nearest to the

648

empire, and they were naturally the first to touch the Roman world; before the close of the third century, indeed, their boats appeared in such force in the English Channel as to call for a special fleet to resist them. The piracy of our fathers had thus brought them to the shores of a land which, dear as it is now to Englishmen, had not as yet been trodden

by English feet. This land was Britain. When the Saxon boats touched its coast, the island was the westernmost province of the Roman Empire. In the fifty-fifth year before Christ a descent of Julius Caesar revealed it to the Roman world; and a century after Caesar's landing, the emperor Claudius undertook its conquest. The work was swiftly carried out. Before thirty years were over, the bulk of the island had passed beneath the Roman sway, and the Roman frontier had been carried to the Frith of Forth and of Clyde. . . .

12. "For three hundred years the Roman sword secured order and peace without Britain and within; and with peace and order came a wide and rapid prosperity. Commerce sprang up in ports among which London held the first rank; agriculture flourished till Britain became one of the corn-exporting countries of the world; the mineral resources of the province were explored in the tin mines of Cornwall, the lead mines of Somerset or Northumberland, and the iron mines of the Forest of Dean. But evils which sapped the strength of the whole empire, told at last on the province of Britain." -- Green.¹

13. "Whilst Italy was ravaged by the Goths, and a succession of feeble tyrants oppressed the provinces beyond the Alps, the British island separated itself [A. D. 409] from the body of the Roman Empire. The regular forces which guarded that remote province, had been gradually withdrawn; and Britain was abandoned without defense to the Saxon pirates, and the savages of Ireland and Caledonia. The Britains, reduced to this extremity, no longer relied on the tardy and doubtful aid of a declining monarchy. They assembled in arms, repelled the invaders, and rejoiced in the important discovery of their own strength . . . Britain was irrecoverably lost. But as the emperors wisely acquiesced in the independence of

649

a remote province, the separation was not embittered by the reproach of tyranny or rebellion; and the claims of allegiance and protection were succeeded by the mutual and voluntary offices of national friendship. This revolution dissolved the artificial fabric of civil and military government, and the independent country, during a period of forty years [A. D. 409-449] till the descent of the Saxons, was ruled by the authority of the clergy, the nobles, and the municipal towns." -- Gibbon.²

14. "Here then, in the year 409, was our England an independent State. In the Anglo-Saxon chronicle -- the curious but meager record of early events, which is supposed to have existed in the time of Alfred, and even to have been partly compiled by that great king -- there is the following entry which singularly agrees with the chronology of Greek and Latin historians: --

"A. 409. -- This year the Goths took the city of Rome by storm, and after this the Romans never ruled in Britain, and this was about eleven hundred and ten years after it was built. Altogether they ruled in Britain four hundred and seventy years since Caius Julius first sought the land. -- knight.³

15. "It was to defend Italy against the Goths that Rome in the opening of the fifth century withdrew her legions from Britain, and from that moment the province was left to struggle unaided against the Picts. Nor were these its only enemies. While marauders from Ireland, whose inhabitants then bore the name of Scots, harried the West, the boats of Saxon pirates, as we have seen, were swarming off its eastern and southern coasts. For forty years Britain held out bravely against these assailants; but civil strife broke its powers of resistance, and its rulers fell back at last on the fatal policy by which the empire invited its doom while striving to avert it, -- the policy of matching barbarian against barbarian.

16. "By the usual promises of land and pay, a band of warriors was drawn for this purpose from Jutland in 449, with two ealdormen, Hengist and Horsa, at their head. If by English history we mean the history of Englishmen in the land which from that time they made their own, it is with this landing of Hengist's war-band

650

that English history begins. They landed on the shores of the Isle of Thanet at a spot known since as Ebbsfleet. No spot can be so sacred to Englishmen as the spot which first felt the tread of English feet." -- Green.⁴

17. "Hengist and Horsa, who, according to the Anglo-Saxon historians, landed in the year 449 on the shore which is called Ypwinesfleet, were personages of more than common sort. 'They were the sons of Wihtgils; son of Witta, Witta of Wecta, Wecta of Woden.' So says the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, and adds, 'From this Woden sprung all our royal families.' These descendants, in the third generation from the great Saxon divinity, came over in three boats. They came by invitation of Wyrtegeone -- Vortigern -- king of the Britons. The king gave them land in the southeast of the country, on condition that they should fight against the Picts; and they did fight, and had the victory wheresoever they came. And then they sent for the Angles, and told them of the worthlessness of the people and the excellences of the land. This is the Saxon narrative." -- Knight.⁵

18. "The work for which the mercenaries had been hired was quickly done, and the Picts are said to have been scattered to the winds in a battle fought on the eastern coast of Britain. But danger from the Pict was hardly over when danger came from the Jutes themselves. Their fellow pirates must have flocked from the Channel to their settlement in Thanet; the inlet between Thanet and the mainland was crossed, and the Englishmen won their first victory over the Britons in forcing their passage of the Medway at the village of Aylesford. A second defeat at the passage of the Cray drove the British forces in terror upon London; but the ground was soon won back again, and it was not till 465 that a series of petty conflicts which had gone on along the shores of Thanet made way for a decisive struggle at Wippedsfleet. Here, however, the overthrow was so terrible that from this moment all hope of saving northern Kent seems to have been abandoned, and it was only on its southern shore that the Britons held their ground. Ten years

651

later, in 475, the long contest was over, and with the fall of Lymme, whose broken walls look, from the slope to which they cling, over the great flat of Romney Marsh, the work of the first English conqueror was done." -- Green.⁶

19. "The arts and religion, the laws and language, which the Romans had so carefully planted in Britain, were extirpated by their barbarous successors. After the destruction of the principal churches, the bishops, who had declined the crown of martyrdom, retired with the holy relics into Wales and Armorica; the remains of their flocks were left destitute of any spiritual food; the practise, and even the remembrance, of Christianity were abolished.

20. "The kings of France maintained the privileges of their Roman subjects; but the ferocious Saxons trampled on the laws of Rome and of the emperors. The proceedings of civil and criminal jurisdiction, the titles of honor, the forms of office, the ranks of society, and even the domestic rights of marriage, testament, and inheritance, were finally suppressed: and the indiscriminate crowd of noble and plebeian slaves was governed by the traditionary customs, which had been coarsely framed for the shepherds and pirates of Germany.

21. "The language of science, of business, and of conversation, which had been introduced by the Romans, was lost in the general desolation. A sufficient number of Latin or Celtic words might be assumed by the Germans to express their new wants and ideas; but those illiterate pagans preserved and established the use of their national dialect. Almost every name, conspicuous either in the church or State, reveals its Teutonic origin; and the geography of England was universally inscribed with foreign characters and appellations. The example of a revolution, so rapid and so complete, may not easily be found."⁷

22. And from that time until now, the history of the Angles and Saxons -- the Anglo-Saxons -- is but the history of England -- Angle-land.

1 [Page 648] "Larger History of England," chap. i, parts. 1, 2, 11, 13-16.

2 [Page 649] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxi, pars. 41, 42.

3 [Page 649] "History of England," chap. iv. last paragraph.

4 [Page 650] "Larger History of England," chap. i. par. 17.

5 [Page 650] "History of England," chap. v. par. 6.

6 [Page 651] "Larger History of England," chap. i, par. 18.

7 [Page 651] Chap. xxxviii, pars. 34, 36, 37, 39.

652

43. ROME DIVIDED -- THE OSTROGOTHS ENTER THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

FOUR years after the Saxons set their feet on the soil of Britain the Ostrogoths established their independence [A. D. 453] in the Western Empire, where they remained as long as they were a nation.

2. It will be remembered that before the permanent separation of the Visigoths from their Eastern brethren, the whole Gothic nation, both Ostrogoths and Visigoths, was subject to the great Hermanric, whose dominions extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea; that the great body of the united nations dwelt in the country drained by the river Dnieper; and that in A. D. 375 the inundation of the Huns swept away the Alani, who dwelt between the Volga and the Don, and poured like a mighty flood upon the dominions of Hermanric. We have already traced the Visigoths from there to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean; we now return to the Ostrogoths, of whom, at the attack of the Huns, it is said: "The Ostrogoths submitted to their fate; and the royal race of the Amali will hereafter be found among the subjects of the haughty Attila." -- Gibbon.1

3. The power of the Huns steadily spread until the reign of Attila. (A. D. 423-453), whose dominions extended from the Black Sea and the Lower Danube to the Baltic, and from the Upper Danube to unknown limits in the steppes of Scythia, over "an empire which did not contain in the space of several thousand miles a single city." The capital -- "an accidental camp which, by the long and frequent residence of Attila, had insensibly swelled into a huge village" -- seems to have been near, if not exactly at the spot, where now Tokay is situated in Hungary.

653

4. "In the proud review of the nations who acknowledged the sovereignty of Attila, and who never entertained during his lifetime the thought of a revolt, the Gepidae and the Ostrogoths were distinguished by their numbers, their bravery, and the personal merit of their chiefs. The renowned Ardaric, king of the Gepidae, was the faithful and sagacious counselor of the monarch, who esteemed his intrepid genius, whilst he loved the mild and discreet virtues of the noble Walamir, king of the Ostrogoths.

5. "The crowd of vulgar kings, the leaders of so many martial tribes, who served under the standard of Attila, were ranged in the submissive order of guards and domestics round the person of their master. They watched his nod; they trembled at his frown; and at the first signal of his will they executed, without murmur or hesitation, his stern and absolute commands. In time of peace, the dependent princes, with their national troops, attended the royal camp in regular succession; but when Attila collected his military force, he was able to bring into the field an army of five, or, according to another account, of seven, hundred thousand barbarians."2

6. In A. D. 451 Attila, with an immense army, made a raid into Gaul, and the Ostrogoths went with him; the way in which it was brought about was this: Theodoric was at that time king of the Visigoths, in their country in southwestern Gaul; his two daughters "were given in marriage to the eldest sons of the kings of the Suevi and of the Vandals, who reigned in Spain and Africa."³ The one who married the son of the king of the Vandals, thus became the daughter-in-law of the terrible Genseric. "The cruel Genseric suspected that his son's wife had conspired to poison him; the supposed crime was punished by the amputation of her nose and ears; and the unhappy daughter of Theodoric was ignominiously returned to the court of Toulouse in that deformed and mutilated condition. This horrid act, which must seem incredible to a civilized age, drew tears from every spectator; but Theodoric was urged, by the feelings of a parent and a king, to revenge such irreparable injuries. The imperial ministers, who always cherished the discord of the barbarians, would have supplied the Goths with

654

arms and ships and treasures for the African war, and the cruelty of Genseric might have been fatal to himself, if the artful Vandal had not armed in his cause the formidable power of the Huns. His rich gifts and pressing solicitations inflamed the ambition of Attila; and the designs of Aetius and Theodoric were prevented by the invasion of Gaul.

7. "The kings and nations of Germany and Scythia, from the Volga perhaps to the Danube, obeyed the warlike summons of Attila. From the royal village, in the plains of Hungary, his standard moved [A. D. 451] toward the west; and after a march of seven or eight hundred miles he reached the conflux of the Rhine and the Neckar, where he was joined by the Franks who adhered to his ally, the elder of the sons of Clodion. A troop of light barbarians who roamed in quest of plunder, might choose the winter for the convenience of passing the river on the ice; but the innumerable cavalry of the Huns required such plenty of forage and provisions as could be procured only in a milder season; the Hercynian forest supplied materials for a bridge of boats; and the hostile myriads were poured, with resistless violence, into the Belgic provinces. . . . From the Rhine and the Moselle, Attila advanced into the heart of Gaul; crossed the Seine at Auxerre; and after a long and laborious march, fixed his camp under the walls of Orleans."

8. Orleans was besieged, and was obstinately defended. But when the defenses had been overcome, and the troops of Attila were entering the city, the imperial army appeared in sight, under the leadership of Aetius the Roman, and Theodoric the Visigoth, who pressed forward to the relief of the city.

9. "On their approach, the king of the Huns immediately raised the siege, and sounded a retreat to recall the foremost of his troops from the pillage of a city which they had already entered. The valor of Attila was always guided by his prudence; and as he foresaw the fatal consequences of a defeat in the heart of Gaul, he repassed the Seine, and expected the enemy in the plains of Chalons whose smooth and level surface was adapted

to the operations of his Scythian cavalry. . . . The nations from the Volga to the Atlantic were assembled on the plain of Chalons, but many of these

655

nations had been divided by faction, or conquest, or emigration: and the appearance of similar arms and ensigns which threatened each other, presented the image of a civil war. 10. "Cassiodorus had familiarly conversed with many Gothic warriors who served in that memorable engagement, -- 'a conflict,' as they informed him, 'fierce, various, obstinate, and bloody; such as could not be paralleled, either in the present or in past ages.' The number of the slain amounted to a hundred and sixty-two thousand, or according to another account, three hundred thousand persons; and these incredible exaggerations suppose a real and effective loss sufficient to justify the historian's remark that whole generations may be swept away, by the madness of kings, in the space of a single hour.

11. "The Huns were undoubtedly vanquished, since Attila was compelled to retreat. . . . It was determined in a general council of war, to besiege the king of the Huns in his camp, to intercept his provisions, and to reduce him to the alternative of a disgraceful treaty, or an unequal combat. But the impatience of the barbarians soon disdained these cautions and dilatory measures; and the mature policy of Aëtius was apprehensive that after the extirpation of the Huns, the republic would be oppressed by the pride and power of the Gothic nation."

12. As Theodoric had been killed in the battle, Aëtius "exerted the superior ascendent of authority and reason, to calm the passions which the son of Theodoric considered as a duty; represented, with seeming affection and real truth, the dangers of absence and delay; and persuaded Torismond to disappoint, by his speedy return, the ambitious designs of his brothers, who might occupy the throne and treasures of Toulouse. After the departure of the Goths, and the separation of the allied army, Attila was surprised at the vast silence that reigned over the plains of Chalons; the suspicion of some hostile stratagem detained him several days within the circle of his wagons; and his retreat beyond the Rhine confessed the last victory which was achieved in the name of the Western Empire."4

656

13. Before the raid into Gaul, Attila had demanded the hand of the princess Honoria, the daughter of Placidia, and sister to Valentinian III; but his offer was rejected. The next year after the battle of Chalons he renewed his demand, and it being again rejected, he, A. D. 452, again took the field, passed the Alps, invaded Italy, ravaging the country as he went, took possession of the royal palace of Milan, and "declared his resolution of carrying his victorious arms to the gates of Rome." Valentinian III had fled to Rome, and it was there decided by him, the Senate, and the people, to send a "solemn and suppliant embassy," headed by Pope Leo the Great, to deprecate the wrath of Attila. "The barbarian monarch listened with favorable, and even respectful attention; and the deliverance of Italy was purchased by the immense ransom, or dowry, of the princess Honoria.

14. "Before the king of the Huns evacuated Italy, he threatened to return more dreadful and more implacable, if his bride, the princess Honoria, were not delivered to his ambassadors within the term stipulated by the treaty. Yet, in the meanwhile, Attila relieved his tender anxiety by adding a beautiful maid, whose name was Ildico, to the list of his innumerable wives. Their marriage was celebrated with barbaric pomp and festivity, at his wooden palace beyond the Danube; and the monarch, oppressed with wine and sleep, retired at a late hour from the banquet to the nuptial bed. His attendants continued to respect his pleasures, or his repose, the greatest part of the ensuing day, till the unusual silence alarmed their fears and suspicions; and after attempting to awaken Attila by loud and repeated cries, they at length broke into the royal apartment. They found the trembling bride sitting by the bedside, hiding her face with her veil, and lamenting her own danger as well as the death [A. D. 453] of the king, who had expired during the night. An artery had suddenly burst; and as Attila lay in a supine posture, he was suffocated by a torrent of blood, which, instead of finding a passage through the nostrils, regurgitated into the lungs and stomach.

15. "The revolution which subverted the empire of the Huns established the fame of Attila, whose genius alone had sustained the huge and disjointed fabric. After his death, the boldest chieftains aspired to the rank of kings; the most powerful kings refused to

657

acknowledge a superior; and the numerous sons, whom so many various mothers bore to the deceased monarch, divided and disputed, like a private inheritance, the sovereign command of the nations of Germany and Scythia. The bold Ardaric felt and resented the disgrace of this servile partition; and his subjects, the warlike Gepidae, with the Ostrogoths, under the conduct of three valiant brothers, encouraged their allies to vindicate the rights of freedom and royalty. In a bloody and decisive conflict on the banks of the river Netad, in Pannonia, the lance of the Gepidae, the sword of the Goths, the arrows of the Huns, the Suevic infantry, the light arms of the Heruli, and the heavy weapons of the Alani, encountered or supported each other; and the victory of Ardaric was accompanied with the slaughter of thirty thousand of his enemies."⁵

16. "The battle was joined near the river Nedao, a stream in Pannonia, which modern geographers have not identified, but which was probably situated in that part of Hungary which is west of the Danube. There, says Jordanes, 'did all the various nations whom Attila had kept under his dominion, meet and look one another in the face. Kingdoms and peoples are divided against one another, and out of one body divers limbs are made, no longer governed by one impulse, but animated by mutual rage, having lost their presiding head. Such were those most mighty nations which had never found their peers in the world if they had not been sundered the one from the other, and gashed one another with mutual wounds. I trow it was a marvelous sight to look upon. There should you have seen the Goth fighting with his pike, the Gepid raging with his sword, the Rugian breaking the darts of the enemy at the cost of his own wounds, the Sueve pressing on with nimble foot,

the Hun covering his advance with a cloud of arrows, the Alan drawing up his heavy-armed troops, the Herul his lighter companies, in battle array.'

17. "We are not distinctly told what was the share of the Ostrogoths in this great encounter, and we may reasonably doubt whether all the German tribes were arranged on one side and all the Tartars on the other with such precision as a modern ethnologist would have used in an ideal battle of the nationalities. But the result is not

658

doubtful. After many desperate charges, victory, which they scarcely hoped for, sat upon the standards of the Gepidae. Thirty thousand of the Huns and their confederates lay dead upon the field, among them Ellak, Attila's first-born, 'by such a glorious death that it would have done his father's heart good to witness it.' The rest of his nation fled away across the Dacian plains, and over the Carpathian Mountains to those wide steppes of southern Russia, in which at the commencement of our history we saw the three Gothic nations taking up their abode." -- Hodgkin.⁶

18. "Ellac, the eldest son of Attila, lost his life and crown in the memorable battle of Netad; his early valor had raised him to the throne of the Acatzires, a Scythian people, whom he subdued; and his father, who loved the superior merit, would have envied the death of Ellac. His brother Dengisich, with an army of Huns, still formidable in their flight and ruin, maintained his ground above fifteen years on the banks of the Danube. The palace of Attila, with the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian Hills to the Euxine, became the seat of a new power, which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepidae. The Pannonia conquests from Vienna to Sirmium, were occupied by the Ostrogoths; and the settlements of the tribes, who had so bravely asserted their native freedom were irregularly distributed according to the measure of their respective strength."⁷

19. "When the Hunnish Empire broke in pieces on the death of Attila [A. D. 453], the East-Goths recovered their full independence. They now entered into relations with the empire, and settled on lands in Pannonia. During the greater part of the latter half of the fifth century, the East-Goths play in southeastern Europe nearly the same part which the West-Goths played [there] in the century before. They were seen going to and fro, in every conceivable relation of friendship and enmity with the Eastern Roman power, till, just as the West-Goths had done before them, they pass from the East to the West."⁸

659

20. Theodoric was the great king of the Ostrogothic power. And the course of events from the establishment of their independence till his accession to the Ostrogothic throne, A. D. 475, is thus told: "Theodoric the Ostrogoth, the fourteenth in lineal descent of the royal line of the Amali, was born in the neighborhood of Vienna [A. D. 455] two years after the death of Attila. A recent victory had restored the independence of the Ostrogoths; and the three brothers, Walamir, Theodemir, and Widimir, who ruled that

warlike nation with united counsels, had separately pitched their habitations in the fertile though desolate province of Pannonia. The Huns still threatened their revolted subjects, but their hasty attack was repelled by the single forces of Walamir, and the news of his victory reached the distant camp of his brother in the same auspicious moment that the favorite concubine of Theodemir was delivered of a son and heir. In the eighth year of his age, Theodoric was reluctantly yielded by his father to the public interest, as the pledge of the alliance which Leo, emperor of, the East, had consented to purchase by an annual subsidy of three hundred pounds of gold.

21. "The royal hostage was educated at Constantinople with care and tenderness. His body was formed to all the exercises of war, his mind was expanded by the habits of liberal conversation; he frequented the schools of the most skilful masters; but he disdained or neglected the arts of Greece; and so ignorant did he always remain of the first elements of science, that a rude mark was contrived to represent the signature of the illiterate king of Italy. The first four letters of his name were inscribed on a gold plate, and when it was fixed on the paper, the king drew his pen through the intervals. As soon as he had attained the age of eighteen, he was restored to the wishes of the Ostrogoths, whom the emperor aspired to gain by liberality and confidence.

22. "Walamir had fallen in battle; the youngest of the brothers, Widimir, had led away into Italy and Gaul an army of barbarians, and the whole nation acknowledged [A. D. 455-475] for their king the father of Theodoric. His ferocious subjects admired the strength and stature of their young prince; and he soon convinced them that he had not degenerated from the valor of his

660

ancestors. At the head of six thousand volunteers, he secretly left the camp in quest of adventures, descended the Danube as far as Singidunum, or Belgrade, and soon returned to his father with the spoils of a Sarmatian king whom he had vanquished and slain.

23. "Such triumphs, however, were productive only of fame, and the invincible Ostrogoths were reduced to extreme distress by the want of clothing and food. They unanimously resolved to desert their Pannonian encampments, and boldly to advance into the warm and wealthy neighborhood of the Byzantine court, which already maintained in pride and luxury so many bands of confederate Goths. After proving by some acts of hostility that they could be dangerous, or at least troublesome, enemies, the Ostrogoths sold at a high price their reconciliation and fidelity, accepted a donative of lands and money, and were entrusted with the defense of the Lower Danube, under the command of Theodoric, who succeeded, after his father's death [A. D. 475], to the hereditary throne of the Amali."⁹

24. Although Gibbon says they "resolved to desert their Pannonian encampments," it must not be understood that this is spoken of the whole nation, but rather the principal warriors; nor that these renounced either their claim or their possessions there; because the history that follows clearly shows that the Ostrogoths dwelt in Pannonia, and that

their superior power was exercised and gratefully acknowledged over all that province during the whole fifty-one years (A. D. 475-526) of the reign of Theodoric.

25. This was so even after the seat of the kingdom had been removed to Italy, as it was, in A. D. 489. "He reduced under a strong and regular government, the unprofitable countries of Rhaetia, Noricum, Dalmatia, and Pannonia, from the source of the Danube and the territory of the Bavarians, to the petty kingdom erected by the Gepidae on the ruins of Sirmium. . . . The Alemanni were protected, an inroad of the Burgundians was severely chastised, the conquest of Arles and Marseilles opened a free communication with the Visigoths, who revered him as their national protector, and as the guardian of his grandchild, the infant son of Alaric [II]."

661

ATJ 26. "His domestic alliances -- a wife, two daughters, a sister, and a niece -- united the family of Theodoric with the kings of the Franks, the Burgundians, the Visigoths, the Vandals, and the Thuringians, and contributed to maintain the harmony, or at least the balance, of the great republic of the West. . . . The Gothic sovereignty was established from Sicily to the Danube; from Sirmium, or Belgrade, to the Atlantic Ocean; and the Greeks themselves have acknowledged that Theodoric reigned over the fairest portion of the Western Empire."¹⁰

1 [Page 652] Chap. xxvi, par. 12.

2 [Page 653] Chap. xxxiv, par. 5.

3 [Page 653] Chap. xxxv, par. 4.

4 [Page 655] Chap. xxxv, pars. 4, 7, 9, 11.

5 [Page 657] Chap. xxxv, pars. 15, 16.

6 [Page 658] "Italy and Her Invaders," book iii, chap. i, par. 3.

7 [Page 658] Chap. xxxv, par. 16.

8 [Page 658] Encyclopedia Britannica, part. Goths, par. 14.

9 [Page 660] Chap. xxxix, par. 2, and note.

10 [Page 661] Id., pars. 10, 11.

662

44. ROME DIVIDED -- THE LOMBARDS.

THE Lombards fixed their name forever upon a part of the fallen empire of Western Rome. Lombardy, in the north of Italy, perpetuates the name of this nation, which at one time even spread its name over all Italy. Although the place where the Lombards permanently fixed their kingdom, and to which their name was given, was in Italy, that was not their first settlement within the Western Empire.

2. The Lombards, as well as the Ostrogoths, had been subjects of the empire of Attila, and obtained their freedom, settling in Noricum on the Danube, at the death of that savage warrior. They were of Vandal blood, and were the kindred of the Heruli and Burgundians.¹

3. "The name Lombard is the Italianized form of the national name of a Teutonic tribe, Longobardi, itself an Italian arrangement based on a supposed etymology of the Teutonic Langbard, Langobardi, the form used when they are first named by the Roman writers -- Velleius and Tacitus. The etymology which made the name mean Longbeard is too obvious not have suggested itself to the Italians, and perhaps to themselves; it is accepted by their first native chronicler, Paul the Deacon, who wrote in the time of Charles the Great [Charlemagne].

4. "But the name has also been derived from the region where they are first heard of. On the left bank of the Elbe, 'where Borde or Bord still signifies a fertile plain by the side of a river, ' a district near Magdeburg is still called the Lange Borde; and lower down the Elbe, on the same side, about Luneburg, Bardengan, with its Bardewik, is still found. It is here that Velleius, who accompanied Tiberius in his campaign in this part of Germany, and who

663

first mentions the name, places them. As late as the age of their Italian settlement [A. D. 568], the Lombards are called Bardi in poetical epitaphs, though this may be for the convenience of meter.

5. "Their own legends bring the tribe as worshipers of Odin [Woden] from Scandinavia to the German shore of the Baltic, under the name of Winili, a name which was given to them in a loose way as late as the twelfth century. By the Roman and Greek writers of the first two centuries of our era they are spoken of as occupying, with more or less extension at different times, the region which is now Hanover and the Altmark of Prussia. To the Romans they appeared a remarkable tribe; 'gens etiam Germana feritate ferocior' [fierce, bold, and savage above all the tribes of the Germans], says Velleius, who had fought against them under Tiberius; and Tacitus describes them as a race which, though few in

numbers, more than held their own among numerous powerful neighbors by their daring and love of war. In the quarrels of the tribes they appear to, have extended their borders; in Ptolemy's account of Germany, in the second century, they fill a large space among the races of the northwest and north."²

6. "The Lombards. This corrupt appellation has been diffused in the thirteenth century by the merchants and bankers, the Italian posterity of these savage warriors; but the original name of Langobards is expressive only of the peculiar length and fashion of their beards. I am not disposed either to question or to justify their Scandinavian origin; nor to pursue the migrations of the Lombards through unknown regions and marvelous adventures. About the time of Augustus and Trajan, a ray of historic light breaks on the darkness of their antiquities, and they are discovered, for the first time, between the Elbe and the Oder.

7. "Fierce beyond the example of the Germans, they delighted to propagate the tremendous belief that their heads were formed like the heads of dogs, and that they drank the blood of their enemies whom they vanquished in battle. The smallness of their numbers was recruited by the adoption of their bravest slaves; and alone,

664

amidst their powerful neighbors, they defended by arms their high-spirited independence. In the tempests of the north, which overwhelmed so many names and nations, this little bark of the Lombards still floated on the surface; they gradually descended toward the south and the Danube; and at the end of four hundred years, they again appear with their ancient valor and renown. Their manners were not less ferocious."³

8. When Attila united under his dreadful sway the kingdoms of both Germany and Scythia, the nation of the Lombards was comprised in the number of his subjects. And when "the kings and nations of Germany and Scythia obeyed the warlike summons of Attila" to invade the Western Empire, A. D. 451-453, this war-loving nation, so "fierce beyond the example of the Germans," was not left behind. The "ferocious" warriors of the Lombard nation were numbered with the forces with which Attila invaded Gaul and Italy; and that nation among the others regained its freedom at the death of Attila.

9. "Attila's sudden death, either by hemorrhage, or the vengeance of his Burgundian bride, checked the progress of the Hunnish Empire. The Ostrogoths, the Gepidae, and the Langobards obtained their independence after a severe struggle, whilst the remains of the nomadic Huns were lost in the rich pastoral steppes of southern Russia." -- Weber.⁴

10. To show more clearly not only the position of the Lombards after the battle of the Netad, but also that of the principal nations which had been subject to Attila, the following facts are given: On the left bank of the Danube, where it flows south, Attila's brother, Dengisich, with the remains of the Huns, "maintained his ground above fifteen years" in a kingdom that was "confined to the circle of his wagons." In A. D. 455, these Huns crossed the river and made an attack upon the Ostrogoths, but were repulsed by a

single division of the Ostrogoths under Walamir. About A. D. 468, Dengisich. with his "kingdom," invaded the Eastern Empire, but

665

lost his life, and his brother Irnac led the remnant of the Hunnish nation away into the Lesser Scythia, whence their fathers had come nearly a hundred years before.⁵

11. The Seyrri, whose king, Edecon, the father of Odoacer, "enjoyed the favor of Attila," and whose part it was in their turn to guard the royal village, remained in alliance with Dengisich for about thirteen years, when in a second bloody battle with the Ostrogoths, about A. D. 465, Edecon was killed, and the Seyrri, were defeated and dispersed..⁶

12. The wooden palace of Attila, on the Teyss, with the plains of what is now Upper Hungary, and "the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian Hills [and after Dengisich left, even from the Danube] to the Euxine [Black Sea], became the seat of a new power which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepidae," and was possessed by that nation about a hundred years.⁷

13. North of the Gepidae, and extending into "the southern provinces of Poland," was the country of the Heruli, who "fought almost naked," and whose bravery was like madness."⁸

14. On the west side of the Danube, as already shown, the Ostrogoths held "the Pannonian conquests from Vienna to Sirmium." Sirmium was near the mouth of the Save.

15. On the Danube above Vienna, and as best we can make out, possessing, for a while at least, both banks of the river, were seated the Lombards, who regained their independence at the death of Attila, A. D. 453. Some time afterward, at the command of the daughter of the king of the Lombards, a brother of the king of the Heruli was assassinated while a royal guest at the Lombard palace, apparently as a suitor for the hand of the Lombard princess. This brought on a war, and the Heruli were successful in imposing upon the Lombards "a tribute, the price of blood." We know not to a certainty how long the tribute was paid. We only know that the success of the Heruli made them insolent, and that their insolence was paid for by their ruin.

666

16. "The assassination of a royal guest was executed in the presence, and by the command, of the king's daughter, who had been provoked by some words of insult, and disappointed by his diminutive stature; and a tribute, the price of blood, was imposed on the Lombards by his brother, the king of the Heruli. Adversity revived a sense of moderation and justice, and the insolence of conquest was chastised by the signal defeat and irreparable dispersion of the Heruli, who were seated in the southern provinces of Poland."⁹

17. This expedition carried the main body of the Lombards beyond the Danube for a while, but the exploit only the more firmly established their power, which was afterward further displayed in the extirpation of the Gepidae. Later, A. D. 526-536, they took entire possession of Noricum and Pannonia, which they held till A. D. 566.

18. In A. D. 567 the Lombards, under their great king, Alboin, removed from Pannonia to Italy. And, "whatever might be the grounds of his security, Alboin neither expected nor encountered a Roman army in the field. He ascended the Julian Alps, and looked down with contempt and desire on the fruitful plains to which his victory [A. D. 568-570] communicated the perpetual appellation of LOMBARDY. . . . From the Trentine Hills to the gates of Ravenna and Rome, the inland regions of Italy became, without a battle or a siege, the lasting patrimony of the Lombards. . . . Delighted with the situation of a city which was endeared to his pride by the difficulty of the purchase, the prince of the Lombards disdained the ancient glories of Milan; and Pavia, during some ages, was respected as the capital of the kingdom of Italy."10

19. So wide-spread in Italy was the Lombard rule, that Lombardy "was indeed, for a time the name for Italy itself." From that time to this history of the Lombards is but the history of Italy; and Lombardy is still "the name of the finest province" of that country, which itself, might almost be called the key of history.

1[Page 662] See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. x, par. 8.

2[Page 663] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Lombards, pars. 2, 3.

3[Page 664] "Decline and Fall," chap. xiii, par.2.

4[Page 664] "Outlines of Universal History," sec. clxxx. Dr. George Weber was professor and director of the High School of Heidelberg, Germany.

5[Page 665] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxv. par. 16; chap. xxxix, par.2.

6[Page 665] Id., chap xxxvi, par. 29.

7[Page 665] Id., chap. xxxv, par. 16: chap. xiii, par.2.

8[Page 665] Id., chap. xliii, par.2; xxxix, par 10,note.

9[Page 666] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlii, par.2.

10[Page 666] chap. xiv, pars. 5-7, 14, 15.

45. ROME DIVIDED -- THE HERULIAN KINGDOM.

THE Heruli were a Vandalic tribe of ancient Germany. The first historic mention of them is about the beginning of the third century. In the great movement of the Goths from the Baltic to the Black Sea, the Heruli and the Burgundians are particularly mentioned. They fixed their habitation on "the marshy lands near the Lake Maeotis [Sea of Azov], were renowned for their strength and agility, and the assistance of their light infantry was eagerly solicited and highly esteemed in all the wars of the barbarians."¹

2. In the third naval expedition of the Goths, about A. D. 260, when Cyzicus was ruined, when Athens was sacked, when Greece was desolated, and when the temple of Diana at Ephesus was destroyed, the Heruli bore a most prominent part. Indeed, it is stated by one historian -- Syncellus -- that this expedition "was undertaken by the Heruli." And when the barbarian host had spread "the range of war both by land and by sea, from the eastern point of Sunium to the western coast of Epirus," and had "advanced within sight of Italy;" and when the emperor Gallienus "appeared in arms and checked the ardor of the enemy;" "Naulobatus, a chief of the Heruli, accepted an honorable capitulation, entered with a large body of his countrymen into the service of Rome, was invested with the ornaments of the consular dignity," and so was the first barbarian that ever held the office of Roman consul.²

3. When the great Hermanric (A. D. 331-361) subjected all the nations from the Black Sea to the Baltic, "the active spirit of the Heruli was subdued by the slow and steady perseverance of

668

the Goths; and after a bloody action, in which the king was slain, the remains of that warlike tribe became a useful accession to the camp of Hermanric."³

4. When, in A. D. 375-376, the nation of the Huns overran the Alani, subdued the Ostrogoths, and forced the Visigoths over the Danube, the Heruli retired from the coast of the Sea of Azov into the forests of central Germany, where we find them under the dominion of Attila. And when "the nations from the Volga to the Atlantic were assembled on the plain of Chalons," the Heruli, under the standard of Attila, bore no inferior part in that memorable conflict.⁴

5. After the death of Attila, when the battle of the Netad had restored to their independence the subject nations, a multitude of the youth of those nations enlisted in the service of the empire, and became "the defense and the terror of Italy," and finally subverted the Western Empire.

6. "The nations who had asserted their independence after the death of Attila, were established, by the right of possession or conquest, in the boundless countries to the north of the Danube, or in the Roman provinces between the river and the Alps. But the bravest of their youth enlisted in the army of confederates who formed the defense and the terror of Italy; and in this promiscuous multitude the names of the Heruli, the Scyrr, the Alani, the Turcilingi, and the Rugians, appear to have predominated."5

7. In this "promiscuous multitude" the Heruli predominated, even above those tribes which were predominant, and being so conspicuous both in numbers and in valor, their name was given to the whole body of "confederates," and the power which they soon established in Italy was called the kingdom of the Heruli. These confederates seem to have gone to Italy, A. D. 454-456, for we find them already there in 457, when the emperor Majorian, in preparing an expedition against the Vandals, was compelled to hire, in addition to them, "many thousands" of their former comrades in the service of Attila.

669

8. "Majorian, like the weakest of his predecessors, was reduced to the disgraceful expedient of substituting barbarian auxiliaries in the place of his unwarlike subjects, and his superior abilities could only be displayed in the vigor and dexterity with which he wielded a dangerous instrument, so apt to recoil on the hand that used it. Besides the confederates, who were already engaged in the service of the empire, the fame of his liberality and valor attracted the nations of the Danube, the Borysthenes, and perhaps of the Tanais. Many thousands of the bravest subjects of Attila, the Gepidae, the Ostrogoths, the Rugians, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Alani, assembled in the plains of Liguria; and their formidable strength was balanced by their mutual animosities."6

9. In the negotiations between Attila and Theodosius the younger, A. D. 446-448, Attila sent five or six successive embassies to the court of Constantinople, and "the two last ambassadors of the Huns, Orestes, a noble subject of the Pannonian province, and Edecon, a valiant chieftain of the tribe of the Scyrr, returned at the same time [A. D. 448] from Constantinople to the royal camp. Their obscure names were afterward illustrated by the extraordinary fortune and the contrast of their sons: the two servants of Attila became the fathers of the last Roman emperor of the West [Augustulus -- the diminutive Augustus], and of the first barbarian king of Italy [Odoacer]."7

10. Following the example of the "confederates," Orestes also went to Italy, but not till A. D. 475. "The example of these warriors was imitated by Orestes, the son of Tatullus, and the father of the last Roman emperor of the West. Orestes had never deserted his country. His birth and fortunes rendered him one of the most illustrious subjects of Pannonia. When that province was ceded to the Huns, he entered into the service of Attila, his lawful sovereign, obtained the office of his secretary, and was repeatedly sent ambassador to Constantinople, to represent the person, and signify the commands, of the imperious monarch. The death of that conqueror restored him to his freedom; and Orestes might honorably refuse

either to follow the sons of Attila into the Seythian desert, or to obey the Ostrogoths, who had usurped the dominion of Pannonia. He preferred the service of the Italian princes, the successors of Valentinian; and as he possessed the qualifications of courage, industry, and experience, he advanced with rapid steps in the military profession, till he was elevated, by the favor of Nepos [the emperor] himself, to the dignities of patrician, and master-general of the troops.

11. "These troops had been long accustomed to reverence the character and authority of Orestes, who affected their manners, conversed with them in their own language, and was intimately connected with their national chieftains, by long habits of familiarity and friendship. At his solicitation they rose in arms against the obscure Greek who presumed to claim their obedience; and when Orestes, from some secret motive, declined the purple, they consented, with the same facility, to acknowledge his son Augustulus as the emperor of the West. By the abdication of Nepos, Orestes had now attained the summit of his ambitious hopes; but he soon discovered, before the end of the first year, that the lessons of perjury and ingratitude which a rebel must inculcate will be retorted against himself, and that the precarious sovereign of Italy was only permitted to choose whether he would be the slave or the victim of his barbarian mercenaries.

12. "The dangerous alliance of these strangers had oppressed and insulted the last remains of Roman freedom and dignity. At each revolution their pay and privileges were augmented; but their insolence increased in a still more extravagant degree; they envied the fortune of their brethren in Gaul, Spain and Africa, whose victorious arms had acquired an independent and perpetual inheritance; and they insisted on their peremptory demand, that a third part of the lands of Italy should be immediately divided among them.

13. "Orestes, with a spirit which, in another situation, might be entitled to our esteem, chose rather to encounter the rage of an armed multitude than to subscribe the ruin of an innocent people. He rejected the audacious demand; and his refusal was favorable to

the ambition of Odoacer, a bold barbarian, who assured his fellow soldiers that if they dared to associate under his command, they might soon extort the justice which had been denied to their dutiful petitions.

14. "From all the camps and garrisons of Italy, the confederates, actuated by the same resentment and the same hopes, impatiently flocked to the standard of this popular leader; and the unfortunate patrician, overwhelmed by the torrent, hastily retreated to the strong city of Pavia, the episcopal seat of the holy Epiphany. Pavia was immediately besieged, the fortifications were stormed, the town was pillaged; and although the bishop might labor, with much zeal and some success, to save the property of the church and the chastity of female captives, the tumult could only be appeased by the execution of

Orestes. His brother Paul was slain in an action near Ravenna; and the helpless Augustulus, who could no longer command the respect, was reduced to implore the clemency, of Odoacer.

15. "That successful barbarian was the son of Edecon, who, in some remarkable transactions, had been the colleague of Orestes himself. The honor of an ambassador should be exempt from suspicion; and Edecon had listened to a conspiracy against the life of his sovereign. But this apparent guilt was expiated by his merit or repentance; his rank was eminent and conspicuous; he enjoyed the favor of Attila; and the troops under his command, who guarded, in their turn, the royal village, consisted of a tribe of Scyrri, his immediate and hereditary subjects. In the revolt of the nations, they still adhered to the Huns; and more than twelve years afterward, the name of Edecon is honorably mentioned in their unequal contests with the Ostrogoths, which was terminated after two bloody battles, by the defeat and dispersion of the Scyrri. Their gallant leader, who did not survive this national calamity, left two sons, Onulf and Odoacer, to struggle with adversity, and to maintain as they might, by rapine or service, the faithful followers of their exile. Onulf directed his steps toward Constantinople, where he sullied, by the assassination of a generous benefactor, the fame which he had acquired in arms.

672

16. "His brother Odoacer led a wandering life among the barbarians of Noricum, with a mind and a fortune suited to the most desperate adventures; and when he had fixed his choice, he piously visited the cell of Severinus, the popular saint of the country, to solicit his approbation and blessing. The lowness of the door would not admit the lofty stature of Odoacer; he was obliged to stoop; but in that humble attitude the saint could discern the symptoms of his future greatness; and addressing him in a prophetic tone, 'Pursue,' said he, 'your design; proceed to Italy; you will soon cast away this coarse garment of skins; and your wealth will be adequate to the liberality of your mind.'

17. "The barbarian, whose daring spirit accepted and ratified the prediction, was admitted into the service of the Western Empire, and soon obtained an honorable rank in the guards. His manners were gradually polished, his military skill was improved, and the confederates of Italy would not have elected him for their general, unless the exploits of Odoacer had established a high opinion of his courage and capacity. Their military acclamations saluted him with the title of king [Aug. 23, A. D. 476]; but he abstained, during his whole reign, from the use of purple and diadem, lest he should offend those princes whose subjects, by their accidental mixture, had formed the victorious army, which time and policy might insensibly unite into a great nation.

18. "Royalty was familiar to the barbarians, and the submissive people of Italy was prepared to obey, without a murmur, the authority which he should condescend to exercise as the vicegerent of the emperor of the West. But Odoacer had resolved to abolish that useless and expensive office; and such is the weight of antique prejudice, that it required some boldness and penetration to discover the extreme facility of the enterprise. The unfortunate Augustulus was made the instrument of his own disgrace; he

signified his resignation to the Senate, and that assembly, in their last act of obedience to a Roman prince, still affected the spirit of freedom, and the forms of the constitution.

19. "An epistle was addressed, by their unanimous decree, to the emperor Zeno, the son-in-law and successor of Leo, who had

673

lately been restored, after a short rebellion, to the Byzantine throne. They solemnly `disclaim the necessity, or even the wish, of continuing any longer the imperial succession in Italy; since, in their opinion, the majesty of a sole monarch is sufficient to pervade and protect, at the same time, both the East and the West. In their own name and in the name of the people, they consent that the seat of universal empire shall be transferred from Rome to Constantinople, and they basely renounce the right of choosing their master, the only vestige that yet remained of the authority which had given laws to the world.

20. "'The republic (they repeated that name without a blush) might safely confide in the civil and military virtues of Odoacer; and they humbly request that the emperor would invest him with the title of patrician, and the administration of the diocese of Italy.' The deputies of the Senate were received at Constantinople with some marks of displeasure and indignation; and when they were admitted to the audience of Zeno, he sternly reproached them with their treatment of the two emperors, Anthemius and Nepos, whom the East had successively granted to the prayers of Italy. 'The first,' continued he, 'you have murdered; the second you have expelled; but the second is still alive, and whilst he lives, he is your lawful sovereign.' But the prudent Zeno soon deserted the hopeless cause of his abdicated colleague. His vanity was gratified by the title of sole emperor, and by the statues erected to his honor in the several quarters of Rome, he entertained a friendly, though ambiguous, correspondence with the patrician Odoacer; and he gratefully accepted the imperial ensign, the sacred ornaments of the throne and palace, which the barbarian was not unwilling to remove from the sight of the people.

21. "In the space of twenty years since the death of Valentinian [March 16, A. D. 455], nine emperors had successively disappeared; and the son of Orestes, a youth recommended only by his beauty, would be the least entitled to the notice of posterity, if his reign, which was marked by the extinction of the Roman Empire in the West, did not leave a memorable era in the history of mankind. The patrician Orestes had married the daughter of Count Romulus,

674

of Petovio in Noricum; the name of Augustus, notwithstanding the jealousy of power, was known at Aquileia as a familiar surname; and the appellations of the two great founders of the city and of the monarchy were thus strangely united in the last of their successors.

22. "The son of Orestes assumed and disgraced the name of Romulus and Augustus; but the first was corrupted into Momyllus by the Greeks, and the second has been changed by the Latins into the contemptible diminutive, Augustulus. The life of this inoffensive youth was spared by the generous clemency of Odoacer, who dismissed him, with his whole family, from the imperial palace, fixed his annual allowance at six thousand pieces of gold, and assigned the castle of Lucullus, in Campania, for the place of his exile or retirement.

23. "Odoacer was the, first barbarian who reigned in Italy over a people who had once asserted their just superiority above the rest of mankind. The disgrace of the Romans still excites our respectful compassion, and we fondly sympathize with the imaginary grief and indignation of their degenerate posterity. But the calamities of Italy had gradually subdued the proud consciousness of freedom and glory. In the age of Roman virtue the provinces were subject to the arms, and the citizens to the laws, of the republic, till those laws were subverted by civil discord, and both the city and the provinces became the servile property of a tyrant. The forms of the constitution, which alleviated or disguised their abject slavery, were abolished by time and violence; the Italians alternately lamented the presence or the absence of the sovereigns, whom they detested or despised; and the succession of five centuries inflicted the various evils of military license, capricious despotism, and elaborate oppression.

24. "During the same period, the barbarians had emerged from obscurity and contempt, and the warriors of Germany and Scythia were introduced into the provinces, as the servants, the allies, and at length the masters, of the Romans, whom they insulted or protected. The hatred of the people was suppressed by fear; they respected the spirit and splendor of the martial chiefs who were invested with the honors of the empire, and the fate of Rome

675

depended on the sword of those formidable strangers. The stern Ricimer, who trampled on the ruins of Italy, had exercised the power, without assuming the title, of a king; and the patient Romans were insensibly prepared to acknowledge the royalty of Odoacer and his barbaric successors.

25. "The king of Italy was not unworthy of the high station to which his valor and fortune had exalted him, his savage manners were polished by the habits of conversation, and he respected, though a conqueror and a barbarian, the institutions, and even the prejudices, of his subjects.

26. "Like the rest of the barbarians, he had been instructed in the Arian heresy; but he revered the monastic and episcopal characters; and the silence of the Catholics attests the toleration which they enjoyed. The peace of the city required the interposition of his prefect Basilius in the choice of a Roman pontiff; the decree which restrained the clergy from alienating their lands was ultimately designed for the benefit of the people, whose devotion would have been taxed to repair the dilapidations of the church.

27. "Italy was protected by the arms of its conqueror; and its frontiers were respected by the barbarians of Gaul and Germany, who had so long insulted the feeble race of Theodosius. Odoacer passed the Adriatic to chastise the assassins of the emperor Nepos, and to acquire the maritime province of Dalmatia. He passed the Alps to rescue the remains of Noricum from Fava, or Feletheus, king of the Rugians, who held his residence beyond the Danube. The king was vanquished in battle, and led away prisoner; a numerous colony of captives and subjects was transplanted into Italy; and Rome, after a long period of defeat and disgrace, might claim the triumph of her barbarian master."⁸

28. Thus by the establishment of the Herulian kingdom of Italy, A. D. 476, the final destruction of the Western Empire was accomplished. Rome, that "mightiest fabric of human greatness" was fallen. That power, "the fourth kingdom" "strong as iron" which had broken in pieces and subdued all kingdoms, was now itself broken to pieces. "The union of the Roman Empire was

676

dissolved: its genius was humbled in the dust; and armies of unknown barbarians, issuing from the frozen regions of the North, had established their victorious reign over the fairest provinces of Europe and Africa." ⁹

29. The kingdom was now divided. Ten kingdoms, ten distinct and independent nations, -- no more, no less -- had fixed themselves within the boundaries of Western Rome; and the prophecy, spoken and written more than a thousand years before, was literally fulfilled.

30. "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man is as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away;" -- nations rise and nations fall; empires rule the world and are brought to ruin; but over it all there appears the fact that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men," and also the truth that "THE WORD OF OUR GOD SHALL STAND FOREVER."¹⁰

1 [Page 667] "Decline and Fall," chap. x, par. 10, note; chap. xxv, par. 31.

2 [Page 667] Chap. x, par. 37, note, par. 38.

3 [Page 668] Chap. xxv, par. 31.

4 [Page 668] Chap. xxxv, par. 9.

5 [Page 668] Chap. xxxvi, par. 28.

6 [Page 669] Chap. xxxvi, par. 12.

7 [Page 669] Chap. xxxiv, par. 12.

8 [Page 675] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxvi, pars. 28-33.

9 [Page 676] Chap. xxxiii. last sentence.

10 [Page 676] [Peter]: 21; Dan. 4: 17, 25, 32; 2: 40-43.

46. THE TEN KINGDOMS.

WE have now described the origin, traced the course, and marked the establishment, of the ten kingdoms that arose upon the destruction of the Western Empire of Rome. The ten are the Alemanni, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Visigoths, the Saxons, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards, and the Heruli.

2. Eight of these are designated by Gibbon in a single paragraph; in giving the history of the conversion of the barbarians, he says: "The formidable Visigoths universally adopted the religion of the Romans, with whom they maintained a perpetual intercourse of war, of friendship, or of conquest. In their long and victorious march from the Danube to the Atlantic Ocean, they converted their allies; they educated the rising generation; and the devotion which reigned in the camp of Alaric, or the court of Toulouse, might edify or disgrace the palaces of Rome and Constantinople. During the same period, Christianity was embraced by almost all the barbarians, who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire: the Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and the various bands of mercenaries [Heruli], that raised Odoacer to the throne of Italy. The Franks and the Saxons still persevered in the errors of paganism; but the Franks obtained the monarchy of Gaul by their submission to the example of Clovis, and the Saxon conquerors of Britain were reclaimed from their savage superstition by the missionaries of Rome."¹

3. In the same chapter, he names another nation, the Lombards after their removal from the Danube to Italy. He mentions their

678

recent conversion to Christianity, and their final adoption of the Catholic faith instead of Arianism, thus: "Gregory the spiritual conqueror of Britain encouraged the pious Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, to propagate the Nicene faith among the victorious savages, whose recent Christianity was polluted by the Arian heresy. Her devout labors still left room for the industry and success of future missionaries, and many cities of Italy were still disputed by hostile bishops. But the cause of Arianism was gradually suppressed by the weight of truth, of interest, and of example; and the controversy which Egypt had derived from the Platonic school was terminated, after a war of three hundred years, by the final conversion of the Lombards of Italy."² And we have already given his designation of the Alemanni as "a great and permanent nation."³

4. Here are named exactly ten nations "who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire."

5. Assuredly no one can suppose for a moment that Gibbon wrote with any intentional reference to an exposition of the prophecy. Nevertheless he has given an exposition of it; because he has written the one single authoritative history of the times of the fulfilment

of this prophecy. That history is itself an exposition, and the very best one, of the prophecy in question. Therefore all that has been attempted in this narration is simply to produce, from the authoritative history, the history of the ten kingdoms as they were developed and established. This list, as the history develops it, will bear the test of the closest legitimate criticism; and it is the only list that will bear it.

6. A number of lists have been made of what are proposed as the ten kingdoms. Perhaps it would be well to notice the principal ones, and, where they disagree with the list which we have drawn from the history, show wherein they are defective. It would not be at all difficult to make up any moderate number of lists of ten names each, each different from the others, composed of the names of tribes or nations that played some part in the destruction of the Western Empire. It is not enough, however, to find ten nations who Participated

679

in the overthrow of the empire; but did such nations establish kingdoms? Nor is it enough to say that they did establish kingdoms; but did they establish kingdoms within the bounds of the Western Empire? Nor yet is it enough to say that they established kingdoms within the bounds of the Western Empire; but can these ten nations be found within the period marked by the prophecy? and do all remain that the prophecy demands shall remain?

7. The fulfilment of prophecy is not haphazard. "For the prophecy came not at any time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."4 By the word of the prophets God has declared what would be in the "course of empire;" and the history of the course of empire declares, according to the prophecy, what has been. God has spoken, and accordingly it is so. The prophecy said that four kingdoms would arise out of the dominion of Alexander; and exactly four did arise. The prophecy said that out of Rome would arise ten kingdoms, and exactly ten did arise.

8. In Daniel, of the fourth kingdom it is said: "Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." The prophecy says that the fourth beast had ten horns; that the fourth beast is "the fourth kingdom;" and that the ten horns "are ten kings that shall arise." Further, when the ten horns had appeared, Daniel says: "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." Then after the angel had said that these "ten horns" "are ten kings," he continued: "And another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings."5

9. From these texts it is clear, (1) that the ten kingdoms first appear; (2) that after that, three of these are "plucked up by the roots;" and (3) that only three are so plucked up. It is evident, therefore, that the ten are all in sight before any of the three are

680

"plucked up." Also, the one that subdues these three comes up "among" the ten. Therefore the ten must all be there at one time, before this other "little horn" comes up, and must all be there when it comes up. Now the three that were plucked up by the roots were the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths; and the date of the plucking up of the first of the three, is March 5, A. D. 493, and of the last, March, A. D. 538.

10. Therefore: --

(1) Any list purporting to be that of the ten kingdoms, that contains the names of any that never were established within the bounds of the Western Empire, can not be a correct list.

(2) Any such list containing the names of any that arose later than A. D. 493, can not be a correct list.

(3) Any such list that contains the names of more than three nations that perished -- "were plucked up by the roots" -- can not be a correct list.

11. To state it in the affirmative form: The ten kingdoms must all be in sight in A. D. 493; they must establish themselves within the bounds of the Western Empire; three, and only three, of them can be plucked up by the roots. The other seven must remain, through their lineal descendants, to the time when all kingdoms shall give place to the kingdom of God. The list of the ten kingdoms that meets these specifications must be the correct list.

12. Not that the remaining seven must all, always, remain equally powerful kingdoms; not that no one of them shall ever extend its boundaries, or even change its locality; not that no one of them shall ever be brought low; not that no one shall ever be made tributary to another; not that no one shall ever have to acknowledge the overlordship of another; because in this same prophecy we read that, "As the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken" (brittle, margin). Part of them retain the strength of iron, while others show more of the weakness of clay. But though part of them may be weak, though they may even "be broken," yet they are never plucked up by the roots; for "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed:

681

and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."⁶

13. Bishop Newton, in his "Dissertations on the Prophecies," pp. 209, 210, has given three distinct lists, all proposed as the ten kingdoms, besides his own; viz, one by Mede, one by Sir Isaac Newton, and one by Bishop Chandler, endorsed by Bishop Lloyd. Mede's list he gives as follows:-

"Mr. Mede, whom a certain writer esteemed as a man divinely inspired for the interpretation of the prophecies, reckons up the ten kingdoms thus in the year A. D. 456, the year after Rome was sacked by Genseric, king of the Vandals: (1) The Britons; (2) the Saxons in Britain; (3) the Franks; (4) the Burgundians in France; (5) the Visigoths in the south of France and part of Spain; (6) the Sueves and Alans in Galicia and Portugal; (7) the Vandals in Africa; (8) the Alemanes in Germany; (9) the Ostrogoths, whom the Longobards succeeded, in Pannonia, and afterward in Italy; (10) the Greeks in the residue of the empire."

14. There are two points in this list that are manifestly wrong: First, in naming the Britons. These could perhaps properly be named in A. D. 456, the date at which Mede makes his list, because then the Saxons had only been seven years on British soil. But in the end, the Saxons utterly swept away not only the power of the Britons, but the Britons themselves.

15. "With the victory of Deorum [A. D. 577] the conquest of the bulk of Britain was complete. . . . Britain had in the main become England. And within this new England a Teutonic society was settled on the wreck of Rome. So far as the conquest had yet gone, it was complete. Not a Briton remained as subject or slave on English ground. . . . It is this that distinguishes the conquest of Britain from that of the other provinces of Rome. The conquest of Gaul by the Franks, or that of Italy by the Lombards, proved little more than a forcible settlement of the one or other among tributary subjects who were destined in the long course of ages to absorb their conquerors. . . . But the English conquest of Britain up to the point which we have reached was a sheer dispossession of the people whom the English conquered.

682

16. "So far as the English sword in these earlier days had reached, Britain had become England, a land, that is, not of Britons, but of Englishmen. Even if a few of the vanquished people lingered as slaves round the homesteads of their English conquerors, or a few of their household words mingled with the English tongue, doubtful exceptions, such as these, leave the main facts untouched. The keynote of the conquest was firmly struck. When the English invasion was stayed for a while by the civil wars of the invaders, the Briton had disappeared from the greater part of the land which had been his own; and the tongue, the religion, the laws of his English conquerors reigned without a break from Essex to Staffordshire, and from the British Channel to the Frith of Forth." -- Green.⁷

17. "Their conquest was not the settlement of armed conquerors amidst a subject people, but the gradual expulsion -- it might almost seem the total extirpation -- of the British and the Roman-British inhabitants. Christianity receded with the conquered Britons into the mountains of Wales, or toward the borders of Scotland, or took refuge among the peaceful and flourishing monasteries of Ireland. On the one hand, the ejection, more or less complete, of the native race, shows that the contest was fierce and long; the

reoccupation of the island by paganism is a strong confirmation of the complete expulsion of the Britons." -- Milman.⁸

18. It is evident, therefore, that for this reason, if for no other, the Britons can not be counted as one of the ten kingdoms. But there is another important consideration that forbids it. The Britons were themselves a part of the body of the Roman Empire, which was conquered and broken up by the new peoples who came in. And if in Britain it were proper to count as a kingdom the conquered equally with the conquerors, then why not also in all the other parts of the empire, and, as Mr. Green shows, with more propriety. If we count the Britons and the Saxons in Britain, we may with equal propriety count the Gauls and the Franks in France, the Spanish and the Suevi in Spain, the Africans and the Vandals in Africa, and so on through the list, which would give twenty kingdom instead of ten!

683

19. Plainly, Mr. Mede's insertion of the Britons is erroneous. The latter consideration, too, demonstrates the impropriety of counting any part of the old empire of Rome as one among the ten which were to arise. The prophetic word is marking the rise and fall of distinct nations; and when Rome has risen, run her course, and is brought to ruin by the rise of ten other kingdoms, it were unreasonable to count a part of that which is fallen, as one of those which were to arise. No, Rome had run her course, as had the empires before her; she had twice exhausted the catalogue of iniquities, and had even covered her iniquities with the profession of the gospel of righteousness; and in the ten kingdoms God raised up new peoples by whom He would fulfil his purposes.

20. Secondly, Mr. Mede's list is defective in another place. He counts as his tenth kingdom, "the Greeks in the residue of the empire." He fills the Western Empire with nine nations, and lumps all the rest of the empire in one! But in A. D. 456 there were divisions in the Eastern, or Greek, Empire, as well as in the Western. By what right can they be summed up in one, any more than could those in the Western Empire? for the empire at that time still existed in the West as it did in the East. In short, two things are certain, either of which excludes Mede's tenth kingdom: (1) we can not rightly go outside of the limits of the Western Empire to count the ten kingdoms; and, (2) if we do go beyond those limits, we can not rightly lump together as one kingdom all that were in the bounds of the Eastern Empire.

21. The others that are named in this list are in the main correct: one minor point may be mentioned, i. e., "the Alemanes in Germany." Simply to prevent misapprehension it may be remarked that if Mede meant, as he probably did, the Alemanni in what is now Germany, he is correct, for the Alemanni were the root of the present nation of Germany. That part of the present Germany which lies south of the river Main and the Moselle, including about half of Bavaria, is the country taken from the Roman Empire by the Alemanni. Of the Roman Empire it formed the provinces of Rhaetia, Vindelicia, Agri Decumates, and a part of Gaul. Of what was then Germany, none lay south of the Main or of the Danube.

22. The next is Sir Isaac Newton's list, thus: --

"(1) The kingdom of the Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa; (2) the kingdom of the Suevans in Spain; (3) the kingdom of the Visigoths; (4) the kingdom of the Alans in Gallia; (5) the kingdom of the Burgundians; (6) the kingdom of the Franks; (7) the kingdom of the Britons; (8) the kingdom of the Huns; (9) the kingdom of the Lombards; (10) the kingdom of Ravenna."

23. We know not at what date Sir Isaac found these, only that, as he names "the kingdom [exarchate] of Ravenna," it must have been somewhere between A. D. 554 and 752, for that is the time of the existence of the exarchate of Ravenna. But that comes into history too late to be counted as one of the ten. They must all be seen before A. D. 493. He, too, names the Britons, but it is most likely that he uses that name for that of the Saxons, as England is even now called Britain, and the English sometimes Britons.

24. His mention of the "Alans in Gallia [Gaul]" as one of the ten kingdoms, is more than their history will justify. It is true that of the Alani that crossed the Rhine in A. D. 406, with the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, a portion settled near Valence and Orleans in Gaul, while the body of the nation went on into Spain; but soon after the battle of Chalons "their separate national existence in Gaul was merged in that of the Visigoths;"⁹ and when, in A. D. 508, the Visigoths were, by the Franks, driven from their Gallic possessions into Spain,¹⁰ this body of the Alani were lost to history, if not to the world. The Huns likewise can not properly be numbered as one of the ten kingdoms; but as they are named in other lists, notice of them is deferred for the present.

25. Bishop Newton makes up his list in the eighth century, which is more than two hundred years too late, and that of itself destroys its value as a correct list. Nevertheless, we insert it. Of course it is not altogether wrong, as it would be scarcely possible to name ten kingdoms at any time after the middle of the fifth century without including some of the right ones. He names them thus:-

"(1) Of the Senate of Rome, who revolted from the Greek emperors, and claimed and exerted the privilege of choosing a new Western emperor;

(2) of the Greeks in Ravenna; (3) of the Lombards in Lombardy; (4) of the Huns in Hungary; (5) of the Alemanes in Germany; (6) of the Franks in France; (7) of the Burgundians in Burgundy; (8) of the Goths in Spain; (9) of the Britons; (10) of the Saxons in Britain."

26. This list, being drawn in the eighth century, is after the establishment of the papacy, and, consequently, is after the rooting up of the three that were displaced that it might be

set up. And as the prophecy plainly says that "three of the first horns" -- three of the ten -- should be "plucked up by the roots," it is certainly a vain effort to try to find ten after three of them have been taken entirely away. Therefore, so far is the bishop's list from being of any real value as that of ten kingdoms, that it is worthless as such; because it is made at a time when the prophecy allows but seven besides the papacy. As for these seven, however, his list contains them all but one -- the Suevi. Of the seven, he gives us the Lombards, the Alemanni, the Franks, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and the Saxons.

27. Bishop Chandler's list, professedly made up from Machiavelli's "History of Florence," is as follows: --

"(1) The Ostrogoths in Moesia; (2) the Visigoths in Pannonia; (3) the Sueves and Alans in Gascoigne and Spain; (4) the Vandals in Africa; (5) the Franks in France; (6) the Burgundians in Burgundy; (7) the Heruli and Turingi in Italy; (8) the Saxons and Angles in Britain; (9) the Huns in Hungary; (10) the Lombards, at first upon the Danube, afterward in Italy."

28. So far as the names are concerned this list is correct, with the exception of the Huns. As this list is the one which has been most generally accepted, it may be well fully to give the facts which exclude the Huns from the enumeration: --

(1) It is a fact that the only part of what is now Hungary that was ever within the Western Empire, is that portion that lies west of the Danube, and which formed part of the province of Pannonia.

(2) It is a fact that the people who formed what is now the kingdom of Hungary, and from whom that country took its name of Hungary, did not appear in Europe till A. D. 884, and in 889 overran the country which bears their name.

686

(3) It is a fact that they were not Huns but Magyars (Ovyypoi, Ugri, Wengri, Ungri, Ungari, Hungari).¹¹ Therefore, to name the "Huns in Hungary," as though Hungary received its name from the Huns, and as though it were a continuation of the kingdom of the Huns, is decidedly an error.

29. This is confirmed by additional facts: --

(1) It is a fact that the true Huns -- the Huns of Attila -- first entered the province of Pannonia about A. D. 380; that Pannonia was abandoned to them by the patrician Aetius about A. D. 424, and was confirmed to them by a treaty with Theodosius II about A. D. 430; that Attila, with his brother Bleda, succeeded his uncle Rugilas in the rule of the Huns in A. D. 433, and died in A. D. 453.

(2) It is a fact that shortly after the death of Attila the power of the Huns was broken to pieces.

(3) It is a fact that from the battle of Netad onward, the Huns never possessed any portion of territory within the Western Empire.

(4) And it is a fact that the empire, the kingdom, and the nation of the Huns of Attila were "extinguished."

30. Gibbon states these last three facts in a single paragraph. He says: "The revolution which subverted the empire of the Huns established the fame of Attila, whose genius alone had sustained the huge and disjointed fabric. . . . Ellac, the eldest son of Attila, lost his life and crown in the memorable battle of Netad; his early valor had raised him to the throne of the Acatzires, a Scythian people, whom he subdued; and his father, who loved the superior merit, would have envied the death, of Ellac. His brother, Dengisich, with an army of Huns, still formidable in their flight and ruin, maintained his ground above fifteen years on the banks of the Danube. The palace of Attila, with the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian Hills to the Euxine, became the seat of a new power which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepidae. The Pannonian conquests, from Vienna to Sirmium were occupied by the Ostrogoths; and the settlements of the tribes, who had so bravely asserted their

687

native freedom, were irregularly distributed according to the measure of their respective strength. Surrounded and oppressed by the multitude of his father's slaves, the kingdom of Dengisich was confined to the circle of his wagons; his desperate courage urged him to invade the Eastern Empire, he fell in battle, and his head, ignominiously exposed in the hippodrome, exhibited a grateful spectacle to the people of Constantinople.

31. "Attila had fondly or superstitiously believed that Irnac, the youngest of his sons, was destined to perpetuate the glories of his race. The character of that prince, who attempted to moderate the rashness of his brother Dengisich, was more suitable to the declining condition of the Huns; and Irnac with his subject hordes retired into the heart of the Lesser Scythia. [The Lesser Scythia -- now the Dobrudscha -- was that little piece of country lying between the Black Sea and the Danube, along the course of that river where it flows northward, near its mouth. It contains about 2,900 square miles.] They were soon overwhelmed by a torrent of new barbarians, who followed the same road which their own ancestors had formerly discovered. The Geougen, or Avars, whose residence is assigned by the Greek writers to the shores of the ocean, impelled the adjacent tribes, till at length the Igours of the North, issuing from the cold Siberian regions which produce the most valuable furs, spread themselves over the desert as far as the Borysthenes [Dnieper] and the Caspian gates; and finally extinguished the empire of the Huns."12

32. The Encyclopedia Britannica tells of the death of Attila in A. D. 453, and then says: "Almost immediately afterward, the empire he had amassed, rather than consolidated, fell to pieces. His too numerous sons began to quarrel about their inheritance, while Ardaric, the king of the Gepidae, was placing himself at the head of a general revolt of the

dependent nations. The inevitable struggle came to a crisis near the river Netad in Pannonia, in a battle in which thirty thousand of the Huns and their confederates, including Ellak, Attila's eldest son, were slain. The nation, thus broken, rapidly dispersed; one horde settled under Roman protection

688

in Little Scythia (the Dobrudscha), others in Dacia Ripensis (on the confines of Servia and Bulgaria) or on the southern borders of Pannonia. The main body, however, appear to have resumed the position on the steppes of the river Ural, which they had left less than a century before."¹³

33. Chambers's Cyclopaedia says: "With the death of Attila the power of the Huns was broken in pieces. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded to him; but there was strife everywhere among the several nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns especially never regained their power."

34. Adams's Historical Chart says: "The fall of the empire of the Huns begins with the death of Attila, A. D. 453. Their power was broken, and the nation was soon extinguished."

35. Pritchard says: "It may be considered, as Mr. Zeuss has shown, as a historical fact, that the Bulgarians were the remains of the Huns, who, after the death of Attila, retreated to the banks of the Volga, and the plains extending from Bulgari [Wolga or Volga, Wolgari, Bolgari, Bulgari, Bulgarians] to the Euxine. From that country, called, as we have seen, Great Bulgari, issued the hordes of Bulgarians who, at a later period [about 660] crossed the Danube and established the Bulgarian kingdom."¹⁴

36. Arminius Vambery, himself a Hungarian, says: "While the Magyars continued to dwell quietly along the Don, the Huns proceeded with an immense army, each tribe contributing ten thousand men, against western Europe, conquering and rendering tributary, in the course of their wanderings, numerous nations, and finally settled on the banks of the Theiss and Danube. Later on, however, in the middle of the fifth century, when the world-renowned Attila, 'the scourge of God,' came into power, the Huns carried their victorious arms over a great part of the western world. The immense empire, however, which had been founded by King Attila, was destined to be but of short duration after the death of its founder. His sons Aladar and Csaba, in their contention for the inheritance, resorted to arms. The war ended with the utter destruction of the nation.

689

While the sons of Attila were contending with each other for the possession of the empire, the Germanic populations fell upon the divided Huns, and drove them back to the Black Sea.

37. "All of the followers of Aladar perished; Csaba, however, succeeded in escaping from the destroying arms of the neighboring nations, who had fallen on the quarreling brothers, with about fifteen thousand men, to the territories of the Greek Empire. . . . He returned afterward with the remainder of his people to the home of his ancestors, on the banks of the Don, where, up to the time of his death, he never tired of inciting the Magyars to emigrate to Pannonia and to revenge themselves on their enemies by reconquering the empire of Attila.

38. "The Gepidae remained now the masters of the country east of the Danube, whilst the Ostrogoths occupied the ancient Roman province. The latter, however, under the lead of their king, Theodoric, migrated in a body to Italy, crossing the Alps, and founded there, on the ruins of the Roman Empire, a Gothic kingdom. The Gepidae remained, in consequence, the sole ruling people in Hungary."¹⁵

39. The Gepidae continued to be the sole ruling people in Hungary for about one hundred years, until A. D. 566, when that nation was obliterated by the united powers of the Lombards and the Avars. The Avars, who are sometimes called Huns, first heard of the Roman Empire in A. D. 558, and were first seen by Europeans when an embassy came from them to Constantinople, in the reign of Justinian, that same year. After the destruction of the Gepidae, the Lombards gave up all their Pannonian possessions to the Avars, A. D. 567, and went to Italy. The Avars inhabited and ruled the country until the invasion of the Magyars, A. D. 889, who still inhabit the country which from them bears the name of Hungary.¹⁶

40. Hodgkin, the very latest authority on the subject (1892), says: "With dramatic suddenness, the stage after the death of Attila is cleared of all the chief actors, and fresh performers come

690

upon the scene. . . . The death of Attila was followed by the dissolution of his empire, as complete and more ruinous than that which befell the Macedonian monarchy on the death of Alexander. . . . Ernak, Attila's darling, ruled tranquilly under Roman protection in the district between the Lower Danube and the Black Sea, which we now call the Dobrudscha, and which was then 'the Lesser Scythia.' Others of his family maintained a precarious footing higher up the stream, in Dacia, Ripensis on the confines of Servia and Bulgaria. Others made a virtue of necessity, and entering Romania, frankly avowed themselves subjects and servants of the Eastern Caesar, toward whom they had lately shown themselves such contumelious foes. There is nothing in the after-history of these fragments of the nation with which any one need concern himself. The Hunnish Empire is from this time forward mere driftwood on its way to inevitable oblivion." -- Hodgkin."¹⁷

41. Nor is yet this all: the very authority upon which was professedly based this first citation of the Huns as one of the ten kingdoms -- this authority itself is against it. Bishop Chandler is said to have made up his list from Machiavelli. From a casual reading some

have supposed that Machiavelli himself named the ten kingdoms as such. This, however, is not the case as appears from Bishop Newton's words. He says: "Machiavelli, little thinking what he was doing (as Bishop Chandler observes), hath given us their names." It is plain, therefore, that the responsibility for Bishop Chandler's list lies not with Machiavelli, but with Bishop Chandler himself. Machiavelli was a Florentine, who lived between the years 1469 and 1527. He wrote a history of Florence, and in the first two chapters he very briefly sketched the barbarian invasions, and the fall of the Western Empire, in which he, simply as a matter of history, gave the names of the nations which invaded the empire.

42. Now the question, is, Is there in Machiavelli's history sufficient evidence to justify Bishop Chandler in setting down the Huns as one of the ten kingdoms that arose on the fall of Western Rome? We here insert all that Machiavelli says directly about the Huns and it will be seen that it answers this question in the negative.

691

After mentioning the inroads of the Visigoths, Burgundians, Alani, Suevi, Vandals, and Franks, he says: "Thus the Vandals ruled Africa; the Alans and Visigoths, Spain; while the Franks and Burgundians not only took Gaul, but each gave their name to the part they occupied; hence one is called France, the other, Burgundy. The good fortune of these brought fresh peoples to the destruction of the empire, one of which, the Huns, occupied the province of Pannonia, situated upon the nearer [western] shore of the Danube, and which, from their name, is still called Hungary.

43. "The Huns, who were said to have occupied Pannonia, joining with other nations, as the Zepidi, Eruli, Turingi, and Ostro, or Eastern, Goths, moved in search of new countries, and, not being able to enter France, which was defended by the forces of the barbarians, came into Italy under Attila their king. . . . Attila, having entered Italy, laid siege to Aquileia, where he remained without any obstacle for two years, wasting the country and dispersing the inhabitants. . . . After the taking and ruin of Aquileia, he directed his course toward Rome, from the destruction of which he abstained at the entreaty of the pontiff, his respect for whom was so great that he left Italy and retired into Austria, where he died. After the death of Attila, Velamir, king of the Ostrogoths, and the heads of the other nations, took arms against his sons, Henry and Uric, slew the one, and compelled the other with his Huns to repass the Danube, and return to their country; whilst the Ostrogoths and Zepidi established themselves in Pannonia, and the Eruli and the Turingi upon the farther [eastern] banks of the Danube.

44. "After the deaths of many emperors, the empire of Constantinople devolved upon Zeno, and that of Rome upon Orestes and Augustulus his son. . . . Whilst they were designing to hold by force what they had gained by treachery, the Eruli and Turingi, who after the death of Attila, as before remarked, had established themselves upon the farther bank of the Danube, united in a league under Odoacer, their general. In the districts which they left unoccupied, the Longobards or Lombards, also a northern people,

entered, led by Gondogo their king. Odoacer conquered and slew Orestes near Pavia; but Augustulus escaped. After this victory, that Rome

692

might with her change of power also change her title, Odoacer, instead of using the imperial name, caused himself to be declared king of Rome."¹⁸

45. The bare facts here stated by Machiavelli are clearly against the propriety of counting the Huns among the ten kingdoms. He says: (1) that the Huns occupied Pannonia, on the western bank of the Danube; (2) that after the death of Attila, the Ostrogoths and other nations "compelled Uric with his Huns to repass the Danube and return to their country;" (3) that the Ostrogoths and Gepidae established themselves in Pannonia; (4) that the Heruli and Turingi occupied the eastern bank of the Danube; (5) that when these latter went to Italy, they left their country unoccupied; (6) and then it was occupied by the Lombards.

46. So by this word, we have the Ostrogoths, the Gepidae, the Heruli, the Turingi, and the Lombards occupying all of Pannonia and both banks of the Danube, -- that is, all the country that had been occupied by the Huns, and that is now Hungary, -- and the Huns returned to their own country on the shores of the Black Sea and in the country of the Volga and the Don. It is true that he says the country on the western shore of the Danube "from their name is still called Hungary;" but, even granting the correctness of this statement, his whole narrative shows that it is so called only from their name and not from their continued occupation; for in another place, when telling of the entrance of the Avars, A. D. 566, whom he calls Huns, he repeats the statement that the Huns after the death of Attila "returned to their country." It appears, however, from all the other authorities which we have cited, that in the matter of the name of Hungary, Machiavelli is mistaken: that name coming from the Magyars, and not from the Huns.

47. Then where, in Machiavelli's history, or within the bounds of the Roman Empire, did Bishop Chandler find a kingdom of the Huns? -- He did not find them there at all, for Machiavelli himself, in harmony with every other authority on the subject, did not place them there. This also is confirmed by Machiavelli: "At this time [the reign of Odoacer, A. D. 476] the ancient Roman Empire was

693

governed by the following princes: Zeno, reigning in Constantinople, commanded the whole of the Eastern Empire; the Ostrogoths ruled Moesia and Pannonia; the Visigoths, Suevi, and Alans held Gascony and Spain; the Vandals, Africa; the Franks and Burgundians, France; and the Eruli and Turingi, Italy. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths had descended to Theodoric, nephew of Velamir. . . . Leaving his friends the Zepidi in Pannonia, Theodoric marched into Italy, slew Odoacer and his son, and . . . established his court at Ravenna, and, like Odoacer, took the title of king of Italy. . . . The Lombards,

as was said before, occupied those places upon the Danube which had been vacated by the Eruli and Turingi when Odoacer their king led them into Italy."19

48. Here, then, is Machiavelli's own list of the princes and peoples who ruled in both the Eastern and the Western Empire between A. D. 476 and 493, and the Huns are not named at all. By what right, then, did Bishop Chandler number the Huns as one of the ten kingdoms, and cite Machiavelli as authority for it? -- By no right whatever. The good Bishop made a mistake, that is all. And solely on the authority of his name, the mistake has been perpetuated nearly two hundred years.

49. By these evidences it is certain that after the battle of the Netad (A. D. 453) there never was within the Western Empire a vestige of the power known to history as that of the Huns. Therefore they certainly can not rightly be counted among the ten kingdoms. And as the Magyars who formed the kingdom of Hungary never appeared in history till they entered Europe in A. D. 884, nor did they ever enter the country that bears their name till A. D. 889, it is literally impossible that they could be counted one of the ten kingdoms which the prophecy demands should be in existence at least 396 years before; that is, in A. D. 493.

50. To these kingdoms as named by Bishop Chandler, Bishop Lloyd affixed certain figures as marking the date of their rise. We quote Bishop Newton's account of it. He says: --

"That excellent chronologer, Bishop Lloyd, exhibits the following list of the ten kingdoms with the time of their rise: (1) Huns, about A. D.

694

356; (2) Ostrogoths, 377; (3) Visigoths, 378; (4) Franks, 407; (5) Vandals, 407; (6) Sueves and Alans, 497; (7) Burgundians, 407; (8) Herules and Rugians, 476; (9) Saxons, 476; (10) Longobards began to reign in Hungary A. D. 526, and were seated in the northern parts of Germany about the year 483."

51. Why Bishop Lloyd should be given the title of "that excellent chronologer," we can not imagine; for not more than half his dates are correct. He dates the Huns "about A. D. 356," whereas about A. D. 356 they were away in the depths of Scythia above the Caspian Sea; they did not cross the Volga till about A. D. 375-375; and their first appearance to the eyes of the Romans was in A. D. 376.20

52. He dates the Ostrogoths A. D. 377. If that was intended to be the date when Alatheus and Saphrax, with their army, crossed the Danube, it is well enough, but in that case, his dating the Visigoths in A. D. 378 is wrong, because they crossed the Danube a year before, instead of a year after, the Ostrogoths. Besides this, of the Ostrogoths who crossed the Danube in A. D. 377, the last remains were slain Jan. 3, A. D. 401, while trying, under the leadership of Gainas, to make their way back into the countries beyond the Danube.21 These, therefore, are not the Ostrogoths at all who formed one of the ten

kingdoms; those being the main body of the nation who submitted to the Huns in A. D. 376, and regained their independence at the battle of the Netad, A. D. 453.²²

53. He dates the Franks A. D. 407, whereas their "uninterrupted possession" of territory and monarchy in Gaul dates from A. D. 351.²³

54. He dates the rise of the Saxons A. D. 476, when the fact is that they entered Britain, in A. D. 449, and never left it.

55. He names the Lombards as "in the northern parts of Germany about" A. D. 483, and says that they began to reign in Hungary A. D. 526. Whereas they were in the northern parts of Germany "about the time of Augustus and Trajan,"²⁴ were in Pannonia

695

A. D. 453, and settled on the banks of the Danube after the battle of the Netad the same year. In the date A. D. 526 he is not so far wrong; as soon after that they had gained possession of all Noricum and Pannonia.

56. "Lyman's Historical Chart" gives the ten kingdoms as follows: --

"Vandals, Alani, Suevi, Visigoths, Burgundians, Franks, Saxons, Heruli Ostrogoths, Lombards."

57. With the exception of the Alani, this is correct. But this same chart says of them in A. D. 418, "The Goths nearly exterminated them," and of those who escaped after the death of their king, Gibbon says: "The remains of those Scythian wanderers who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were ever afterward confounded."²⁵ As this was only twelve years after they crossed the Rhine, it is certain that the Alani are not entitled to a place among the ten kingdoms.

58. After viewing thus the lists of the ten kingdoms as named by others, we repeat, and we do it with the stronger assurance, that the ten nations named by Gibbon as the ones "who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire," are the ones, and the only ones, that form the ten kingdoms of the prophecy of Daniel 2:41-43, and 7:7, 8, 19, 24.

59. If any one would inquire why on this subject so large use has been made of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and why his account is so fully trusted, the answer is: Because "the great work of Gibbon is indispensable to the student of history;" because "the literature of Europe offers no substitute for the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;'" because "it has obtained undisputed possession, as rightful occupant, of the vast period which it comprehends;" because "this history is the sole undisputed authority to which all defer, and from which few appeal to original writers, or to more

modern compilers;" because that "in France and Germany, as well as in England, -- in the most enlightened

696

countries of Europe, Gibbon is constantly cited as an authority;" in short, because there is no other; and because "the vast design of Gibbon" and "the laborious execution of his immense plan" have rendered "the decline and fall of the Roman Empire an unapproachable subject to the future historian."²⁶

60. For convenience, there is set down here in order, the names of the ten kingdoms which the undisputed history gives, with the dates at which they respectively or successively entered the Western Empire never to leave it (except the three that were plucked up by the roots), with the places and dates of their settlement: --

ALEMANNI, about A. D. 300, in Agri Decumates from the river Main to Basel and the Lake of Constance; A. D. 351, take Alsace Lorraine in addition; A. D. 455, extend to the Seine.

FRANKS, A. D. 351, northeast Gaul; early in the fifth century spread to the Somme; middle of the fifth century, A. D. 455, to the Seine; and gradually progress till in the sixth century they take all Gaul north and west of the Moselle and the mountains of the Vosges and the Cevennes.

BURGUNDIANS, Dec. 31, A. D. 406; in Burgundy, A. D. 420; spread over West Switzerland and the whole valley of the Rhone, A. D. 443-476.

SUEVI, Oct. 13, A. D. 409 in Spain; A. D. 428 in Galicia in Spain; A. D. 466 held the kingdom of Galicia, and shortly afterward spread to what is now Portugal.

VANDALS, Dec. 31. 406; in Spain, A. D. 409; in Africa, May, A. D. 429.

VISIGOTHS, A. D. 408, Italy; in southwest Gaul (Aquitaine), A. D. 419; spread into Spain, A. D. 466.

SAXONS, A. D. 449, Britain.

OSTROGOTHS, A. D. 451, under Attila; A. D. 453, in Pannonia; A. D. 489, in Italy.

LOMBARDS, A. D. 451, under Attila; A. D. 453, in Noricum.

HERULI, A. D. 451, under Attila; A. D. 475, in Italy.

1 [Page 677] "Decline and Fall," chap xxxvii, par. 18.

- 2 [Page 678] Id., par. 29.
- 3 [Page 678] Chap. x, par. 26.
- 4 [Page 679] 2 Peter 1:21, margin.
- 5 [Page 679] Dan. 2:41; 7:8,24; chap. i. par. 30; chap. ii, pars. 11, 15, of this book.
- 6 [Page 681] Dan. 2:44; chap. i, par. 30, of this book.
- 7 [Page 682] "Larger History of the English People," chap. ii, pars. 1-5.
- 8 [Page 682] "Latin Christianity," book iv, chap. iii, par. 4.
- 9 [Page 684] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Alani.
- 10 [Page 684] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxviii, pars. 13, 29.
- 11 [Page 686] See Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Hungary, History; Gibbon, chap iv. pars. 4-8; Hallam's "Middle Ages," chap. i. part i. sec. xii; Pritchard's "Physical History, of Mankind," Vol. iv. chap. xvi, sec. vi, par. 1; and "Empires of the Bible," chap. ii. pars, 23, 28.
- 12 [Page 687] Chap xxxv, par. 16.
- 13 [Page 688] Art. Huns.
- 14 [Page 688] "Physical History of Mankind," Vol. iv. chap. xvi, sec. vi, par. 1.
- 15 [Page 689] "The Story of Hungary," chap. iii, pars, 5,6; chap. ii, pars, 5, 6, note. At the writing of that book, in 1886. Arminius Vambery was professor of the University of Buda-Pesth, the capital of Hungary.
- 16 [Page 689] See "Decline and Fall," chap xlii, par. 6; chap. xiv, pars. 2-4.
- 17 [Page 690] "Italy and Her Invaders," book iii, chap. 1, pars. 1,2.
- 18 [Page 692] Chap. i, pars. 6, 7.
- 19 [Page 693] Chap. ii, pars. 1, 10.
- 20 [Page 694] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxvi, pars, 12, 13.
- 21 [Page 694] Id., chap. xxvi, pars. 31, 32; xxxii, pars 5-7.

22 [Page 694] Id., chap.xxvi, par. 13; with xxxiv, par. 5; xxxv, par. 16.

23 [Page 694] Id., chap. xix, par. 20, with note, and xxxviii, par. 3.

24 [Page 694] "Decline and Fall," chap. xiii, par. 2.

25 [Page 695] Chap. xxxi, par. 38.

26 [Page 696] Milman and Guizot, in preface to Milman's edition, "Decline and Fall."

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW,

ARGUMENT OF

ALONZO T. JONES

BEFORE THE

United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor;

AT

WASHINGTON, D. C., DEC. 13, 1888.

AMERICAN SENTINEL:

1059 CASTRO ST., OAKLAND, CAL.; 26 AND 28 COLLEGE PLACE,

CHICAGO, ILL.; 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

1889.

COPYRIGHTED 1889, BY ALONZO T JONES.

www.maranathamedia.com.au

INTRODUCTION

THIS pamphlet is a report of an argument made upon the national Sunday bill introduced by Senator Blair in the fiftieth Congress. It is not, however, exactly the argument that was made before the Senate Committee, as there were so many interruptions in the course of my speech that it was impossible to make a connected argument upon a single point. By these questions, etc., my argument was not only forced to take a wider range than was intended when I began to speak, but I was prevented from making the definite argument that I designed to present. I do not speak of these interruptions and counter-arguments by way of complaint, but only to explain why this pamphlet is issued. Nevertheless it is a fact that while there were eighteen speeches before mine, occupying three hours, in all of which together there were only one hundred and eighty-nine questions and counter-arguments by all the members of the Committee who were present, I was interrupted by the Chairman alone, one hundred and sixty-nine times in ninety minutes, as may be seen by the official report of the hearing. -- Fiftieth Congress, Second Session, Messages and Documents No. 43, pp. 73-102.

A national Sunday law is a question of national interest. While it is true that the Sunday-rest bill did not become a law, the legislation having died with the expiration of the fiftieth Congress, it is also true that those who worked for the introduction and passage of that bill are now laying plans to have another national

iv

Sunday bill introduced as soon as possible in the fiftyfirst Congress, and will do all in their power to secure its enactment into law. The scope that was given to the subject by the questions asked of me by the Senate Committee, has opened the way for a somewhat exhaustive treatment of the subject. These questions being raised by United States senators, -- men of national affairs, -- show that a wider circulation of this matter is not out of place. The subject is worthy of the careful attention of the whole American people. The principles of the American Constitution, the proper relationship between religion and the State, the distinction between moral and civil law, the inalienable civil and religious rights of men, -- these are questions that never should become secondary in the mind of any American citizen.

An eminent American jurist has justly observed that in a government of the people "there is no safety except in an enlightened public opinion, based on individual intelligence." Constitutional provisions against the encroachments of the religious upon the civil power are safeguards only so long as the intelligence of the people shall recognize the truth that no man can allow any legislation in behalf of the religion, or the religious observances, in which he himself believes, without forfeiting his own religious freedom.

In enlarging as I have upon the matter presented in the original hearing, the meaning or intention of any statement has not been changed in the slightest degree. The

argument is submitted to the American people with the earnest hope that they will give thoughtful consideration to the principles involved. The positions taken will bear the severest test of every form of just criticism.

v

The bill proposed by Senator Blair, and upon which the argument was made, is as follows: --

"50th CONGRESS, } S. 2983. 1st SESSION. }

"IN the Senate of the United States, May 21, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor: --

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

"SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: Provided, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter.

"SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not

vi

being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of

the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person or corporation, or the agent or employee of any person or corporation, who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

"SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

"SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory,

vii

into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day."

Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D., representative of the Seventh-day Baptists, had spoken, and asked that a section be added to the bill granting exemption to observers of the Seventh day; but in answering the questions that were asked by the Chairman, Mr. Lewis compromised his position, and was followed soon after by Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, who remarked that Dr. Lewis had "given his whole case away." This is what is referred to in my introductory remarks to the effect that we did not intend to "give our case away."

A. T. J.

viii

CONTENTS.

SYNOPSIS. -- Introduction, 3-7; Beginning of Mr. Jones's Argument before the Senate Committee, 9, 10; The Words of Christ, 11, 12; Civil Government a Social Compact, 13-16; What to God? -- What to Caesar? 17-20; The Sabbath Not Due to Caesar, 21, 22; Civil Sabbath Laws Antichristian, 23, 24; The Civil Power Enforces Civility, 25, 26; Sunday-Law Inconsistency, 27, 28; Laws against Blasphemy, 29-40; Christianity and Roman Law, 41, 42; The United States Constitution, 43, 44; Sunday Laws Religious Legislation, 45, 46; Sunday Laws Unconstitutional, 47, 48; Sunday-Law Petitions, 49, 50; Sunday Laws Not Good, 51, 52; Religion Necessary to a Rest Day, 53, 54; A Rest Day Belongs Only to God, 55, 56; The History of It, 57, 58; A New Theocracy, 59, 60; The Government of Israel, 61, 62; The New Theocracy, 63-66; The Fourth-Century Theocracy 67, 68; Fourth-Century Sunday Laws, 69, 70; The Union of Church and State, 71, 72; The Foundation of the Inquisition, 73, 74; No Scripture Authority for Sunday, 75, 76; Sabbath Laws Belong Only with a Theocracy, 77, 78; More! More! More! More! 79, 80; Enforced Church-going on Sunday, 81, 82; The Object of Sunday Laws, 83, 84; Shall the Church Compel the Civil Power? 85, 86; The Cardinal Knows What He is Doing, 87, 88; The Argument Is Logical, 89, 90; Sunday Laws Mean Church and State, 91, 92; Only God Can Enforce the Decalogue, 93, 94; No Earthly Theocracy -- No Sunday Laws, 95, 96; A National Religion Proposed, 97, 98; Worse than Russia, 99, 100; The State Not a Religious Partisan, 101, 102; Shall this Majority Rule? 103, 104; Sunday Laws and the Working-Men, 105-108; Wages for Doing Nothing, 109-112; Church Members Compel Work on Sunday, 113, 114; The Preachers Desecrate the Day, 115, 116; Will They Compel Themselves? 117, 118; An Exemption Clause, 119, 120; Exemption Is Toleration in Disguise, 121, 122; The Workings of a Sunday Law, 123-128; Subversion of Liberty, 129, 130; The Workings of a Sunday Law, 131-134; Legislative Power not Omnipotent, 135, 136; An Unconstitutional Decision, 137, 138; The Pharisees Justified Themselves, 139, 140; Sunday Laws Invade Inalienable Rights, 141-146; Earthly Governments Civil, Not Moral, 147-152; Is the Objection Imaginary? 153, 154; No Ticket of Leave for Us, 155, 156; W. C. T. U. Legislation, 157, 158; Exemption for the Territories, 159, 160; The New Doctrine of Protection, 161, 162; Two Sundays Instead of One, 163, 164; The Answer to Unanswerable Arguments, 165, 166; The Authority for Sunday Laws, 167-172; No Authority for Sunday Laws, 173-183; Appendix A, 184-191; Appendix B, 192.

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

ARGUMENT OF ALONZO T. JONES BEFORE THE SENATE

COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator Blair. -- There are gentlemen present who wish to be heard in opposition to the bill. Prof. Alonzo T. Jones, of Battle Creek College, Mich., is one of those who have spoken to me in regard to it. Will you not state, Prof. Jones, what your desire is? I have no doubt that we can obtain leave of the Senate to sit during its session to-day. It is exceedingly desirable to go on with this hearing, and complete it now. How would such an arrangement comport with your convenience? First, state, please, whom you represent, and your reasons for desiring to be heard.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman, I represent the people known as Seventh-day Adventists. It is true, we have been entirely ignored by the other side. The very small "sect," as they stated it, of Seventh-day Baptists has been recognized, but we are more than three times their number, and many times their power in the real force of our work. We have organizations in every State and Territory in the Union. We have the largest printing-house in Michigan; the largest printing-house on the Pacific Coast; the largest Sanitarium in the world; a college in California and one in Michigan; an academy in Massachusetts; a printing establishment in Basel, Switzerland; one in Christiana,

10

Norway; and one in Melbourne, Australia. Our mission work has enlarged until, besides embracing the greater part of Europe, it has also extended nearly around the world; and we desire a hearing, with the consent of the Committee.

Senator Blair. -- Where do you reside?

Mr. Jones. -- At present in Michigan. My home for the past four years has been in California. I am now teaching history in Battle Creek College, Mich.

I must say in justice to myself, and also in behalf of the body which I represent, that we dissent almost wholly, I might say, wholly, from the position taken by the representative of the Seventh-day Baptists. I knew, the instant that Dr. Lewis stated what he did here, that he had "given his case away." We have not given our case away, Senators, nor do we expect to give it away. We expect to go deeper than any have gone at this hearing, both upon the principles and upon the facts, as well as upon the logic of the facts.

Senator Blair. -- This matter is all familiar to you. You are a professor of history. Can you not go on this afternoon?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, if I can have a little space between now and this afternoon to get my papers together. I have some references to read that I did not bring with me this morning.

Senator Blair. -- Very well.

ARGUMENT.

Senator Blair. -- You have a full hour, Professor. It is now half past one.

Mr. Jones. -- There are three particular lines in which I wish to conduct the argument: First, the

11

principles upon which we stand; second, the historical view; and, third, the practical aspect of the question.

The principle upon which we stand is that civil government is civil, and has nothing to do in the matter of legislation, with religious observances in any way. The basis of this is found in the words of Jesus Christ in Matt. 22:21. When the Pharisees asked whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not, he replied: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

In this the Saviour certainly separated that which pertains to Caesar from that which pertains to God. We are not to render to Caesar that which pertains to God; we are not to render to God by Caesar that which is God's.

Senator Blair. -- May not the thing due to Caesar be due to God also?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir. If that be so, then the Saviour did entangle himself in his talk, the very thing which they wanted him to do. The record says that they sought "how they might entangle him in his talk." Having drawn the distinction which he has, between that which belongs to Caesar and that which belongs to God, if it be true that the same things belong to both, then he did entangle himself in his talk; and where is the force in his words which command us to render to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar, and to God the things that are God's?

Senator Blair. -- Is it not a requirement of God's that we render to Caesar that which is due to Caesar?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes.

Senator Blair. -- If Caesar is society, and the Sabbath is required for the good of society, does not God require

us to establish the Sabbath for the good of society? and if society makes a law accordingly, is it not binding?

Mr. Jones. -- It is for the good of society that men shall be Christians; but it is not in the province of the State to make Christians. For the State to undertake to do so would not be for the benefit of society; it never has been, and it never can be.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not confuse this matter? A thing may be required for the good of society, and for that very reason be in accordance with the will and the command of God. God issues his commands for the good of society, does he not? God does not give us commands that have no relation to the good of society.

Mr. Jones. -- His commands are for the good of man.

Senator Blair. -- Man is society. It is made up of individual men.

Mr. Jones. -- But in that which God has issued to man for the good of men he has given those things which pertain solely to man's relationship to his God; and he has also given things which pertain to man's relationship to his fellow-men. With those things in which our duty pertains to our fellow-men, civil government can have something to do.

Senator Blair. -- Man would obey God in obeying civil society.

Mr. Jones. -- I will come to that point. In the things which pertain to our duty to God, with the individual's right of serving God as one's conscience dictates, society has nothing to do; but in the formation of civil society, there are certain rights surrendered to the society by the individual, without which society could not be organized.

Senator Blair. -- That is not conceded. When was this doctrine of a compact in society made? It is the philosophy of an infidel.

Mr. Jones. It is made wherever you find men together.

Senator Blair. -- Did you and I ever agree to it? Did it bind us before we were compos mentis?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. Civil government is an ordinance of God.

Senator Blair. -- Then it is not necessarily an agreement of man?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, it springs from the people.

Senator Blair. -- As to the compact in society that is talked about, it is not conceded that it is a matter of personal and individual agreement. Society exists altogether independent of the volition of those who enter into it. However, I shall not interrupt you further. I only did this because of our private conversation, in which I thought you labored under a fallacy in your fundamental proposition, that would lead all the way through your argument. I suggested that ground, and that is all.

Mr. Jones. -- I think the statement of the Declaration of Independence is true, that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Senator Blair. -- I do not controvert that.

Mr. Jones. -- Of all men in the world, Americans ought to be the last to deny the social compact theory of civil government. On board the "Mayflower," before the Pilgrim Fathers ever set foot on these shores, the following was written: --

"In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign,

14

Lord King James, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, king, defender of the faith, etc., having undertaken for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia; do by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid: and by virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape Cod, the eleventh of November, in the reign of our sovereign, Lord King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland, the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini, 1620."

The next American record is that of the fundamental orders of Connecticut, 1638-39, and reads as follows: --

"Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his diuine prudence so to order and dispose of things that we, the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, and Harteford, and Wethersfield, are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vppon the river of Conectecotte and the lands thereunto adioyneing; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent gourment

established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons, as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one public State or commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be joined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together," etc.

15

And, sir, the first Constitution of your own State -- 1784 -- in its bill of rights, declares: --

"I. All men are born equally free and independent; therefore, all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good."

"III. When men enter into a state of society, they surrender some of their natural rights to that society, in order to insure the protection of others; and without such an equivalent, the surrender is void.

"IV. Among the natural rights, some are in their very nature unalienable, because no equivalent can be received for them. Of this kind are the rights of conscience."

And in Part 2, of that same Constitution, under the division of the "form of government," are these words: --

"The people inhabiting the territory formerly called the province of New Hampshire, do hereby solemnly and mutually agree with each other to form themselves into a free, sovereign, and independent body politic, or State, by the name of the State of New Hampshire."

In the Constitution of New Hampshire of 1792, these articles are repeated word for word. They remain there without alteration in a single letter under the ratification of 1852, and also under the ratification of 1877. Consequently, sir, the very State which sends you to this capitol is founded upon the very theory which you here deny. This is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence; it is the doctrine of the Scripture; and therefore we hold it to be eternally true.

These sound and genuine American principles -- civil governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, and the inalienability of the

16

rights of conscience, -- these are the principles asserted and maintained by Seventh-day Adventists.

Senator Blair. -- But society is behind the government which society creates.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. All civil government springs from the people, I care not in what form it is.

Senator Blair. -- That is all agreed to.

Mr. Jones. -- But the people, I care not how many there are, have no right to invade your relationship to God, nor mine. That rests between the individual and God, through faith in Jesus Christ; and as the Saviour has made this distinction between that which pertains to Caesar and that which is God's, when Caesar exacts of men that which pertains to God, then Caesar is out of his place, and in so far as Caesar is obeyed there, God is denied. When Caesar -- civil government -- exacts of men that which is God's, he demands what does not belong to him; in so doing Caesar usurps the place and the prerogative of God, and every man who regards God or his own rights before God, will disregard all such interference on the part of Caesar.

This argument is confirmed by the apostle's commentary upon Christ's words. In Rom. 13:1-9, is written: --

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye

17

must needs be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is easy to see that this scripture is but an exposition of Christ's words, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." In the Saviour's command to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, there is plainly a recognition of the rightfulness of civil government, and that civil government has claims upon us which we are in duty bound to recognize, and that there are things which duty requires us to render to the civil government. This scripture in Romans 13 simply states the same thing in other words:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."

Again: the Saviour's words were in answer to a question concerning tribute. They said to him, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" Rom. 13: 6 refers to the same thing, saying, "For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." In answer to the question of the Pharisees about the tribute, Christ said, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." Rom. 13:7, taking up the same thought, says, "Render therefore to all their dues:

18

tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." These references make positive that which we have stated, -- that this portion of Scripture (Rom. 13: 1-9) is a divine commentary upon the words of Christ in Matt. 22: 17-21.

The passage refers first to civil government, the higher powers, -- the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers, as bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then it commands to render tribute to whom tribute is due, and says, "Owe no man any thing; but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Then he refers to the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments, and says, "It there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

There are other commandments of this same law to which Paul refers. There are the four commandments of the first table of the law, -- the commandments which say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing;" "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Then there is the other commandment in which are briefly comprehended all these, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

Paul knew full well these commandments. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? -- Because he was writing concerning the principles set forth by the Saviour, which relate to our duties to civil government.

19

Our duties under civil government pertain solely to the government and to our fellow-men, because the powers of civil government pertain solely to men in their relations one to another, and to the government. But the Saviour's words in the same connection

entirely separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to civil government. The things which pertain to God are not to be rendered to civil government - - to the powers that be; therefore Paul, although knowing full well that there were other commandments, said, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" that is, if there be any other commandment which comes into the relation between man and civil government, it is comprehended in this saying, that he shall love his neighbor as himself; thus showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained simply in things pertaining to the relation of man with his fellow-men, and in those things alone.

Further: as in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the relations which men bear toward God.

As the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in the enumeration here given of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties enjoined in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be; that is to say, again, that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty

20

enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with those the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God -- not to Caesar, nor by Caesar -- that which is God's. Therefore, as in his comment upon the principle which Christ established, Paul has left out of the account the first four commandments, so we deny, forever, the right of any civil government to legislate in anything that pertains to men's duty to God under the first four commandments. This Sunday bill does propose to legislate in regard to the Lord's day. If it is the Lord's day, we are to render it to the Lord, not to Caesar. When Caesar exacts it of us, he is exacting what does not belong to him, and is demanding of us that with which he should have nothing to do.

Senator Blair. -- Would it answer your objection in that regard, if, instead of saying "the Lord's day", we should say, "Sunday"?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir, Because the underlying principle, the sole basis, of Sunday, is ecclesiastical, and legislation in regard to it is ecclesiastical legislation. I shall come more fully to the question you ask, presently.

Now do not misunderstand us on this point. We are Seventh-day Adventists; but if this bill were in favor of enforcing the observance of the seventh day as the Lord's day, we would oppose it just as much as we oppose it as it is now, for the reason that civil

government has nothing to do with what we owe to God, or whether we owe anything or not, or whether we pay it or not.

Allow me again to refer to the words of Christ to emphasize this point. At that time the question was

21

upon the subject of tribute, whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not. In answering the question, Christ established this principle: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." That tribute money was Caesar's; it bore his image and superscription; it was to be rendered to him. Now, it is a question of rendering Sabbath observance, and it is a perfectly legitimate and indeed a necessary question to ask right here: Is it lawful to render Lord's day observance to Caesar? The reply may be in His own words: Show me the Lord's day; whose image and superscription does it bear? -- The Lord's, to be sure. This very bill which is under discussion here to-day declares it to be the Lord's day. Then the words of Christ apply to this. Bearing the image and superscription of the Lord, Render therefore to the Lord the things that are the Lord's, and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. It does not bear the image and superscription of Caesar; it does not belong to him; it is not to be rendered to him.

Again: take the institution under the word Sabbath: Is it lawful to render Sabbath observance to Caesar or not? Show us the Sabbath; whose image and superscription does it bear? The commandment of God says, it "is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It bears his image and superscription, and his only; it belongs wholly to him; Caesar can have nothing to do with it. It does not belong to Caesar; its observance cannot be rendered to Caesar, but only to God; for the commandment is, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all. Therefore, belonging to God, bearing his superscription, and not that of Caesar, according to Christ's commandment,

22

it is to be rendered only to God; because we are to render to God that which is God's, and the Sabbath is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Sabbath observance, therefore, or Lord's day observance, whichever you may choose to call it, never can be rendered to Caesar. And Caesar never can demand it without demanding that which belongs to God, or without putting himself in the place of God, and usurping the prerogative of God.

Therefore, we say that if this bill were framed in behalf of the real Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, the day which we observe; if this bill proposed to promote its observance, or to compel men to do no work upon that day we would oppose it just as strongly as we oppose it now, and I would stand here at this table and argue precisely as I am arguing against this, and upon the same principle, -- the principle established by Jesus Christ, -- that with that which is God's the civil government never can of right have anything to do. That duty rests solely between man and God; and if any man does not

render it to God, he is responsible only to God, and not to any man, nor to any assembly or organization of men, for his failure or refusal to render it to God; and any power that undertakes to punish that man for his failure or refusal to render to God what is God's, puts itself in the place of God. Any government which attempts it, sets itself against the word of Christ, and is therefore antichristian. This Sunday bill proposes to have this Government do just that thing, and therefore I say, without any reflection upon the author of the bill, this national Sunday bill which is under discussion here to-day is antichristian. But in saying this I am not singling out this contemplated law as worse than all other Sunday

23

laws in the world. There never was a Sunday law that was not antichristian. and there never can be one that will not be antichristian.

Senator Blair. -- You oppose all the Sunday laws of the country, then?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir.

Senator Blair. -- You are against all Sunday laws?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed; and we would be equally against a Sabbath law if it were proposed, for that would be antichristian, too.

Senator Blair. -- State and national, alike?

Mr. Jones. -- State and national, sir. I shall give you historical reasons presently, and the facts upon which these things stand, and I hope they will receive consideration.

George Washington, I believe, is yet held in some respectful consideration -- he is by the Seventh-day Adventists at least -- and he said, "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and is to be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience." And so should we be protected, so long as we are law-abiding citizens. There are no saloon keepers among us. We are as a body for prohibition; and as for the principles of Christian temperance, we conscientiously practice them. In short, you will find no people in this country or in the world, more peaceable and law-abiding than we endeavor to be. We teach the people according to the Scripture, to be subject to the powers that be; we teach them that the highest duty of the Christian citizen is strictly to obey the law, -- to obey it not from fear of punishment, but out of respect

24

for governmental authority, and out of respect for God, and conscience towards him.

Senator Blair. -- That is the common Mormon argument. The Mormons say their institution is a matter of religious belief. Everybody concedes their right to believe in Mormonism, but when they come to the point of practicing it, will it not be to the disturbance of others?

Mr. Jones. -- I should have come to that, even though you had not asked the question. But as you have introduced it, I will notice it now. My argument throughout is that the civil government can never have anything to do with men's duties under the first four of the ten commandments; and this is the argument embodied in Washington's words. These duties pertain solely to God. Now polygamy is adultery. But adultery is not a duty that men owe to God, in any way, much less does it come under any of the first four commandments. This comes within the inhibitions of the second table of the law of God -- the commandments embracing duty to our neighbor. How men should conduct themselves toward their fellow-men, civil government must decide; that is the very purpose of its existence. Consequently, the practice of polygamy lying wholly within this realm, is properly subject to the jurisdiction of civil government. My argument does not in the least degree countenance the principles of Mormonism, nor can it fairly be made to do so. I know that it is offered as a very ready objection; but those who offer it as an objection and as an argument against the principles upon which we stand, thereby make adultery a religious practice. But against all such objection and argument, I maintain that adultery is not in any sense a religious practice. It is not only highly irreligious,

25

but it is essentially uncivil; and because it is uncivil, the civil power has as much right to blot it out as it has to punish murder, or thieving, or perjury, or any other uncivil thing. Moreover, we deny that honest occupations on any day of the week, or at any time whatever, can ever properly be classed with adultery.

There are also people who believe in community of property in this world. Suppose they base their principles of having all things in common upon the apostolic example. Very good. They have the right to do that. Every one who sells his property and puts it into a common fund, has a right to do that if he chooses; but suppose these men in carrying out that principle, and in claiming that it is a religious ordinance, were to take without consent your property or mine into their community. Then what? -- The State forbids it. It does not forbid the exercise of their religion; but it protects your property and mine, and in exercising its prerogative of protection, it forbids theft. And in forbidding theft, the State never asks any questions as to whether thieving is a religious practice. So also as to polygamy, which is practiced among the Mormons. But let us consider this in another view.

It is every man's right in this country, or anywhere else, to worship an idol if he chooses. That idol embodies his conviction of what God is. He can worship only according to his convictions. It matters not what form his idol may have, he has the right to worship it anywhere in all the world, therefore in the United States. But suppose that in the worship of that god he attempts to take the life of one of his fellow-men, and offer it

as a human sacrifice. The civil government exists for the protection of life, liberty, property, etc., and it must punish that man for his attempt upon the life of

26

his fellow-man. The civil law protects man's life from such exercise of any one's religion, but in punishing the offender, the State does not consider the question of his religion at all. It would punish him just the same if he made no pretensions to worship or to religion. It punishes him for his incivility, for his attempt at murder, not for his irreligion. I repeat, the question of religion is not considered by the State; the sole question is, Did he threaten the life of his fellow-man? Civil government must protect its citizens. This is strictly within Caesar's jurisdiction; it comes within the line of duties which the Scripture shows to pertain to our neighbor, and with it Caesar has to do.

Therefore it is true that the State can never of right legislate in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments, a man invades the rights of his neighbor, as to life, family, property, or character, then the civil government says that it is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious or immoral? -- Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only. It never can be proper for the State to ask any question as to whether any man is religious or not, or whether his actions are religious or not. The sole question must ever be, Is the action civil or uncivil.

Senator Blair. -- Now apply that right to this case -- to the institution of the Sabbath among men for the good of men.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good, we will consider that. Here are persons who are keeping Sunday. It is their right to work on every other day of the week. It is their right to work on that day, if they desire; but they

27

are keeping that day, recognizing it as the Sabbath. Now while they are doing that which is their right, here are other people who are keeping Saturday, and others who are keeping Friday. The Mohammedans recognize Friday. But we will confine ourselves to those who keep Saturday, the seventh day, as the Sabbath. Those who keep Sunday, and who want legislation for that day, ask that other people shall be forbidden to work on Sunday, because they say it disturbs their rest, it disturbs their worship, etc.; and they claim that their rights are not properly protected. Do they really believe that in principle? Let us see. They will never admit (at any rate, I have never yet found one of them who would) that their work on Saturday disturbs the rest, or the worship, of the man who rests on Saturday. If their work on Saturday does not disturb the Sabbath rest, or the worship, of the man who keeps Saturday, then upon what principle is it that our work on Sunday disturbs the rest of those who keep Sunday? I have never found one on that side yet who would admit the principle. If their work does not disturb our rest and our worship, our work cannot disturb their rest or their worship. More than this: In a general Sunday

convention held in San Francisco, at which I was present, there was a person who spoke on this very question. Said he: "There are some people, and a good many of them in this State, who do not believe in Sunday laws, and who keep Saturday as the Sabbath; but," said he, "the majority must rule. The vast majority of the people do keep Sunday; their rights must be respected, and they have a right to enact it into law." I arose and said, "Suppose the Seventh-day people were in the majority, and they should go to the legislature and ask for a law to compel you to keep

28

Saturday out of respect to their rights. Would you consider it right?" There was a murmur all over the house, "No."

Senator Blair. -- Upon what ground did they say, No?

Mr. Jones. -- That is what I should like to know. They were not logical. Their answer shows that there is no ground in justice nor in right for their claim that the majority should rule in matters of conscience.

Senator Blair. -- That does not follow. At least it does not strike me that it follows. The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society, and if Caesar regulates society, then the majority has a right in this country to say what we shall render to Caesar.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good, but the majority has no right to say what we shall render to God; nor has it any right to say that we shall render to Caesar that which is God's. If nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every one thousand people in the United States kept the seventh day, that is, Saturday, and I deemed it my right, and made it my choice, to keep Sunday, they would have no right to compel me to rest on Saturday.

Senator Blair. -- In other words, you take the ground that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on Sabbath, if it disturbs others?

Mr. Jones. -- As to its disturbing others, I have proved that it does not. The body of your question states my position exactly.

Senator Blair. -- You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath. This question was passed me to ask: "Is the speaker also opposed to all laws against blasphemy?"

29

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir. But not because blasphemy is not wrong, but because civil government cannot define blasphemy, nor punish it. Blasphemy pertains to God, it is an offense against him, it is a sin against him.

Senator Blair. -- Suppose the practice of it in society at large is hurtful to society?

Mr. Jones. -- That will have to be explained. How is it hurtful to society?

Senator Blair. -- Suppose it be hurtful to society in this way: A belief in the existence of God, and reverence for the Creator, and a cultivation of that sentiment in society, is for the good of society; is, in fact, the basis of all law and restraint. If the Almighty, who knows everything, or is supposed to, and has all power, has no right to restrain us, it is difficult to see how we can restrain each other.

Mr. Jones. -- He has the right to restrain us. He does restrain us.

Senator Blair. -- To commonly blaspheme and deride and ridicule the Almighty, would, of course, have a tendency to bring up the children who are soon to be the State, in an absolute disregard of him and his authority. Blasphemy, as I understand it, is that practice which brings the Creator into contempt and ridicule among his creatures.

Mr. Jones. -- What is blasphemy here, would not be blasphemy in China, and many other countries.

Senator Blair. -- We are not dealing with pagan communities. A regulation that may be appropriate in a pagan community, would not answer men in a Christian community. Do you mean that there is no such thing as blasphemy?

Mr. Jones. -- No; I do not mean that.

0 Senator Blair. -- The Chinaman hardly believes in

any god whatever; at least in no such God as we do. Taking our God and these Christian institutions of ours, what do you understand blasphemy to be?

Mr. Jones. -- There are many things that the Scriptures show to be blasphemy.

Senator Blair. -- The power of the law has undertaken in various States to say that certain things are blasphemy.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; but if the law proposes to define blasphemy and punish it, why does it not go to the depth of it, and define all and punish all?

Senator Blair. -- Perhaps it may not go as far as it ought. You say you are opposed to all laws against blasphemy, cursing, and swearing?

Mr. Jones. -- In relation to any one of the first four commandments.

Senator Palmer. -- Suppose that what is defined as blasphemy in the statutes of the several States, should detract from the observance of the law and regard for it, would you regard laws against it as being improper?

Mr. Jones. -- Under the principle that the Scripture lays down, no legislation in any way can be proper in regard to the first four commandments. There may be many ways in which it would appear very appropriate for civil government to do this or to do that; but when you have entered upon such legislation, where will you stop?

Senator Palmer. -- Abstaining from blasphemy is a part of the education of the youth of the country.

Mr. Jones. -- That is true. If youth are properly educated, they will never blaspheme.

0 Senator Palmer. -- We pass laws for the education of the youth. The question is whether abstention from blasphemy could not be included in the scope of education. Take it on that ground.

Mr. Jones. -- Idolatry (and covetousness is idolatry) is no more than a violation of the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me;" and if the State can forbid the violation of the third commandment and the fourth, why may it not forbid the violation of the first and the second, and in that case supplant God at once, and establish an earthly theocracy? That is the only logical outcome.

Senator Blair. -- Covetousness is a state of mind; but when it becomes practice by stealing -- taking from another without consideration -- the law interferes.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Palmer. -- There is an infection in blasphemy or in covetousness. For instance, if one covetous man in a neighborhood should infuse the whole neighborhood with covetousness to such an extent that all would become thieves, then covetousness would be a proper subject of legislation.

Mr. Jones. -- Never! You forbid the theft, not the covetousness. You cannot invade the condition of mind in which lies the covetousness.

Senator Blair. -- We do not say that we must invade the condition of mind; but society has a right to make regulations, because those regulations are essential to the good of society. Society by a major vote establishes a regulations, and we have to obey what is settled by the majority.

Mr. Jones. -- How shall it be discovered what is blasphemy, as it is only an offense against God? In the Puritan Theocracy of New England, our historian, Bancroft, says that "the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes was blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy."

Senator Blair. -- But the law was behind the jury, and said that the practice should be punished. If a

32

jury of twelve men said that one had committed the overt act, then it could be punished. It was the majority who made the law, and the jury only found the question of fact after the law had been violated. The jury did not make the law. This is a question as to making the law.

Mr. Jones. -- It is not wholly a question only of making the law. The question is whether the law is right when it is made. There is a limit to the lawmaking power; and that limit is the line which Jesus Christ has drawn. The government has no right to make any law relating to the things that pertain to God, or offenses against God, or religion. It has nothing to do with religion.

Blasphemy, according to Judge Cooley, in his "Constitutional Limitations," "is purposely using words concerning the Supreme Being, calculated and designed to impair and destroy the reverence, respect, and confidence due to him, as the intelligent Creator, Governor, and Judge of the world; . . . a bad motive must exist; there must be a willful, malicious attempt to lessen men's reverence for the Deity, or for the accepted religion."

It is seen at a glance that this comes from the old English system of statutes regulating "offenses against God and religion." That is where this statute is placed in every system of civil law; it could not be placed anywhere else. But offenses against God are to be answered for only at his tribunal; and with religion, or offenses against it, the civil power has nothing to do. It is a perversion of the functions of civil government to have it made a party to religious controversies. It will have ample exercise for its power and jurisdiction to keep religious disputants as well as other people civil,

33

without allowing itself ever to become a partisan in religious disputes and the conservator of religious dogmas.

But according to Judge Cooley's definition, blasphemy is an attempt to lessen men's reverence, not only for the Deity, but for "the accepted religion" as well. But any man in this wide world has the right to lessen men's reverence for the accepted religion, if he thinks that religion to be wrong. Consequently, as I said a moment ago, that which would be counted blasphemy here would not be counted blasphemy in China; and that which is in the strictest accordance with the word of God and the faith of Jesus Christ here, is necessarily blasphemy in China, or in Turkey, or in Russia. A man who preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ in China commits blasphemy under this definition. He does make a willful attempt to lessen men's reverence for their accepted religion, and for the deities recognized in their religion. He had to do so, if he is ever to get them to believe in Christ and the religion of Christ. He has to bring them to the place where they will have no reverence for their deities or for their accepted religion, before they ever can accept the religion of Jesus Christ. It is the same way in Turkey, or any other Mohammedan country, or any heathen country. Wherever the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in any Mohammedan or heathen country, it is blasphemy under this definition, because its sole object is not only to lessen men's reverence for their deities and for their accepted religion, but to turn them wholly from it, and if possible to obliterate it from their minds.

It is so likewise in Russia. Anybody there who speaks against the accepted religion, or against the saints, or their images, is subject to the penalty of blasphemy, which is banishment for life to Siberia.

But if blasphemy be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, if it be right for a government to make itself the "defender of the faith," then it is perfectly proper for the laws of China to prohibit under whatever penalty it pleases, the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within the Chinese dominions; because its effect is to lessen men's reverence for the deities recognized by China, and for the accepted religion of the country. It is the same way in any of the other countries named. And in that case there is no such thing as persecution on account of religion. The only persecutions that have ever been, were because of men's speaking against the accepted religion. If this principle be correct, then the Roman empire did perfectly right in prohibiting under penalty of death the preaching of the religion of Jesus Christ. Whenever Paul, or any of his brethren, spoke in the Roman empire, they blasphemed according to the Roman law. They were held as blasphemers, and were put to death under the very principle of this definition, which is the principle of the American statutes on the subject of blasphemy. The Christians had to tell the Roman empire that the Roman gods were no gods. They had to tell the Roman empire that the genius of Rome itself, which the Roman system held to be the supreme deity, was not such; but that it was subordinate, and that there was a higher idea of God and of right than the Roman empire or the Roman law knew anything of. They did speak deliberately

against the chief deity of Rome, and all the gods of Rome. They did it with the express purpose of destroying reverence for them and for the accepted religion. Rome put them to death. And I repeat, if the principle of the American statutes against blasphemy is correct, then Rome did right.

35

To make this clearer, I quote a passage from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in defense of this principle, in a decision upon this very subject, which says: "To prohibit the open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of a country, is a necessary measure to preserve the tranquillity of a government." That is precisely what the Roman empire did. Christianity did openly, publicly, and explicitly deny the popular religion of the country. It did it with intent to destroy men's reverence for the deities and the religion of that country. Rome prohibited it; and upon the principle of the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which is the principle of American law on blasphemy, Rome did right, and Christianity was a blaspheming religion. The principle of this decision seems to be that those who represent the popular religion of a country have so little of the real virtue of the religion which they profess, that if anybody speaks against it, it is sure to rouse their combativeness to such a degree as to endanger the public tranquillity. Therefore, in order to keep civil those who represent the popular religion, the State must forbid anybody to deny that religion.

This decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is one of the grand precedents that have been followed in all the later decisions upon this subject in the younger States; but this decision itself followed one by Chief Justice Kent of the Supreme Court of New York in 1811, in which the embodies the same principles. He defends the right of the State to punish such offenses against what he calls a Christian people, and not equally to punish like offenses against the religion of other people in this country, by the following argument: --

36

"Nor are we bound by any expressions in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mohammed, or of the Grand Llama, and for this plain reason: that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors."

This is only to argue that if the morality of the country were engrafted upon the religion of Mohammed or the Grand Llama, and Christians were to speak against and deny that accepted religion, it would be proper that the State should punish those

Christians for so doing. If that principle be correct, then a Mohammedan country has the right to prohibit the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within its limits.

According to these decisions, Luther and the reformers of his day were blasphemers. The penalty was death, in many cases at the stake, yet under this principle the State did right to put them to death in whatever way the law prescribed; because they did certainly make an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of every country in which they lived, and of all Europe; and if the words of Luther were used to-day in any Catholic country, they would be counted as blasphemous, as a willful and malicious reviling of the accepted religion. The reformers did hold up to ridicule and contempt the popular religion of all Europe. They did right, too; and when the State punished them, it was but carrying out the principles upheld by Chancellor Kent and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and all the other States that have legislated on the subject of religion.

As I have already stated, it was upon this principle precisely that the Roman empire forbade the preaching

of the gospel the Christ. It only forbade an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of the country, yet in forbidding that, it forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. But Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did it in the face of the Roman law, and in opposition to the whole power of the Roman empire; and everybody in all the world has an undeniable right to make an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of this country, or any other, if he thinks that religion to be wrong.

The principle of these decisions and of the civil statutes against blasphemy, is essentially a pagan principle, and not a Christian principle. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that Chief Justice Kent not only cited the precedents of the church-and-state principles of the colonies and of the British government, but appealed to the pagan governments of antiquity and the papal institutions of modern Europe, as the basis of his decision. It is true that all these nations have set themselves up as the special guardians of their deities, and have prohibited the denial of the popular religion; and it is equally true that all these nations have resisted every step in enlightenment and progress that has ever been made in the march of time. Every step forward in religion and in enlightenment has of necessity been taken in the face of all the opposition which these States and empires could bring to bear. But the principles of American institutions are neither pagan nor papal. The principles of the American Constitution which forbids legislation on the subject of religion, are Christian principles. And it is strictly in order for Supreme Courts in making decisions in behalf of what they boast of as the Christian religion, to base their decision upon something else than the course of

the pagan governments of antiquity, and the papal institutions of modern Europe. Upon such a subject it would seem to be proper for them to refer to the teachings and the principles of the Author of Christianity, but singularly enough, it has never been done, and doubtless for the very good reason that it never can be done; for the teachings of Jesus Christ are directly against it. His word forbids civil government to have anything to do with what pertains to God. And instead of teaching his disciples to prosecute, to fine, and to punish by civil law those who speak against them or their religion, he says, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." How can men be brought to respect God or Jesus Christ by civil penalties upon their bodies and goods? How can they respect the religion of men who are ready to prosecute and imprison them? Every principle of the thing is contrary both to the spirit and the letter of Christianity. The religion of Jesus Christ properly exemplified in the daily lives of those who profess it, is the best argument and the strongest defense against blasphemy, both as defined by the Scriptures and by the civil statutes.

Laws, therefore, prohibiting "what a jury may call blasphemy," are pagan, and not Christian. The decisions of the Supreme Courts of New York and Pennsylvania upon this subject are pagan decisions, and not Christian; they are based upon pagan precedents, not Christian. The deadly persecutions of all history, pagan, papal, and so-called Protestant, are justified in these decisions. Michael Servetus was burnt for "blasphemy." The only use that ever has been, or ever is, made of any such laws in any country, is to give some

religious bigots who profess the popular religion, an opportunity to vent their wrath upon persons who disagree with them. Any man who really possesses the religion of Christ will have enough of the grace of God to keep him from endangering the public tranquillity when his religion is spoken against.

Therefore, I say that we are opposed to all laws of civil government against blasphemy, not because blasphemy is not wrong, but because it is a wrong of that kind with which civil government has nothing to do; and in this we stand wholly upon Christian principle. We stand exactly where the early Christians stood; for, I say again, when Paul spoke in the Roman empire, he was blaspheming, according to the law, was held as a blasphemer and an atheist, and was put to death as such, under the very principle upon which the American laws of blasphemy are sustained.

Senator Blair. -- The law was wrong, you say?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly the law was wrong. The Roman law was that no man should have particular gods of his own, -- gods not recognized by the Roman law.

Senator Blair. -- That law was not for the good of society?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Certainly it was not. Then you have to repeal the law or obey it.

Mr. Jones. -- It ought to be repealed.

Senator Blair. -- During these eighteen hundred years we have contrived to repeal that law; but here comes an intelligent people who have evolved among themselves, as the result of a thousand or fifteen hundred years of history, among other things, the institution of the Christian Sabbath, by writing it in the

40

laws of every State in this country, so that the whole American people made up of communities or States, have enacted the principle of this law.

Mr. Jones. -- The same principle is under the bill before the Committee. There is the same principle under it all. If you can legislate in regard to the Sabbath, you can legislate in regard to blasphemy; you can legislate in regard to idolatry, and every other offense against God, as did both the Puritan and the papal theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- You deny the right of the majority, in other words, to make a law in conformity with which the whole shall practice in society?

Mr. Jones. -- I deny the right of any civil government to make any law respecting anything that pertains to man's relationship to his God, under the first four of the ten commandments. I wish right here to show further that this is not only the principle of the word of Jesus Christ, but also of the American Constitution.

Before Christianity was preached in the world, the Roman empire had among its laws these statutes: --

"1. No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws.

"2. Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same. But hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular.

"3. Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death."

The Christians did have a particular God of their own, not recognized by the Roman law. They did introduce a new religion. The Roman empire enforced the law, and that is why the Christians were put to death. If things pertaining to God be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, then no Christian was ever persecuted, and there has never been persecution in this world. All the Roman empire did in killing Christians was to enforce the law. Then the question was with the Christians, at that time, and the question is with us, Is not the law wrong? and did not the Christians have the right to attack the law? That is what they did. When a Christian was brought before the magistrate, a dialogue followed something like this: --

Magistrate. -- "Have you a particular God of your own, -- a god not recognized by the Roman law?"

Christian. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Did you not know that the law is against it?"

C. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Have you not introduced a new religion?"

C. -- "Yes."

M. -- "Did you not know that the law is against it?"

C. -- "Yes."

0 M. -- " Did you not know that the penalty is death, for those of the lower ranks?"

1 C. -- "Yes."

2 M. -- "You are of the lower ranks?"

3 C. -- "Yes."

4 M. -- "You have introduced a new religion?"

5 C. -- "Yes."

6 M. -- "You have a God of your own?"

7 C. -- "Yes."

8 M. -- "What is the penalty?"

9 C. -- "Death."

0 That was all. The Romans enforced the law upon the Christians in the first days of Christianity; and there was no persecution in it, if the principle be recognized

42

that civil government has a right to legislate in religious things. The empire had this apparent advantage, too, that the law existed before Christianity was known in the world. Christianity appeared to Rome as nothing else than an uprising against the imperial power. Laws are made to be enforced; and to enforce the law is all that the Roman empire ever did, whether up to the time of Constantine, or at any other time. In fact, all the papacy did in the Middle Ages was to have the emperors enforce the law. We stand to-day just where the Christians did at that time; we come to the root of the whole matter, and deny the right of the civil government to legislate on anything that pertains to our duties to God under the first four commandments, and assert the Christian and American principle that every man has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

The principle that the Christians asserted was to render to Caesar that which is Caesar's, and to deny the right of Caesar to demand anything that pertains to God. They gave their lives in support of that principle, against the law of the Roman empire, and against the very existence of the Roman empire. This principle was asserted and maintained until it forced the Roman empire, with all its power, to recognize the right of every man to have a particular god of his own, and to worship that god as he chose. The Roman empire did come in the days of Constantine and Licinius to that point. At the death of Galerius, it was decreed in the Roman law, by the emperors Constantine and Licinius in the Edict of Milan, that every man should be at liberty to have any god he pleased, and worship him as he pleased. But it was the Christian principle that forced the Roman empire to that point in the face of all its laws and institutions of ages.

43

Our national Constitution embodies the very principle announced by Jesus Christ, that the civil government shall have nothing to do with religion, or with what pertains to God; but shall leave that to every man's conscience and his God. As long as he is a good citizen, the nation will protect him and leave him perfectly free to worship whom he pleases, when he pleases, as he pleases, or not to worship at all, if he pleases.

In Article VI. of the Constitution of the United States, this nation says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By an amendment making more certain the adoption of the principle, it declares in the first amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This first amendment was adopted in 1789, by the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution. In 1796 a treaty was made with Tripoli, in which it was declared (Article II.) that "the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." This treaty was framed by an ex-Congregationalist clergyman, and was signed by President Washington. It was not out of disrespect to religion or Christianity that these clauses were placed in the Constitution, and that this one was inserted in that treaty. On the contrary, it was entirely on account of their respect for religion, and the Christian religion in particular, as being beyond the province of civil government, pertaining solely to the conscience, and resting entirely between the individual and God. This fact is so well stated by Mr. Bancroft in his "History of the Constitution of the United States," that I will here insert it: --

44

"In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and often these protectors, one after another, might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian War grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation, -- the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest forms, -- when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power." -- Last chapter.

At this point I am brought to the assertion of the second of the principles upon which we stand in our

45

opposition to Sunday laws, or any other form of religious legislation: that is, the principle of the Constitution of the United States; and upon this principle I maintain that this proposed Sunday law is unconstitutional.

The object of this Sunday bill is wholly religious. The last section shows the object of the entire bill; and that is, "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day." No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the civil, observance of the day that is required; because it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word civil is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The title of the bill declares that its object is to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day as a day of rest, "and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship." The first section defines the Lord's day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; the third section refers to it as a day of religious worship; the fourth section refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and the sixth section plainly declares, what is apparent throughout, that the object of the bill is "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day," on the first day of the week.

It is the religious observance of the day that its promoters, from one end of the land to the other, have in view. In the convention, now in session in this city,

46

working in behalf of this bill, only yesterday Dr. Crafts said: --

"Taking religion out of the day, takes the rest out."

In the "Boston Monday Lectures," 1887, Joseph Cook, lecturing on the subject of Sunday laws, said: --

"The experience of centuries shows, however, that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship. Unless Sabbath observance be founded upon religious reasons, you will not long maintain it at a high standard on the basis of economic and physiological and political considerations only."

And in the Illinois State Sunday convention held in Elgin, Nov. 8. 1887, Dr. W. W. Everts declared Sunday to be "the test of all religion."

Sunday is a religious institution wholly; Sunday legislation, wherever found, is religious legislation solely; and this bill does not in its terms pretend to be anything else than religious. Being therefore as it is, religious legislation, it is clearly unconstitutional. In proof of this, I submit the following considerations: --

All the powers of Congress are delegated powers. It has no other power; it cannot exercise any other. Article X. of Amendments of the Constitution expressly declares that --

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In all the powers thus delegated to Congress, there is no hint of any power to legislate upon any religious question, or in regard to the observance of any religious institution or rite. Therefore, this Sunday bill, being a religious bill, is unconstitutional; and any legislation with regard to it will be unconstitutional. Sunday being

47

a religious institution, any legislation by Congress in regard to its observance, will be unconstitutional as long as the United States Constitution shall remain as it now is.

Nor is this all. The nation has not been left in doubt as to whether the failure to delegate this power was or was not intentional. The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," shows that the failure to delegate such power was intentional, and makes the intention emphatic by absolutely prohibiting Congress from exercising any power with regard to religion. It is impossible to frame a law on the subject of religion that will not prohibit the free exercise of religion. Therefore the first amendment to the Constitution absolutely prohibits Congress from ever making any law with regard to any religious subject, or the observance of any religious rite or institution.

More than this, the National Reform Association knows, and has been contending for twenty-five years, that for Congress to make any Sunday laws would be unconstitutional. Yet the National Reform Association is one of the most prominent agencies in urging forward this bill; and the Secretary of that Association stood at this table to-day to plead for its passage. And this only shows that they are willing knowingly to resort to unconstitutional means to secure their coveted power, and to accomplish their purposes. As for Dr. Crafts and his fellow-workers, whether or not they know it to be unconstitutional, we do not know. In the announcements of the national Sunday-law

convention now (Dec. 11-13, 1888) being held in this city, it was stated that the church in which the convention was to meet would

48

be festooned with the names of six millions of petitioners; but at the beginning of the first meeting it was stated that there were fourteen millions of them. A question was sent up asking how the number could have grown so much larger so suddenly. Mrs. Bateham was recalled to the platform to answer the question, and when she answered it, the cause of such a sudden and enormous growth was explained by the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter indorsing the bill, and solely upon the strength of his name, seven million two hundred thousand Catholics were counted as petitioners.

This was not a complete answer to the question, because the Cardinal's letter does not authorize any such use of it as they have made, at least so much of it as was made public does not. The whole of the letter was not made public there, because, Dr. Crafts said, it was for the Senate Committee. It was laid on the table here to-day. But so much of it as was read merely referred to the action of the Baltimore Council in commanding a stricter observance of Sunday, and said: --

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by judicious legislation."

This was all. He said, "I am happy to add my name," etc. He did not say that he added, or that he wished to add, seven million two hundred thousand others with his name, or in his name; yet this was done. But it was not so much to be wondered at, because the same principle had been acted upon before throughout the country, and when five hundred petitioners could be made out of one hundred, and two hundred

49

and forty thousand out of two hundred and forty, it was perfectly easy and entirely consistent to make seven million two hundred thousand and one out of one.

This thing was perfectly consistent also with the principle in another point. The petition reads: "We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby petition," etc. In counting these seven million two hundred thousand petitioners in behalf of the Sunday law, they thereby certified that all these were Catholics "twenty-one years of age or more." But there was not a man in that convention, and there is not a woman in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, who does not know that there are not that many Catholics in the United States "twenty-one years of age or more." They virtually certified that all the Catholics in the United States are "twenty-

one years of age or more," for they distinctly announced that "all the Roman Catholics" were petitioning for the Sunday law. But as they had virtually certified the same thing of the Protestant churches throughout the country, why should they not go on and swing in "all the Roman Catholics" in the same way? They could do the one just as honestly as they could do the other. When men and women professing themselves to be Protestant Christians will do such things as that to carry the Catholic Church with them, it is not to be wondered at if they should be willing to resort to unconstitutional means to make their religious zeal effective in national law.

Senator Blair. -- Then you assume that this bill and all Sunday laws concern only the relation of man to God, and not the relation of men to each other?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, that is the principle upon which we stand.

50

Senator Blair. -- Right there I find fault with your original proposition. You have got to establish, before you can defeat the ground of Sunday laws, that Sunday laws are not for the good of Caesar; that is, not for the good of society.

Mr. Jones. -- I have not had time to prove that yet. I will prove fully that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody.

Senator Blair. -- Come to the point as soon as you can. That is the point in this case, as between you and the law proposed to be enacted.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good. For the State to compel men to do no work is to enforce idleness. Idleness is the root of unlimited evil. It is a true proverb that we learned in our boyhood, "Satan always finds something for idle hands to do." In this world, to compel men to be idle is to force them into a line of influences and temptations which in the very nature of things can end only in evil. It is well known, and it is one of the principal grounds of the complaints of those who are working for Sunday laws, that Sunday is, of all the week, the day of the most wickedness; that the record of crime and violence on Sunday exceeds that of any other day of the week, especially in large cities.

Dr. Crafts refers constantly to London as an exemplary city in the matter of enforced Sunday laws, but the fact was brought out last spring by a member of this Committee -- Senator Payne -- that the statement had lately been "made on authority, that London on Sunday is the most immoral and dissipated city in the world." Now why is this? They argue that it is because the saloons are open on Sunday. But the saloons are open every other day of the week. Then the saloons being open no more on Sunday than on any

51

other day, why is it that there is so much more violence done on Sunday than on other days of the week? -- It is because more men are idle on Sunday than on any other day of the week. Upon this point I quote an extract from the Cincinnati Commercial Gazette of March 10, 1888.

"They declare Sunday the moral ruin of the people. They prove it by alleged statistics of criminal prosecutions to show that more crimes of violence are committed on Sunday than on all other days of the week. Why is this? Because the saloons are open? -- They are open on other days. This reduces them to the sole reason that it is because it is a day of idleness.

"Their argument is absolutely destructive to the beneficence of the custom of a rest day. They continually affirm that a Sabbath day is the very foundation of religion, morals, and society, and they incessantly declare that the custom of Sunday cessation from work in the cities had made it a day of moral ruin. What is their recourse from the destruction which they charge upon the day of idleness? -- To make statutes more stringent to enforce idleness. Arguing that idleness on that day leads mankind to moral ruin, they call for a more rigid enforcement of idleness, to lead mankind to the ways of salvation.

"Surely there is need to revise their basis in season before they can proceed rationally in legislation. Selling beer is no more a sin on Sunday than on other days. The reason why more crimes of violence are done on Sunday than on other days -- if that is a fact -- is not that the saloons are open, but that the men are idle. The good of a day of rest for the toilers has to be taken with the drawback of this unavoidable evil from idleness and indulgences of appetites. The cause is the cessation of vocations."

This argument is entirely sound. We submit to the consideration of any candid mind that it would be far better to allow men to follow their honest occupations

on Sunday as they do on other days of the week, than to compel them to be idle, and thus forcibly throw them into the way of all the temptations and evil that beset men in this world. No State, therefore, can ever afford for its own good to enact laws making idleness compulsory, as Sunday laws do.

More than this, to prohibit men from following their honest occupations at any time, under penalties of fine or imprisonment, or perhaps both, is for the State to relegate honest occupations to the realm of crime and put a premium upon idleness and recklessness. It is well known that in many localities if a man will only be idle on Sunday, he can run into all sorts of dissipation and wickedness to any extent, except that of down-right violence, without any fear of prosecution or penalty of any kind. But if any

quiet, industrious citizen chooses to engage in his honest occupation, -- going quietly about his own business on his own premises on Sunday, -- he is subjected to prosecution, to a penalty of a heavy fine, and perhaps imprisonment. This is nothing else than to put a premium upon wickedness. No State can afford to make crimes of honest occupations. No State can afford to put such a premium upon idleness and all its attendant wickedness.

All these complaints of evil and violence and wickedness on Sunday, so enlarged upon by the people who are working for Sunday laws, is an open confession that wickedness is the effect of enforced idleness, and this in itself is the strongest argument that can be offered against the very things for which they plead. The States of the Union have all these years been sowing the wind in this very thing, and now they are reaping the whirlwind. And, worse than all, they propose to

53

cure the evils of all this enforced idleness by more stringently enforcing more idleness throughout the whole nation, and by the national power.

It may be answered that this reflects upon the wisdom of God in appointing a day of rest; but it does not. God appointed the Sabbath for a purpose; and that purpose is that men should remember him in his works of creation, and worship him as Creator.

The intention of the commandment enjoining the observance of the Sabbath day, is the honor of God, and his worship as Creator. This worship and the religious sanctions which God has associated with the Sabbath, are considerations which will ever prevent the day from becoming a day of idleness of those who keep the Sabbath in obedience to him; and the worship of God and the religious sanctions which he has put upon the Sabbath, are the only things that ever can prevent the Sabbath from becoming a day of idleness. Those who advocate this Sunday bill well know this. This whole principle is embodied in that statement Dr. Crafts made to the Knights of Labor, that "if you take religion out of the day, you take the rest out." The same principle is also apparent in the words of Joseph Cook, before referred to, that you will in vain endeavor to secure the enforcement of a day of rest unless you enforce it as a day of worship; and unless it be founded on religious reasons, it cannot be long maintained.

Thus these men themselves confess the point which I here make: that it is only the religious sanctions and worship that can ever keep a day of rest from being a day of idleness, and of consequent wickedness. But it is only God who can furnish those sanctions; the State never can. Therefore, next step in the

54

proceeding on the part of those who are calling for this law is to have the State attempt to supply the religious sanctions which belong with the day of rest, and which only can keep it from being a day of idleness and a day of evil. But they know that the State has none of

those religious sanctions; and they know that these will have to be supplied to the State by the church, and then the church will call upon the State, by its power, to force them upon the citizen.

This is precisely what is proposed. Rev. Sam Small, in a sermon in Kansas City last winter, expressed the views of many more than himself, when he said: --

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously, and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it, and enact it into laws."

But any attempt to enforce religious observances only enforces hypocrisy and multiplies sin, because love for God is essential to every act of religious duty. For a man to tender obedience or homage to God when he has no love for God in his heart, only dishonors God, and does violence to his own nature. For anybody to obey God, or perform religious observances from interested motives, is sin; and for the State to exert its power in compelling men to act religiously, and pretend to honor God when they have in the heart no love for God, is only to force them into hypocrisy, and to compel them to commit sin, which, increased and multiplied by the exertion of national power, can end only in ruin, and that speedily.

For as Mr. Buckle has most forcibly expressed it: --

55

"In this way, men being constrained to mask their thoughts, there arises a habit of securing safety by falsehood, and of purchasing impunity with deceit. In this way, fraud becomes a necessity of life; insincerity is made a daily custom; the whole tone of public feeling is vitiated; and the gross amount of vice and of error fearfully increased."

Consequently, it is only at its own peril that the State can ever enforce the observance of a day of rest.

More than this, for the State to allow itself to be dictated to by the church as is here proposed by Mr. Small, is to render the church superior to the civil power, which can end in nothing but a religious despotism, which is the worst of all despotisms. Thus by every line of reasoning that can spring from the subject, it is demonstrated that for the State to fix a day of compulsory rest can only end in evil. Therefore, my proposition is proved, that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody.

Further: as it is only the religious sanctions which surround a day of rest, that can prevent it from being a day of idleness, and consequently of evil; and as God only can

supply these sanctions, it follows that to God only, can Sabbath observance be rendered. He only can command it; he only can secure it; and being a duty which can be rendered only to God, we are brought again directly to the command of Jesus Christ, to render unto God, not to Caesar, that which is God's, which clearly forbids the State to have anything to do with Sabbath observance.

This whole line of argument is fully sustained by the Sabbath commandment itself. That commandment says: "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

56

thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Here are the reasons: first, he rested on the seventh day; second, he blessed it and made it holy. That you may become tired is not given as a reason for doing no work on the seventh day. God does not say that on the seventh day you shall do no work, because if you should, you would overdo or break down your physical system. Nothing of the kind. Man's physical wants are not referred to in the commandment. It say, Work six days, because the Lord worked six days; rest on the seventh day, because the Lord rested on the seventh day; keep that day holy, because the Lord blessed it and made it holy. It is the Lord who is to be held in view. It is the Lord who is to be exalted. Therefore the fourth commandment and its obligations have solely to do with man's relationship to God. It is not man's physical, but his spiritual, needs that are held in view in the Sabbath commandment. It is intended to be a day in which to worship God, -- a day of holy remembrance of him, and of meditation upon his works. The day is to be kept holy. If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all. When the State undertakes to demand the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, it demands of men that which does not belong to it, but which belongs only to God. When the State undertakes to secure the observance of the Sabbath, it undertakes that which, to it, is an impossible task, because holiness is not an attribute of civil government, nor has it either the power or the credentials

57

to promote holiness; and as has been already demonstrated, all that it ever can do in any such effort is to enforce idleness and put a premium upon recklessness, which, for its own welfare, the State can never afford to do. If the State undertakes to supply, from whatever source, the religious sanctions which alone can keep the day from being one of idleness, generating evil, it only enforces hypocrisy, and increases sin.

Therefore I repeat, that by every logical consideration of the subject, I have sustained my proposition that Sunday laws are not for the good of anybody or anything in this world.

Senator Blair. -- Do you understand that this bill undertakes to make anybody worship God?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, I affirm that it does; and I will prove it by statements made by those who stood here to-day. But I have some other points to make first; and here I propose to introduce my historical argument. I want you all to see that in this way the papacy was made in the fourth century. I shall read all that I do read, perhaps, on this point, from Neander's Church History, vol. 2, Prof. Torrey's edition, Boston, 1852. I can only refer to it by the page. As I have related, the Roman empire was forced by the principles of Christ, to recognize the right of every man to worship as he chose. This right was recognized in the Edict of Milan, A. D. 312. But liberty of conscience trembled in the balance but a moment, and then the bishopric, with that ambitious spirit that developed the papacy, took up the strain, and carried forward that line of work which ended in the imperious despotism of the Middle Ages. I want you to see just how that was done, and you will then have no difficulty in seeing the tendency of the present movement.

Neander says: --

"There had in fact arisen in the church a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way." -- p. 132.

A theocratical theory of government tending to subordinate the secular to itself, was the scheme. In other words, the church aimed to make the ecclesiastical power superior to the civil power. These theocratical bishops made themselves and their power a necessity to Constantine, who, in order to make sure of their support, became a political convert to the form of Christianity, and made it the recognized religion of the empire; for says Neander further: --

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." -- Idem.

Out if that theocratical theory of government came the papacy, which did subordinate the civil to the ecclesiastical power, and that same spirit is to be guarded against to-day in the United States as much as in any other country.

I want you to see that there is a theocratical theory underlying this whole scheme. Mr. Bateham has said that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union started this movement a short time ago, and that they had worked it up. What is their aim in civil

59

government? I quote from the monthly reading of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of September, 1886, -- a monthly reading for all the local Unions throughout the country -- the following: --

"A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers; hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."

A theocratical theory, you see, is behind this movement, and is again coming in to interfere in civil things, to establish a theocracy, and to subordinate the civil power at last, to the ecclesiastical.

Senator Blair. -- Do you think the question of giving the ballot to women is a religious question?

Mr. Jones. -- No. I only read this for the purpose of giving the proof that there is a theocratical theory underlying this, as there was that in the fourth century, so as to show the parallel.

Senator Blair. -- But the parallel seems to imply that the extension of the suffrage to woman is by divine appointment, and is the introduction of a theocratic form of government?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, they want the ballot so as to make a theocracy successful.

Senator Blair. -- Therefore you would be against woman's suffrage?

Mr. Jones. -- I would be against woman's suffrage, or any other kind of suffrage, to establish a theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- But that is not the question. It is possible these women have misstated their own idea there.

0 Mr. Jones. -- No, because I have other proofs. Let me read them.

Senator Palmer. -- Do you suppose they intended there a practical theocracy?

Mr. Jones. -- I do, sir; but let me read further, and you will get their own words.

Senator Blair. -- If these women are trying to overthrow the institutions of the country, and are about to establish a sacerdotal State, we ought to know it.

Mr. Jones. -- That is true, and that is why I am speaking here; we want the nation to know it.

Senator Blair. -- These women need looking after, I admit.

Mr. Jones. -- They do in that respect, and there are many men concerned in the same business.

Senator Blair. -- Otherwise it would not be dangerous.

Mr. Jones. -- It would be dangerous anyway. A theocratical theory of government is dangerous any where. It is antichristian, as well as contrary to right and the principles of justice.

Senator Blair. -- Do you suppose that the government of heaven is a theocracy?

0 Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; but a civil government -- a government of earth -- is not.

1 Senator Blair. -- Then why is it dangerous?

2 Mr. Jones. -- Governments of earth are not dangerous when properly controlled.

3 Senator Blair. -- They only say that a true theocracy is yet to come. A millennium is supposed to be coming; perhaps they have reference to a millennium that we have not yet got, so that they will wait some years before they get it.

4 Mr. Jones. -- But I am going to read what kind of laws they propose to make to bring in the millennium.

5 Senator Blair. -- So far as you have read, you have not touched the question; for they say a true theocracy

is yet to come, and it may be they are looking to the coming down of the New Jerusalem, for the time of the new theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- No, because no true theocracy can ever come through civil laws, or through politics, or through the ballot.

Senator Blair. -- That is not sure at all.

Mr. Jones. -- It is by the Scriptures.

Senator Blair. -- I do not know; I have read the Bible several times. But go on.

Mr. Jones. -- The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, and led them through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges "until Samuel the prophet," to whom, when he was a child, God spoke, and by whom he made known his will. In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. This was allowed, and God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king of Israel. Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king of Israel; and David's throne God established forevermore. When Solomon succeeded to the kingdom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father." 1 Chron. 29 : 23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God. The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, and who entered into a solemn covenant before God that he

would loyally render allegiance to the king of Babylon. But Zedekiah broke his covenant; and then God said to him: --

"Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Eze. 21:25-27; see chap. 17:1-21.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "It shall be no more, until he

come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Who is he whose right it is? -- "Thou . . . shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33. And while he was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the night in which he was betrayed he himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will "be no more, until he come whose right it is," and then it will be given him. And that time is the end of this world, and the beginning of "the world to come." Therefore while this world stands, a true theocracy can never be in it again. Consequently, from

63

the death of the Christ till the end of this world, every theory of an earthly theocracy is a false theory; every pretension to it is a false pretension; and wherever any such theory is proposed or advocated, whether in Rome in the fourth century, or here in the nineteenth century, it bears in it all that the papacy is or that it ever pretended to be, -- it puts a man in the place of God.

Now I will read another statement as to the purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It is from the annual address of the President of the National Union, at the Nashville convention, 1887. It is as follows; --

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; -- "

Senator Blair. -- "Shall be."

Mr. Jones. -- "Shall be this world's king."

Senator Blair. -- But you are a clergyman, and you read the Bible to us.

Mr. Jones. -- I am going to read a passage presently right on this point.

Senator Blair. -- Is it not in the same Bible that the time when Christ is to be the king, is the present?

Mr. Jones. -- I am going to read a passage from the Bible in connection with this subject. Allow me to finish this extract: --

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; -- yea, verily, **THIS WORLD'S KING** in its realm of cause and effect, -- king of its courts, its camps, its

commerce, -- king of its colleges and cloisters, -- king of its customs and constitutions. . .
. The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

That emphasizes "this world's king." Jesus Christ himself said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Then assuredly the Woman's Christian Temperance Union stands against the words of Jesus Christ, in saying that he shall be this world's king; and that that kingdom is to enter the realm of the law through the gate-way of politics. Jesus Christ has his entrance through the gate-way of the gospel, and not through politics.

Nor did this purpose end with the Nashville National Woman's Christian Temperance Union convention. The proposition was repeated by the New York national convention last summer, in the following resolution: --

"Resolved, That Christ and his gospel, as universal king and code, should be sovereign in our Government and political affairs."

Well, let us apply the resolution. Suppose the gospel were adopted as the code of this Government. It is the duty of every court to act in accordance with the code. There is a statute in that code which says, --

"If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if the trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."

Suppose, then, a man steals a horse. He is arrested, tried, and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code, and the Government must conform to the code. He is released, and repeats the act; is again arrested and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code.

And if he repeats the offense seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turns to the court, saying, : I repent," the Government must forgive him, for so says that which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has resolved should be the governmental code.

Any such system as that would destroy civil government in twenty-four hours. This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only illustrating the absurd perversion of its principles by these people who want to establish a system of religious legislation here. God's government is moral, and he has made provision for maintaining his government with the forgiveness of transgression. But he has made no such provision for civil government. No such provision can be made, and

civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God's method of saving those who sin against his moral government; civil government is man's method of preserving order, and has nothing to do with sin, nor the salvation of sinners. If civil government arrests a thief or a murderer and finds him guilty, the penalty must be executed, though the Lord does forgive him.

The theocratical theory referred to seems to pervade the whole body, for the eighth district of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Augusta, Wis., Oct. 2-4, 1888, representing fifteen counties, passed this resolution: --

"Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and, --

"Whereas, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law, and the only law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore, --

"Resolved, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation."

66

The law which Christ gave from Sinai is not a civil law; it is the moral law. But if that be a civil law, and this a civil government, what in the world does a civil government want with a moral Governor? These excellent women should be informed that civil government is based upon civil law, and has civil governors only. Moral government is founded in moral law, and has a moral Governor only. Any governmental theory that confounds these is a theocratical theory, which is precisely the governmental theory of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, as is demonstrated by these proofs. And any theocratical theory of government since Christ died, is the theory of the papacy.

These extracts prove that the purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the establishment of "a practical theocracy." Please do not misunderstand me here. There are none who have more respect or more good wishes for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in the line of its legitimate work, than have we. We are heartily in favor of union, of temperance union, of Christian temperance union, and of woman's Christian temperance union; but we are not in favor of any kind of political Christian temperance union, nor of theocratical temperance union. We sincerely wish that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union would stick to its text, and work for Christian temperance by Christian means; and not for Christian temperance by political means, nor for political temperance by theocratical means. I believe in Christian temperance. Not only do I believe in it, but I practice it. I practice Christian Temperance more strictly than the Woman's Christian Temperance Union even preaches it. But believing in it as thoroughly as I do, and endeavoring to practice it as strictly as I believe in it, I would never

lift my hand nor open my lips in any effort to compel men to practice the Christian temperance in which I believe and which I practice. Christianity persuades men, instead of trying to compel them. By the purity and love of Christ, Christianity draws men instead of trying to drive them. It is not by the power of civil government, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, that Christianity secures the obedience of men and the practice of Christian temperance.

The establishment of a theocracy is the aim of the prime movers in this Sunday-law movement, as it was also the aim of the church leaders of the fourth century. And what came of that movement at that time? I read again: --

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and. . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." -- Neander, p. 132.

This being their theory, which resulted in the determination "to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims," the question arises, What means did they employ to secure control of this power? The answer is, They did it by means of Sunday laws.

The first and greatest aim of the political church managers of that time was the exaltation of themselves; and second only to that was the exaltation of Sunday. These two things had been the principal aim of the bishops of Rome for more than a hundred years, when Constantine gave them a chance to make their schemes effectual by the power of the State. The arrogant pretensions of the bishop of Rome to secure power over the whole church, was first asserted in behalf

of Sunday by Victor, who was bishop of Rome from A. D. 193 to 202.

"He wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter [that is, commanding them to celebrate it on Sunday]. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition. . . with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome." -- Mosheim, chap. 4, par. 11.

The one means by which these church managers secured from Constantine the use of the power of the State, was the famous edict prohibiting certain kinds of work on "the venerable day of the sun." That edict runs thus: --

"Let all the judges and towns-people and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines, lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

This edict was issued March 7, A. D. 321. Only judges and towns-people and mechanics were to rest on Sunday; people in the country were at full liberty to work. But this did not satisfy the political managers of the churches for any great length of time. "The object of the first Sunday law," says Sozomen, "was that the day might be devoted with less interruption

69

to the purposes of devotion." And as the government was now a theocracy, it was only consistent that all should be required to be religious. Consequently, an additional Sunday law was secured, which commanded all people to do no work on Sunday.

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered in fact as guilty of sacrilege." -- Neander, p. 300.

Then as the people were not allowed to do any manner of work, they would play, and as the natural consequence, the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday. But the object of the law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and that the people might go to church. Consequently, that this object might be met, there was another step to take, and it was taken. At a church convention held at Carthage in 401, the bishops passed a resolution to send up a petition to the emperor, praying --

"That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast-days, to some other days of the week." -- Idem.

History does not say whether or not this petition represented the names of fourteen million petitioners, the greater part of whom never signed it at all. History is also silent as to whether the petition was indorsed by any one man who could be counted for seven million two hundred thousand men. But history is not silent as to the reason why it was necessary to send up the petition. The petitioners themselves gave the reason, and it was this; --

"The people congregate more to the circus than to the church." -- Idem, note 5.

In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But rather than to give up their jobs, they would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were compelled to work: they pronounced it persecution, and asked for a law to protect those persons from such "persecution." The church had become filled with a mass of people, unconverted, who cared vastly more for worldly interests and pleasures than they did for religion. And as the government was now a government of God, it was considered proper that the civil power should be used to cause all to show respect for God, whether or not they belonged to a church, or whether they had any respect for God.

The people, not being allowed to work, crowded the circus and the theater. They had no wish to be devoted; and as they were forced to be idle, a flood of dissipation was the inevitable consequence. Neander says of it: --

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hinderance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart." -- Idem.

And further: --

"Church teachers. . . were in truth often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church." -- Idem.

And the church could not then stand competition; she wanted a monopoly. She got it, at last.

This petition of the Carthage Convention could not be granted at once, but in the year 425, the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made; namely, --

In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance." -- Idem, p. 301.

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which "the devotion of the faithful" was "disturbed" by these things, was that when the circus or the theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the "faithful" would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and therefore their "devotion" was "disturbed." And of course the only way in which the "devotion" of such "faithful" ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time. Thus, and by this means, every reason for not being devoted was taken away from all the people. Then in the very next sentence Neander says: --

"In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases as final as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he did for them did he give them power over those who did not belong to the church, to compel them to act as though they did, except in that one thing of the Sunday law. Their decisions, which he decreed to be final, were binding only on those who voluntarily chose that tribunal, and affected none others. Before this time, if any who had repaired to the tribunal of the

bishops were dissatisfied with the decision, they could appeal to the civil magistrate. This edict cut off that source of appeal, yet affected none but those who voluntarily chose the arbitration of the bishops. But in the Sunday law, power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday law there was given to the church control of the civil power, that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as if they did. The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing -- the Sunday law. Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

The work, however, was not done yet. True, the bishops had secured the power of the State to take away from the people all excuse for not being religious; but from the beginning of the whole scheme, the people had no real wish to be religious. They had none of the spirit of devotion in their hearts; and although the State had forbidden them to work, and had shut the Sunday circuses and theaters, still the people would not be religious. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them; and the theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case; and the great Catholic Church Father and Catholic saint, Augustine, was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote: --

"It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or

73

by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development." -- Schaff's Church History, vol. 2, sec. 27.

Of this theory Neander remarks: --

"It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which. . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition." -- Church History, p. 217.

The history of the Inquisition is only the history of the carrying out of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded. The church induced the State to compel all to be idle for their own good. Then it was found that they all were more inclined to wickedness. Then to save them from all going to the Devil, they tried to compel all to go to heaven. The work of the Inquisition was always for love of men's souls, and to save them from hell!.

Allow me to summarize these statements from Neander: He says of the carrying into effect of the theocratical theory of those bishops, that they made themselves dependent upon Constantine by their disputes, and "by their determination to use the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." Then he mentions the first and second Sunday laws of Constantine; the Sunday law of 386; the Carthage Convention, resolution, and petition of 401; and the law of 425 in response to this petition; and then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: "In this way the church received help from the State for

74

the furtherance of her ends." She started out with the determination to do it; she did it; and "in this way" she did it. And when she had secured the control of the power of the State, she used it for the furtherance of her own aims, and in her own despotic way, as announced in Augustine's Inquisitorial theory. The first step logically and inevitably led to the last; and the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step unto the last, as framed in the words of Augustine, and illustrated in the history of the Inquisition.

That is the system with which Sunday laws belong. That is the theory upon which they are based. They have no other foundation. Mr. Elliott, who has spoken here in behalf of this bill, knows that there is no law in the Bible for keeping the first day of the week. I could read a passage from his own book, "The Abiding Sabbath," page 184, in which he confesses "the complete silence of the New Testament, so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath, or definite rules for its observance, are concerned." And everybody knows that the Old Testament does not say anything about the observance of the first day of the week as Sabbath. Everybody likewise knows that the Old Testament does not say anything about keeping the first day of the week as the day of the resurrection of the Saviour, or for any other reason. Dr. Johnson and others here this morning have said that the first day of the week was chosen because it was a memorial of the resurrection of the Saviour. It is the New Testament that tells about the resurrection of the Saviour. That is granted. Dr. Elliott confesses, and the American Tract Society publishes it, that there is "complete silence of the New Testament" in regard to it. Then what right have they

75

to put it into law, and try to compel by civil law all people to keep as the Lord's day that for which there is no scriptural authority? Let me read another passage from another book, printed by the American Sunday-school Union. On page 186 of "The Lord's Day," written by Mr. A. E. Waffle, are these words: --

"Up to the time of Christ's death, no change had been made in the day. The authority must be sought in the words or in the example of the inspired apostles."

Then on the very next page he says: --

"So far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not, however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week."

Dr. Schaff, in the Schaff Herzog Cyclopedia, says: --

"No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined."-- Article Sunday.

If, then, they confess that Christ gave no law for its observance, why do they want to compel people to observe it? What right have they to compel anybody to observe it? I deny their right to compel me or anybody else to do what Christ never commanded any man to do.

Senator Blair. -- You admit there was a Sabbath before Christ came?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- And he said came not to destroy, but to fulfill?

0 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

1 Senator Blair. -- Is there anything in the New Testament which destroyed the Sabbath already existing?

2 Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

76

Senator Blair. -- Then why does it not continue to exist?

Mr. Jones. -- It does exist, and we keep the commandment which provides for the Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- Then you say there is a Sabbath recognized, and that is equivalent to its re-affirmation by Christ?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- I do not see from what you are stating, but that Christ recognized an existing law, and that it is continuing at the present time. You say that it is one day, and they say that it is another.

Mr. Jones. -- But they are after a law to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, when they confess that the Lord never gave any command in regard to it. The commandment which God gave says that the "seventh day is the Sabbath."

Senator Blair. -- Is it still the Sabbath?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, and we keep it; but we deny the right of any civil government to compel any man either to keep it or not to keep it.

Senator Blair. -- The civil government of the Jews compelled its observance?

0 Mr. Jones. -- That was a theocracy.

1 Senator Blair. -- Does it follow that when the only form of government is a theocracy and that embraces all that appertains to government, another form of government which is not a theocracy necessarily, cannot embrace the same subject-matter as the theocracy? If the subject-matter of a theocratical, a monarchial, or a republican

form of government is not the same, to control the establishment of good order in society, pray what is it? We say, and it our form of government, that the people shall legislate, shall construe the law,

77

and execute the law. Under the old theocratic form, God made the law, God construed it, and God executed it through his instrumentalities; but we do just the same thing by the will of the people, that under the theocratic form of government was done in the other way. Now if the Sabbath is necessarily for the general good of society, a republican form of government must make and enforce the observance of the Sabbath just as the theocracy did. You seem to be laboring, as it strikes me, under the impression that a civil government for the good of the people carried on by us under the republican form, cannot do anything that the theocratic form of government does when the theocratic is the only form. They necessarily cover the same subject-matter, -- the control, the development, the good, and the health of society, it makes no difference which one it may be.

Mr. Jones -- A theocratic government is a government of God.

Senator Blair. -- So are the powers that be ordained of God.

Mr. Jones. -- This Government is not a government of God.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not consider the Government of the United States as existing in accordance with the will of God?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, but it is not a government of God. The government of God is a moral government. This is a civil government.

Senator Blair. -- A theocracy is a civil government, and governs in civil affairs, as well as in the region of spirituality and morality and religion.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, and God governs it, and nothing but a theocracy can enforce those things which

78

pertain to man's relation to God under the first four commandments.

Senator Blair. -- But this proposed legislation is outside of the theocratic part of it.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all; for it purposes by penalties to "promote" the religious observance of the Lord's day, while nothing but the government of God can do that. That is the point I am making here, that if you allow this legislation, you lead to the

establishment of a new theocracy after the model of the papacy, and civil government has nothing to do with religious things. This bill is wholly religious; and if you begin this course of religious legislation, you will end only in a theocracy, -- a man-made theocracy, -- and that will be the papacy repeated.

Senator Blair. -- We have had the Sunday laws in this country for three hundred years. They have constantly become more and more liberalized. Have you ever known an instance, though the sentiment in favor of the Sabbath seems to be growing constantly stronger, where any State in this Union undertook to enact a law that anybody should go to church, which is the danger you seem to apprehend?

Mr. Jones. -- Not yet. They are now after the first law. This will lead to that. The law of Constantine was enacted in 321, and it commanded at first only that towns-people and mechanics should do no work, that they might be religious. They did not ask for too much at first. As was said in a ministers' meeting in San Diego, Cal., about two months ago, "In this thing you must not ask for too much at first. Ask just what public sentiment will bear, and when you get that, ask for more." And as was said upon this bill by Dr. Crafts in this Capitol, --

79

"We will take a quarter of a loaf, half a loaf, or a whole loaf. If the Government should do nothing more than forbid the opening of the post-offices at church hours, it would be a national tribute to the value of religion, and would lead to something more satisfactory."

Then in telling what would be more satisfactory, he said: --

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and so make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

At another point in the same speech, Mr. Crafts referred to the proposed law as one for "protecting the church services from post-office competition." And in explaining how this could be done, he said: --

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve, would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; but we want more."

And, --

"A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of the employees, would be better than nothing; but we want more than this."

He continues: --

"Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be opened at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing;. . . but we desire more than this."

0 How much more? Still he continues: --

1 "A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday, would be better than nothing; but we want more than that."

2 And when will they ever get enough? It is precisely as it was when the Emperor Constantine forbade the

80

judges, towns-people, and mechanics to work on Sunday. That was an imperial tribute to the "value of religion," and led to "something more satisfactory" -- to the church managers.

Senator Blair. -- Have you ever heard of a proposition's being made in any legislative body to compel any one to attend church on Sunday?

Mr. Jones. -- The propositions that are made are for that very purpose, to stop the Sunday trains, the Sunday newspapers, -- in short, to stop all work on Sunday, so that the people can go to church.

Senator Blair. -- But these people come here and say that they have no such purpose, and they have been doing these things in the States for a hundred years, and during the Colonial period anterior to that time. Have you ever heard on the American continent, within the territory of what is now the United States, a proposition or a suggestion in a legislative body to compel anybody to attend church?

Mr. Jones. -- Not in legislative body, but in ecclesiastical bodies.

Senator Blair. -- Ecclesiastical bodies do not make the laws. Congress is not an ecclesiastical body.

Mr. Jones. -- But it is an ecclesiastical body that is seeking to secure and enforce this law, just as the New England theocracy did when "absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine;" and then when people were compelled under such penalty to go to church and listen to the preaching, it was such preaching as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomacke of an ostrich."

Nor was this confined to Colonial times or to New England; for after the Colonies became States, North

Carolina had a Sunday law, -- has yet, for aught I know, -- reading as follows: --

"Be it enacted. . . that all and every person or persons shall on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety."

In 1803, Tennessee passed a law embodying the same words. But South Carolina and Georgia went farther than this; South Carolina enacted that --

"All and every person 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, publicly and privately; and having no reasonable or lawful excuse, on every Lord's day shall resort to their parish church, or some other parish church, or some meeting or assembly of religious worship."

In 1803, Georgia likewise enacted a Sunday law whose first section required all persons to attend public worship. In 1821, the State of Connecticut, in revising its laws, made its Sunday law read in the first section, that --

"It shall be the duty of the citizens of this State to attend the public worship of God on the Lord's day."

This is precisely the line of things proposed by these men and women now working for this Sunday law. This is the first step in that direction. The whole object which they have in view in stopping work on Sunday, is identical with that of the fourth century; namely, in order that the people may be devoted, in order that they may go to church. The very intention of these men in securing the law is religious.

I will refer you to some of the statements of the very men who stood in this room this forenoon, arguing

for this Sunday bill. Dr. W. W. Everts, of Chicago, in a Sunday-law convention in Illinois, Nov. 8, 1887, declared Sunday to be the "test of all religion." Taking his own words, what can the enforcement of it ever be but the enforcement of a religious test? Dr. Crafts, who is so prominent in this work, said to the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis, as I have before quoted, and he repeated it in this city last night, "If you take religion out of the day, you take the rest out of it." This statement was made in reply to a question as to whether a day of rest could not be secured to the working-men without reference to religion. Taking the statement of Dr. Crafts, therefore, its being a day of rest to anybody depends altogether upon whether religion is in it; for if you take religion out, you take the rest out. He, with these others, demands a law compelling the people to take the rest.

Religion being in the rest, and the rest wholly dependent upon the fact that religion is in it, it is inevitable that their effort to secure a law compelling everybody to rest on Sunday is an effort to establish by law a religious observance.

Again: in the Boston Monday lectureship of 1887, Joseph Cook said, --

"The experience of centuries shows that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship."

Further: Dr. Everts said in the Elgin convention: --

"The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, and allow the hour of worship to go by unheeded."

And in Chicago only three weeks ago, Dr. Herrick Johnson named the matter with which he said the Sunday papers are filled -- crime, scandal, gossip, news, and politics -- and exclaimed: --

83

"What a melange! what a dish to set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast, to prepare him for hearing the word of God! It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether."

Dr. Everts said further in the Elgin convention: --

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!"

I will give one more statement which sums up the whole matter. In a Sunday-law mass-meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, Cal., in January, 1887, Rev. Dr. Briggs, of Napa, Cal., said to the State: --

"You relegate moral instruction to the church, and then let all go as they please on Sunday, so that we cannot get at them."

Therefore they want the State to corral all the people on Sunday, so that the preachers can get at them.

These statements might be multiplied indefinitely; but these are enough. The speeches, and the sermons, and the work, of those who are in favor of the Sunday laws, are all in the same line. They all plainly show that the secret and real object of the whole Sunday-law movement is to get the people to go to church. The Sunday train must be stopped, because church members ride on it, and don't go to church enough. The Sunday paper must be abolished, because the people read it instead of going to church, and because those who read it and go to church too, are not so well prepared to receive the preaching.

It was precisely the same way in the fourth century concerning the Sunday circus and theater. The people, even the church members, would go to these instead of to church; and even if they went to both, it must be confessed that the Roman circus or theater was not a very excellent dish -- "What a melange!" -- to set down before a man to prepare him for hearing the word of God. The Sunday circus and theater could not afford to keep open unless they could get a great many spectators, and so break up a great many congregations; and as they hurried the spectators fast on to perdition, they had to be shut on Sunday, so as to keep "a great many congregations" out of perdition. It is exceedingly difficult to see how a Sunday circus in the fourth century could hurry to perdition any one who did not attend it; or how a Sunday train in the nineteenth century can hurry to perdition any one who does not ride on it. And if any are hurried to perdition by this means, who is to blame: the Sunday train, or the ones who ride on it? And Dr. Johnson's complaint of the Sunday papers, is of the same flimsy piece. If the Sunday paper gets into a man's house, where lies the blame; upon the paper, or upon the one who takes it and reads it? Right here lies the secret of the whole evil now, as it did in the fourth century: they blame everybody and everything else, even to inanimate things, for the irreligion, the infidelity, and the sin that lie in their own hearts.

When they shall have stopped all Sunday works; and all Sunday papers, and all Sunday trains, in order that the people may go to church and attend to things divine, suppose that then the people fail to go to church or attend to things divine: will the religio-political managers stop there? Having done all this that the

people may be devoted, will they suffer their good intentions to be frustrated, or their good offices to be despised? Will not these now take the next logical step, -- the step that was taken in the fourth century, -- and compel men to attend to things divine? Having taken all the steps but this, will they not take this? Having compelled men to rest, will they stop short of an effort to supply the religious sanctions which alone can prevent a day of enforced rest from being a day of enforced idleness, and consequently of wickedness? The probability that they will not is strengthened by the fact that the theory

upon which this is carried on is identical with that of the fourth century -- the theory of a theocracy.

I have cited the theocratical purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The National Reform Association, whose secretary stood at this table to-day to plead for the passage of this bill, aims directly at the establishment of a theocracy in this Government. In their own words, they propose to make this republic "as truly and really a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel."

The Sunday-law Association also holds much the same theory. In the Elgin Sunday-law convention, Dr. Mandeville, of Chicago, said: --

The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty, and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty."

Nehemiah was ruling there in a true theocracy, a government of God; the law of God was the law of the land, and God's will was made known by the written word, and by the prophets. Therefore, if Dr. Mandeville's argument is of any force at all, it is so only upon

86

the claim of the establishment of a theocracy. With this idea the view of Dr. Crafts agrees precisely, and Dr. Crafts is general field secretary for the National Sunday-law Union. He claims, as expressed in his own words, that --

"The preachers are the successors of the prophets." -- Christian Statesman, July 5, 1888.

Now put these things together. The government of Israel was a theocracy; the will of God was made known to the ruler by prophets; the ruler compelled the officers of the law to prevent the ungodly from selling goods on the Sabbath. This government is to be made a theocracy; the preachers are the successors of the prophets; and they are to compel the officers of the law to prevent all selling of goods and all manner of work on Sunday. This shows conclusively that these preachers intend to take the supremacy into their hands, officially declare the will of God, and compel all men to conform to it. And this deduction is made certain by the words of Prof. Blanchard, in the Elgin convention: -

-

"In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are the representatives of God."

And the chief of these representatives of God, will be but a pope again; because when preachers control the civil power as the representatives of God, a pope is inevitable.

These quotations prove, to a demonstration, that the whole theory upon which this religio-political movement is based, is identical with that of the fourth century, which established the papacy. They show also that the means employed -- Sunday laws -- by which to gain control of the civil power to make the wicked

87

theory effective, are identical with the means which were employed in the fourth century for the same purpose. The next question is, Will they carry the theory into effect as they did in the fourth century and onward? In other words, when they get the power to oppress, will they use the power? A sufficient answer to this would seem to be the simple inquiry, If they do not intend to use the power, then why are they making such strenuous efforts to get it? If Congress lets them have the power, they will surely use it. Human nature is the same now as it was in the fourth century. Politics is the same now it was then. And as for religious bigotry, it knows no centuries; it knows no such thing as progress or enlightenment; it is ever the same. And in its control of civil power, the cruel results are also ever the same.

How appropriate, therefore, is it that Cardinal Gibbons should indorse the national Sunday bill! How natural, indeed, that he should gladly add his name to the number of petitioners in support of the movement to secure legislation in the interests of the church! He knows just how his brethren in the fourth century worked the same kind of scheme; he knows what the outcome of the movement was then; and he knows full well what the outcome of this movement will be now. He knows that the theory underlying this movement is identical with the theory which was the basis of that; he knows the methods of working are the same now as they were then; he knows that the means employed to secure control of the civil power now, are identical with the means employed then; and he knows that the result must be the same. He knows that when religion shall have been established as an essential element in legislation in this Government, the experience of fifteen

88

hundred eventful years, and "the ingenuity and patient care" of fifty generations of statesmen, will not be lost in the effort to make the papal power supreme over all here and now, as was done there and then. And in carrying out the instructions of Pope Leo XIII., that "all Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled upon the principles of the true church," the Cardinal assuredly is glad to have the opportunity to add his name to the more than six millions of Protestants who are set for the accomplishment of the same task.

To those Protestants who are so anxious to make religion a subject of legislation, it now appears very desirable; and it also appears a very pleasant thing to secure the alliance of the papacy. But when they shall have accomplished the feat, and find themselves in the midst of the continuous whirl of political strife and contention with the papacy, not alone for supremacy, but for existence, -- then they will find it not nearly so desirable as it now appears to their vision, blinded by the lust for illegitimate power.

And when they find themselves compelled to pay more than they bargained to, they will have but themselves to blame; for when they make religion a subject of legislation, they therein confess that it is justly subject to the rule of majorities. And then, if the Romish Church secures the majority, and compels the Protestants to conform to Catholic forms and ordinances, the Protestants cannot justly complain. Knowing, as we do, the outcome of the same kind of movement before, we do not propose to allow this scheme to be worked out here without a decided protest.

Senator Blair. -- You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or nation either.

89

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, of course I am logical, all the way through. I want to show you the wicked principle upon which this whole system is founded, and the reason I do this is because the last step is involved in the first one. If you allow this principle and this movement to take the first step, those who get the power will see in the end that they take the last step. That is the danger. See how in the fourth century the logic of it ended only with the Inquisition.

Senator Blair. -- Was the Inquisition abolished by the abolition of the Sunday laws?

Mr. Jones. -- No; but the principle of it was established by Sunday laws.

Senator Blair. -- Then if the inquisition was established by the Sunday laws, how was it abolished, but by the abolition of the Sabbath? How can you remove an effect except by removing its cause?

Mr. Jones. -- The Sunday laws never have been abolished.

Senator Blair. -- Then the Sunday law could not have been the cause of the Inquisition.

Mr. Jones. -- The power which embodies the Inquisition still continues, and its emissaries have been in this country defending the Inquisition. That same power is now

grasping for the control of the civil law, and the same causes generally produce the same effects.

Senator Blair. -- And the removal of the causes removes the effects with them.

Mr. Jones. -- Sometimes.

0 Senator Blair. -- Therefore the Sunday laws were not the cause of the Inquisition, unless the Inquisition still exists.

1 Mr. Jones. -- No, the Sunday laws did not cause the Inquisition.

2 Senator Blair. -- I understood you to say that it did.

90

Mr. Jones. -- I say, through that the church received the power to make the principle and the work of the Inquisition effective. A certain exercise of power may be forbidden, and yet the means by which the power was obtained may not be forbidden. In other words, the power which was obtained through the deception of Sunday laws, may be prohibited in certain things, and yet allowed in many other things.

Senator Blair. -- The Lord made the Sabbath, and governed the Jewish nation for nearly three thousand years with a Sabbath. Do you think the Sabbath was for the good of the Jewish people, or for their injury?

Mr. Jones. -- It was established for the good of the human race.

Senator Blair. -- Including the Jewish people?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir.

Senator Blair. -- It was established as a part of the civil administration.

Mr. Jones. -- But the church and the State were one.

Senator Blair. -- Therefore what we call the civil administration was included in that theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- The church and the State were one. They were united, and it was a theocracy.

0 Senator Blair. -- If the administration of the Sabbath during these three thousand years, at least, was for the good of the Jews and the human race, why will not the Sabbath be good for the Jews and the human race since the time of Christ, as well as before?

1 Mr. Jones. -- It is for the good of the human race.

2 Senator Blair. -- The civil law must administrate it if it is done. Then we will get no Sabbath now under our division of powers of government, unless we have the Sabbath recognized and enforced by the State authority?

91

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly we have a Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- Your proposition is to strike out the Sabbath from the Constitution and condition of society in these modern times?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Certainly so far as its existence and enactment and enforcement by law are concerned.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, by civil law.

Senator Blair. -- It was enforced in what we call the civil conduct of men under that theocratic form of government for at least three thousand years.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- Now the observance of the Sabbath depends upon a compulsory observance of the law.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all.

0 Senator Blair. -- It required the law of God which he enforced by death, by stoning men to death when they violated it, and we have the Sabbath day only by virtue of what we call the civil law, which is equally a part of God's law.

1 Mr. Jones. -- That government was not organized specially to enforce the Sabbath.

2 Senator Blair. -- They stoned men to death who violated the law.

3 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; and likewise for the transgression of the other commandments.

4 Senator Blair. -- God enforced it, in other words, by human means.

5 Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; my answer to all that is that that was a theocracy, -- a union of church and state. The church was the State, and the State was the church.

6 Senator Blair. -- You say now that there is no State to enforce it?

92

Mr. Jones. -- I say that no government can enforce the Sabbath, or those things which pertain to God, except a theocratic government -- a union of church and state. Therefore I say that if you establish such a law as is here proposed, you lead directly to a union of church and state. The logic of the question demands it, and that is where it will end, because the law cannot be enforced otherwise. These gentlemen say they do not want a union of church and state. What they mean by church and state is, for the State to select one particular denomination, and make it the favorite above all other denominations. That is a union of church and state according to their idea. But a union of church and state was formed by Constantine when he recognized Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire. Everybody knows that that was a union of church and state, and that it ended in the papacy. A union of church and state is where the ecclesiastical power controls the civil power, and uses the civil power in its own interests. That is where this movement will end, and that is one of the reasons why we oppose it.

Senator Blair. -- You say the church and state separated shall not do those proper things which the church and state always did when united in the theocracy?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir.

Senator Blair. -- Then why do you say that the state --

Mr. Jones. -- I did not mean to deny your proposition; I think the way you intended, I mean "Yes," because I certainly do say that the church and state separated shall do those proper things which were done when they were united in the theocracy.

Senator Blair. -- If in this division of the powers of

93

government into church and state, you exclude from the powers of the church the establishment and enforcement and regulation of the Sabbath, why do you not necessarily, if the Sabbath is a good thing, pass it over to the control of the State?

Mr. Jones. -- Because if the church will not recognize it and preserve it, the State cannot compel people to do it. The State that attempts it is bound to fail.

Senator Blair. -- Then you necessarily take the ground that God did wrong in the enforcement of the Sabbath during those three thousand years when his government was both church and state.

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir. If God would come himself to govern, and make himself governor, as he did of Israel, he could enforce the law as he did there. But until God does that, we deny the right of all the churches or anybody else, to do it.

Mr. Senator Blair. -- Even if it is for the good of society?

Mr. Jones. -- What they say is for the good of society is for the ruin of society.

Senator Blair. -- Do you understand that it is the church or the State that is making this law?

Mr. Jones. -- It is the State that is doing it, just as Constantine did it, to satisfy the churches.

Senator Blair. -- It may or may not satisfy the churches. The churches give their reasons here, which may be right or wrong, for the establishment of the Sabbath -- for this Sunday legislation in all the States. The State, the whole people, make the law. You say that the whole people shall not make a good law because the churches ask for it.

Mr. Jones. -- I say the whole people shall not make a bad law, even though the churches do demand it; for any civil law relating to God is a bad law.

Senator Blair. -- Then what God did for three thousand years for the good of the Jews and the human race, was wrong?

Mr. Jones. -- No, sir; it was right.

Senator Blair. -- Then why not continue it?

Mr. Jones. -- Because he has discontinued that kind of government.

Senator Blair. -- We have done nothing in the world to divide the powers of government into those of church and state. We say those departments shall not interfere with each other.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly.

Senator Blair. -- Here and in the States we are trying to run the civil parts. We have taken jurisdiction of a portion of what God has entire jurisdiction, as to the church and state in the civil relations of men. The entire society does that. We put the sovereignty into the hands of everybody except women, and some of us are trying to do that. We have the same subject-matter, the good of society under our control, which under the theocracy was united into both church and state. If you do not let the State continue to do what was essential to society then, and is now, you are striking at one of the great ends for which government exists.

Mr. Jones. -- Not at all; because God has discontinued that kind of government.

Senator Blair. -- He has not discontinued the necessity of laws for the regulation of society.

0 Mr. Jones. -- He has in that way.

1 Senator Blair. -- No; it is just as necessary that there should be a Sabbath now for the good of man, as when God made and enforced the law by his direct supervision under a theocracy.

Mr. Jones. -- But no government but a theocracy can enforce such laws.

Senator Blair. -- Then unless we have a theocracy, we shall have no Sabbath.

Mr. Jones. -- We shall have no laws regulating the Sabbath.

Senator Blair. -- The Sabbath did not descend to the Jews and to all mankind, because there was a theocratic form of government among the Jews. How did the Sabbath come to mankind at large, when there was no theocratic form of government?

Mr. Jones. -- Those nations never kept it. Nobody but the Jews ever kept it.

Senator Blair. -- They could have kept it, because you say the Sabbath existed for all; not for the Jews alone, but for the human race.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly, but if they did not keep it, it would do no good.

Senator Blair. -- It did not exist for good, then?

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; a thing may exist for my good, and I may refuse to use it, as thousands do the salvation of Christ.

0 Senator Blair. -- I was taking your statement as true that it did exist for good outside of the Jews.

1 Mr. Jones. -- I said it was for the good of man. The Saviour said it was for the good of man. The Saviour died for the good of man.

2 Senator Blair. -- You would abolish the Sabbath, anyway?

3 Mr. Jones. -- Yes, in the civil law.

4 Senator Blair. -- You would abolish any Sabbath from human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?

96

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.

Senator Blair. -- Your time has expired. Please take five minutes to close, as I have asked you some questions; still, they were questions that touched the trouble in my own mind.

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly; but I supposed that I was to have an hour to devote, uninterruptedly, to the points in questions.

Senator Blair. -- We have always been accustomed to conducting these hearings with reference to getting at the difficulties we had in our own minds, and I do not feel as though you could complain with an hour and ten minutes, if we give you ten minutes more.

Mr. Jones. -- Very good. Mr. Chairman, I have shown that in the fourth century this same movement developed a theocracy and in that the papacy, religious despotism, and oppression for conscience' sake. Now I want to show the secret of at least a portion of the present movement. The representative of the National Reform Association spoke here in behalf of this proposed legislation. That Association is asking for such a law and for such an amendment to the Constitution as you have proposed, in relation to the Christian religion in the public schools. That measure pleases them well, and this proposed Sunday law pleases them well.

Senator Blair. -- Just incorporate that proposed amendment to the Constitution in your remarks.

Mr. Jones. -- Very well; it is as follows: --

"50th CONGRESS, } S. R. 86.

1st SESSION. }

"Joint Resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.

97

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution: --

"ARTICLE.

"SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

"SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the People of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

"SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary."

98

What, then, do these men propose to do with the civil power when they can use it? The Christian Statesman is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, said: --

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."

To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality, is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christians, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites. It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association declares, civil power has the right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D. D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared in the Christian Statesman of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men."

Rev. M. A. Gault, a district secretary and a leading worker of the Association, says: --

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences, is to have the Government simply set up the moral law and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

When they have the Government lay its hand on dissenters, what will they have it do? Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Neb., and reported in the Christian Statesman of May 21, 1885, said: --

99

"We might add in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the Devil, and for the sake of the Devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

That is what they propose to do. And that is worse than Russia. In the Century for April, 1888, Mr. Kennan gave a view of the statutes of Russia on the subject of crimes against the faith, quoting statute after statute providing that whoever shall censure the Christian faith or the orthodox church, or the Scriptures, or the holy sacraments, or the saints, or their images, or the Virgin Mary, or the angels, or Christ, or God, shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote parts of Siberia. This is the system in Russia, and it is in the direct line of the wishes of the National Reform Association.

Nor is that all. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., another vice-president of that Association, makes all dissenters atheists. He names atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists, then classes them all together as atheists. I will read his own words: --

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry -- the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."

100

They class us as atheists, and are going to condemn all alike; and you are asked to give them the power. Remember these are the views of the members of the National Reform Association, whose secretary stood at this table this morning in defense of this Sunday law. These extracts show what his ideas are, and how he would use them. Dr. Everts, of Chicago, who also was here, declared last month in Chicago, in my hearing, on the subject of this Sunday law, that "it is atheism or the Sabbath."

Mr. Edwards continues: --

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic; for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist; but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith. . . . I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon ! The atheist may live, as I have said; but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land ! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent!"

Senator Blair. -- Many atheists are for Sunday laws.

Mr. Jones. -- Let them be so if they choose; but what I am striking at, is that these men have no right

to say that I am an atheist simply because I do not believe in keeping Sunday.

Senator Blair. -- You come here and seriously argue against these people, because they and the atheists blackguard each other. What have we to do with that? They abuse each other. It is worse in the Christian than in the atheist, because the Christian has some rules to guide his conduct, which the atheist has not. Here seems to be some strong intemperate language which one human being makes use of towards another. An atheist or a Christian alike may find fault with that. I do not know any way that we can interfere with it; but if you claim to argue against this bill because these people abuse atheists, I reply to that by saying that many atheists are for this bill just as these people are. They unite in support of this bill, therefore mutual recriminations amount to nothing.

Mr. Jones. -- But the mutual recrimination amounts to this, that although this is confined simply to words between them now, --

Senator Blair. -- I do not think you ought to argue to us by taking this precious time of yours and ours to show that these people use intemperate language towards each other.

Mr. Jones. -- But I am doing it to show that they use the intemperate language now, but if they get the law, they will use more than the language against them. These men only want to make the State a party to their religious disputes. They want to get the nation by law to commit itself to the defense of religious observances, so they can add its power to their side of the controversy, and send to "hell" or some other place where the Devil is, those who even accidentally disagree with them. But the State has no business to allow itself to

be made a party to any religious controversy. That has been the bane of every nation except this, and God forbid that this one should be dragged from its high estate, and made the tool of the irregular passions of religious parties. The State will find its legitimate employment in seeing that these parties keep their hands off each other, and that the ebullitions of their religious zeal are kept within the bounds of civility. It is not safe to put civil power into the hands of such men as these. But that is just what this Sunday bill will do if it shall pass.

Senator Blair. -- The atheist is for this proposed law. He is not intelligently going to support a law which enables these people to burn him at the stake.

Mr. Jones. -- I know he is not intelligently going to do it.

Senator Blair. -- He is liable to be as intelligent as they are. Mr. Hume was a very intelligent man; so was Voltaire; so was Franklin, if Franklin was an atheist; Franklin was a deist, at all events.

Mr. Jones. -- It is safe to say that not one in ten of the people whose names are signed in behalf of this Sunday law now what is the intention of it, and what those will do with it when they get it.

Senator Blair. -- Then it is a lack of intelligence on their part.

Mr. Jones. -- I know people who signed that petition who would now be just as far from signing it as I would.

Senator Blair. -- That is because you told them of those terrible consequences which they had not believed would follow. The masses of the people do not believe that the Christian people of this country have united in every State in this Union for such a purpose.

Mr. Jones. -- Here is the principle: Here are six million Protestants and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics --

103

Senator Blair. -- Cardinal Gibbons has written a letter which is in evidence. He is for it, and a great many Catholics are also for it; but it does not follow that those Catholics are for it simply because Cardinal Gibbons wrote that letter. They were for it before Cardinal Gibbons wrote the letter. You must remember that the Catholics in this country are intelligent, as well as we. Some of them are ignorant, some of us are ignorant.

Mr. Jones. -- But here is the point. These people are complaining of the continental Sunday --

Senator Blair. -- They do not complain of it because it is Catholic; they complain of it because it is not as good for the people as our form of Sunday --

Mr. Jones. -- Certainly. And in this movement, the American Sunday, they say, comes from the Puritans, and these people know --

Senator Blair. -- Do you argue against it because it comes from the Puritans, or because it comes from the Catholics? It comes from both, you say; we say it is for the good of society, and that God is for it, because it is for the good of man.

Mr. Jones. -- But let me state the point that I am making: I think everybody knows that it is perfectly consistent with the Catholic keeping of Sunday for the Catholic to go the church in the morning and to the pleasure resort if he chooses in the afternoon. These men stand here in convention, and cry out against the continental Sunday and against its introduction here. Everybody knows that the continental Sunday is the Roman Catholic Sunday. Yet these men, while denouncing the continental Sunday, join hands with the Roman Catholics to secure this Sunday law. They have counted here six million Protestants and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics. Suppose this law were secured in answer to these petitions, would

104

they then have a Puritan Sabbath, or a continental Sunday? In other words, would the six million Protestants compel the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to keep Sunday in the Puritan, or even the Protestant way, or will the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics do as they please on Sunday, and let the six million Protestants whistle for "the breath of the Puritan " which Dr. Herrick Johnson invokes ? More than this, if it should come to compulsion between these, would not the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics be able to make it unpleasant for the six million Protestants?

Senator Blair. -- I have been all through this that the working people go through. I have been hungry when a boy. The first thing I can remember about is being hungry. I know how the working people feel. I have tugged along through the week, and been tired out Saturday night, and I have been where I would have been compelled to work to the next Monday morning if there had been no law against it. I would not have had any chance to get that twenty-four hours of rest if the Sunday law had not given it to me. It was a civil law under which I got it. The masses of the working people in this country would never get that twenty-four hours' rest if there had not been a law of the land that gave it to us. There is that practical fact, and we are fighting with that state of things. The tired and hungry men, women, and children, all over this country, want a chance to lie down, and rest for twenty-four hours out of the whole seven days.

Mr. Jones. -- So have I been through this that the working people go through. I have carried the hod by the day. I have swung the hammer and shoved the plane by the day. I am a working-man now just as much as I ever was, though not in precisely the same way; and I say to you that I never was robbed of that

105

twenty-four hours' rest. Nor are there so many compelled to lose it as these Sunday-law advocates try to make out. Dr. Crafts said last night over in that convention that he had had communication with people in every nation but two, and --

"In the world around he could not find a man who had financially lost by refusing to work on Sunday. But many have gained by the conscientious sacrifice."

Much testimony was borne in the Chicago convention last month to the same effect in this country; and in the convention now in session in this city, the Hon. Mr. Dingley, member of Congress from Maine, said last night that the American working-men are indifferent to the efforts which are put forth in this direction.

Senator Blair. -- He is wrong about it. Mr. Dingley didn't know what he was talking about when he said that.

Mr. Jones. -- He said he had investigated the matter.

Senator Blair. -- I have investigated it, and I say that Mr. Dingley was simply laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. Jones. -- Dr. Crafts said this morning that he talked two hours with a convention of laboring men at Indianapolis, answering their questions, until at the end of two hours they indorsed this movement. If they are crying for it, if they are fairly tearing their hair for it, how can it be possible that he had to talk two hours to persuade them that it was all right?

Senator Blair. -- Take his statement in full, if you take it at all. He says they are crying for it.

Mr. Jones. -- Then why was it necessary to talk to them for two hours?

Senator Blair. -- Then you simply say he did not tell the truth? You discredit the witness?

0 Mr. Jones. -- I do.

Senator Blair. -- You say perhaps he did not tell the truth, that is all. I think he was right.

Mr. Jones. -- But the two things do not hitch together properly. If they are calling for it so loudly, certainly it ought not to require two hours to convert them. The fact is that the laboring men are not calling for it. Great effort is being made to have it appear so. But the Knights of Labor never took any such step except at the solicitation of Dr. Crafts. This bill had scarcely been introduced last spring before Dr. Crafts made a trip to Chicago and other cities, soliciting the indorsement of the Knights of Labor. Instead of their petitioning for this Sunday law, they have first been petitioned to petition for it; the object of it had to be explained, and objections answered, before they could even be

brought to support it. The object of the petition for this bill was explained by Dr. Crafts to the Central Labor Union of New York, and its indorsement secured. the Central Labor Union embraces a number of labor organizations, and the Christian Union declares the Central Labor Union to be a "radically Socialistic" organization. This, in itself, would not be particularly significant were it not for the fact that the arguments which Dr. Crafts presents to these organizations to gain their support are entirely Socialistic. Nor are these confined to Dr. Crafts. Other leaders of the movement also advocate the same principles.

Dr. Crafts went to the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis last month to get the delegates there to indorse the petition for the passage of this Sunday bill. He has referred to this in his speech here this forenoon, and has made a portion of his speech to them and to the Locomotive Engineers a part of his speech here. A report of his speech at Indianapolis was printed in the Journal of United Labor, the official journal of the Knights of Labor of America, Thursday, Nov. 29, 1888. He said to them there: --

107

"Having carefully read and re-read your 'declaration of principles' and your 'constitution,' and having watched with interest the brave yet conservative shots of your Powderly at intemperance and other great evils, I have found myself so closely in accord with you that I have almost decided to become a Knight of Labor myself. If I do not, it will be only because I believe I can advance your 'principles' better as an outside ally."

The following question was asked by one of the Knights: --

"Would it not be the best way to stop Sunday trains to have the Government own and control the railroads altogether, as the Knights advocate?"

Dr. Crafts answered: --

"I believe in that. Perhaps the best way to begin the discussion of Government control for seven days per week is to discuss this bill for Government control on one day. If the railroads refuse the little we now ask, the people will be the more ready to take control altogether."

The Knights of Labor advocate the doctrine that the Government shall take control of all the railroads in the country, and hire the idle men in the country at regular railroad wages, and run the roads, as it now runs the Post-office Department, without reference to the question whether anything is made or lost by the Government. This is what gave rise to the above question. Dr. Crafts proposes to play into their hands by making the bid for their support, that if they will help the Sunday-law workers get Government control of the railroads one day in the week, then the Sunday-law workers will help the Knights to get Government control every day in the week.

Another question that was discussed both there and at the convention of Locomotive Engineers at Richmond, Va., was the following: --

"Will not one day's less work per week mean one-seventh less wages?"

The response to this was as follows: --

"As much railroad work as is done in seven days can be done in six days, and done better, because of the better condition of the men. And on this ground the engineers would be sustained in demanding, and, if necessary, compelling, the railroad company to so readjust the pay schedule that the men will be paid as much as at present."

That is to say, Dr. Crafts and the Sunday-law workers propose to stand in with the laboring men to compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is made certain by the following petition to the State legislatures, which is being circulated everywhere with the petition for this bill. I got this at the Chicago convention. Dr. Crafts distributed the petitions by the quantity there, and he is doing the same at the convention now in this city: --

"To the State Senate [or House]: The undersigned earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding any one to hire another, or to be hired for more than six days in any week, except in domestic service, and the care of the sick; in order that those whom law or custom permits to work on Sunday may be protected in their right to some other weekly restday, and in their right to a week's wages for six days' work."

Now a week consists of seven days. A week's wages for six days' work is seven days' wages for six days' work. This petition asks the legislatures of all the States to pass a law protecting employees in their right to seven days' wages for six days' work. No man in this world has any right to seven days' wages for six days' work. If he has a right to seven days' wages for six days' work, then he has an equal right to six days'

wages for five days' work; and to five days' wages for four days' work; and to four days' wages for three days' work; to three days' wages for two days' work; to two days' wages for one day's work; and to one day's wages for no work at all. This is precisely what the proposition amounts to. For in proposing to pay seven days' wages for six days' work, it does propose to pay one day's wages for no work. But if a man is entitled to one day's wages for doing nothing, why stop with one day? Why not go on and pay him full wages every day for doing nothing? It may be thought that I misinterpret the meaning of the petition; that, as it asks that nobody be allowed to hire another for more than six days of any week, it may mean only that six days are to compose a week; and that it is a week's wages of six days only that is to be paid for six days' work. That is not the meaning of the

petition. It is not the intention of those who are gaining the support of the Knights of Labor by inventing and circulating the petition.

Dr. George Elliott, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church in this city, -- the church in which this National Sunday Convention is being held, -- the church that is now festooned with fourteen million petitions that they have n't got, -- festooned, at least partly, with one seven-million-two-hundred-thousand-times-multiplied Cardinal, -- Dr. Elliott, while speaking in favor of this bill this forenoon, was asked by Senator Call these questions: --

"Do you propose that Congress shall make provision to pay the people in the employ of the Government who are exempted on Sunday, for Sunday work?"

"Mr. Elliott. -- I expect you to give them adequate compensation.

"Senator Call. -- Do you propose that the same amount shall be paid for six days' work as for seven?"

110

"Mr. Elliott. -- I do; for the reason that we believe these employees can do all the work that is to be done in six days. And if they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay."

There it is in plain, unmistakable words, that they deliberately propose to have laws, State and national, Which shall compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is sheer Socialism; it is the very essence of Socialism. No wonder they gained the unanimous indorsement of the convention of the Knights of Labor, and of the Locomotive Engineers, and the Socialistic Labor Union of New York City, by proposing to pay them good wages for doing nothing. I confess that I, too, would support the bill upon such a proposition as that if I looked no further than the money that is in it.

But this is not all. The Knights of Labor not only accept the proposition, but they carry it farther, and logically, too. This principle has been advocated for some time by the Knights of Labor in demanding ten hours' pay for eight hours' work -- virtually two hours' pay for doing nothing. The Christian Union and the Catholic Review propose to help the working-men secure their demanded eight-hour law, and then have the working-men help to get the six-day law by forbidding all work on Sunday. Dr. Crafts and Dr. Elliott go a step farther, and propose to secure the support of the working-men by having laws enacted compelling employers to pay them full wages on Sunday for doing nothing. But the Knights of Labor do not propose to stop with this. The same copy of the Journal of United Labor which contained the speech of Dr. Crafts, contained the following in an editorial upon this point: --

"Why should not such a law be enacted? All the work now performed each week could easily be accomplished in five days of eight hours each if employment

111

were given to the host of willing idle men who are now walking the streets. It is a crime to force one portion of a community to kill themselves by overwork, while another portion of the same people are suffering from privation and hunger, with no opportunity to labor. The speech of the Rev. Mr. Crafts, published elsewhere, furnishes an abundance of argument as to why such a law should be put in force."

So when the Sunday-law advocates propose to pay a week's wages for six days' work of eight hours each, because all the work can be done in six days that is now done in seven, then the Knights of Labor propose to have a week's wages for five days' work, because, by employing all the idle men, all the work that is now done in seven days can be done in five. And as Dr. Elliott has said, "If they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay." But if a week's wages are to be paid for five days' work of eight hours each, that is to say, if two days' wages can rightly be paid for no work at all, why should the thing be stopped there? If the Government is to take control of the railroads all the time in order to pay two days' wages for doing nothing, and if the States are to enact laws compelling employers to pay employees two days' wages for doing nothing, then why shall not the Government, both State and national, take possession of everything, and pay the laboring men full wages all the time for doing nothing? For if men have the right to one day's wages for no work, where is the limit to the exercise of that right? The fact of the matter is that there is no limit. If a man is entitled to wages for doing nothing part of the time, he is entitled to wages for doing nothing all the time. And the principle upon which Dr. Crafts and his other Sunday-law confreres gain the support of the working-men to this Sunday bill is nothing at all but the principle of down-right Socialism.

112

There is a point right here that is worthy of the serious consideration of the working-men. These Sunday-law workers profess great sympathy for the laboring men in their struggle with the grinding monopolies, and by Sunday laws they propose to deliver the working-men from the power of these monopolies. But in the place of all these other monopolies, they propose to establish a monopoly of religion, and to have the Government secure them in the perpetual enjoyment of it. They may talk as much as they please about the grasping, grinding greed of the many kinds of monopolies, and there is truth in it; but of all monopolies, the most greedy, the most grinding, the most oppressive, the most conscienceless the world ever saw or ever can see, is a religious monopoly. When these managers of religious legislation have delivered the working-men from the other monopolies -- granting that they can do it -- then the important question is, Who will deliver the working-men from the religious monopoly?

Senator Blair. -- Abolish the law of rest, take it away from the working people, and leave corporations and saloon keepers and everybody at perfect liberty to destroy that twenty-four hours of rest, and lawgivers and law-makers will find out whether or not the people want it, and whether they want those law-makers.

Mr. Jones. -- There are plenty of ways to help the working-men without establishing a religious monopoly, and enforcing religious observance upon all. There is another point that comes in right here. Those who are asking for the law and those who work for it, are those who compel the people to work on Sunday. In the Illinois State Sunday convention in Chicago last month, it was stated in the first speech made in the convention, "We remember how that the working-men are compelled to desecrate the Sabbath by the great corporations."

113

The very next sentence was, "We remember also that the stockholders, the owners of these railroads, are members of the churches, that they sit in the pews and bow their heads in the house of God on the Sabbath day."

Senator Blair. -- That is only saying that there are hypocrites in this world. What has that to do with this proposed law?

Mr. Jones. -- I am coming to that. It has a good deal to do with it. The stockholders who own the railroads act in this way, those men said; and it was stated by a minister in that convention that a railroad president told him that there were more petitions for Sunday trains from preachers than from any other class.

Senator Blair. -- There are a lot of hypocrites among the preachers, then.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; although you yourself have said it. I confess I have not the heart to dispute it.

Senator Blair. -- I do not find any fault with that statement. If it is true, it does not touch this question.

Mr. Jones. -- If these preachers and church members will not keep the Sabbath in obedience to what they say is the commandment of God, will they keep it in obedience to the command of the State?

Senator Blair. -- Certainly the hard working man needs rest; the preachers, church members, and millionaires may do as they please: the bill comes in here and says that the national government, taking part of the jurisdiction of the civil government of the United States by a concession made by the States, by virtue of its control of interstate commerce, and the post-office business, and the army and navy, will take advantage of what the

States have given to the general Government in the way of jurisdiction, and will not introduce practices which destroy the Sabbath in the States. That is the object of this legislation. That is all that is undertaken

114

here. It is simply an act proposing to make efficient the Sunday-rest laws of the State, and nothing else.

Mr. Jones. -- But those laws are to be enforced, if at all, by those who are so strongly in favor of them.

Senator Blair. -- No, by the State. If these people were in favor of them, or not in favor of them, or violated them, that is another thing. A man may be for a law which he violates. A great many of the strongest temperance people in the world use intoxicating liquors. They say that they realize the evil, and that they are in favor of the enactment of law which will extirpate those evils. The strongest advocates I have ever seen of temperance legislation are men who have come to realize that the grave is just ahead of them. They cannot get rid of the appetite, but they pray the government: for legislation that will save the boys.

Mr. Jones. -- That is all right. I am in favor of prohibition straight; but not Sunday prohibition.

Senator Blair. -- You cannot adduce a man's practice as a reply to the argument on a question that touches the public good. It does not vitiate a man's principle because he fails to live up to it himself.

Mr. Jones. -- But the secret of the whole matter is this: As an argument for the Sunday law, these men assert that the great railroad corporations desecrate the Sabbath, and by persistently running Sunday trains, also compel the railroad men to work and to desecrate the day. They at the same time assert that the men who own the railroads belong to the churches. If, then, the railroads compel their men to desecrate the day, and the owners of the railroads are church members, then who is it but the church members that are compelling people to desecrate the day?

Further than this, they quoted at Chicago the statement of a railroad president, that the roads "get more

115

requests for Sunday trains signed by preachers" than they do from other people. But as the church members own the railroads, and the preachers request them to run Sunday trains, then who is to blame for the "desecration" of the day but the preachers and their own church members? Can't the preachers stop asking for Sunday trains without being

compelled to do so by the civil law? In the Chicago convention last month -- November 20, 21 -- Dr. Knowles, who is secretary of this National Sunday-law Union, said that by the influence of William E. Dodge, even after his death, the Delaware & Lackawanna Railroad Company had resisted the temptation to run trains on Sunday until the present year. But five hundred ministers met in conference in New York and used competing lines on Sunday, and by this the hands of the Sunday observance committee have been tied ever since. After that, when the Delaware & Lackawanna directors were asked not to run Sunday trains, they replied, --

"How can you come to us pleading for us to run no trains on Sunday, when your preachers by the hundreds on Sunday use our rival lines, which do run on Sunday. If your preachers ride on Sunday trains on other roads, we cannot see why they and other people cannot ride on our trains on Sunday. And if it is all right for these other roads to run trains on Sunday, -- and certainly ministers of the gospel would not ride on them if it were wrong, -- then we cannot see how it can be such a great wrong for us to run Sunday trains."

That is a very proper answer. No wonder the Sunday committee's hands are tied by it. And yet that very conference of five hundred preachers, assembled in New York last summer, took the first decided step toward the organization of the National Sunday Association, of which Dr. Knowles himself is secretary.

By these facts there is presented the following condition

116

of things: (1.) Church members own the railroads; (2.) Preachers sign requests for Sunday trains; (3.) The church members grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains, and the preachers ride on the Sunday trains, and other church members go on Sunday excursions; (4.) Then the whole company -- preachers and church members -- together petition Congress and the State legislatures to make a law stopping all Sunday trains! That is to say, they want the legislatures, State and national, to compel their own railroad-owning church members not to grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains. In other words, they want the civil power to compel them all -- preachers and church members -- to act as they all say that Christians ought to act. And they insist upon quoting all the time the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." But if they will not obey the commandment of God, which they themselves acknowledge and quote, what assurance have we that they will obey the law of Congress or State legislature when they get it, especially as it will rest entirely with themselves to see that the law is enforced? Will they compel themselves by civil law to do what they themselves will not otherwise do? The sum of this whole matter is that they want the civil power to enforce church discipline; and that not only upon themselves, but upon everybody else. The whole system, and all the pretensions upon which this Sunday law is demanded, are crooked.

As to the enforcement of the law, it will fall to those who are working to get it; because certainly those who do not want it will not enforce it, and the officers of the law are not given to the enforcement of laws which are not supported by public opinion. This is proved by the fact that the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago now have Sunday laws that ought to satisfy any reasonable

117

person, and yet not one of them is enforced. And the preachers of that city and State, instead of seeing that these are enforced, call convention after convention to work up more Sunday laws, both State and national.

What, then, is the next intention? -- It is to make it a political question in both State and nation, and make the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws the price of votes and political support. This is proved by the following resolutions adopted by the Elgin Sunday-law convention: --

"Resolved, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath newspapers, engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God's day brings them.

"Resolved, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath."

Such a resolution as this last may work in Illinois, though it is doubtful, but with their own statement made in that convention, it is certain that this resolution can never work under the Constitution of the United States. They stated in the convention that the Sabbath is "the test of all religion." To demand that candidates or political officers shall pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcement of statutes in favor of the Sabbath is, therefore, to require a religious test as a qualification for office. The national Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government; "consequently, no Sabbath or Sunday-law test can ever be applied to any candidate for any national office or public trust.

118

It is true they use the word civil in the resolution, but that corresponds with much of their other work. There is not, and there cannot be, any such thing as a civil Sabbath. The Sabbath is religious wholly, and they know it; and in all their discussion of this resolution and the subject generally in the convention, it was as a religious institution, and that only.

Senator Blair. -- Is there any other point you would wish to present?

Mr. Jones. -- There is another point, and that is, that we will be sufferers under such a law when it is passed. They propose to put in an exemption clause. Some of them favor an exemption clause, but it would not in the least degree check our opposition to the law if forty exemption clauses were put in, unless, indeed, they should insert a clause exempting everybody who does not want to keep it. In that case, we might not object so much.

Senator Blair. -- You care not whether it is put in or not?

Mr. Jones. -- There is no right whatever in the legislation; and we will never accept an exemption clause as an equivalent to our opposition to the law. It is not to obtain relief for ourselves that we oppose the law. It is the principle of the whole subject of the legislation to which we object; and an exemption clause would not modify our objection in the least.

Senator Blair. -- You differ from Dr. Lewis?

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, we will never accept an exemption clause, as tending in the least to modify our opposition to the law. We as firmly and as fully deny the right of the State to legislate upon the subject with an exemption clause as without.

Senator Blair. -- There are three times as many of you as of his denomination?

119

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir; there are nearly thirty thousand of us, and we ask for no exemption clause. We stand wholly upon the principle of the question. There should be no exemption from a just law. If the law is right, it is wrong to exempt.

In 1887 Mrs. Bateham herself wrote and printed a "Letter to Seventh-day Believers," proposing in substance that if we would help them to secure a Sunday law, they would exempt us from its penalties. We replied then as we reply now and always. We will not help you to put upon others what we would not have put upon ourselves.

Senator Blair. -- You object to it?

Mr. Jones. -- We object to the whole principle of the proposed legislation. We go to the root of the matter, and deny the right of Congress to enact it.

Senator Blair. -- You say that the proposed exemption does not make it any better?

Mr. Jones. -- Not a bit; because if the rightfulness of the legislation be admitted, then we admit that it is the right of a majority to say that such and such a day shall be the Sabbath or the Lord's day, and that it shall be kept. The majorities change in civil government; the majority may change within a few years, -- may change, in fact, at any election, -- and then the people may say that the day which we believe should be kept must be observed, or they may say that this day shall not be kept. If we admit the propriety of the legislation, we must also admit the propriety of the legislation to the effect that a certain day shall not be kept, and it makes every man's observance of Sunday, or otherwise, simply the football of majorities. That has been the course of religious legislation from the formation of the papacy onward, and that is the end of religious legislation of all kinds everywhere.

120

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think there is a distinction between a majority in a monarchical government, and a majority in a republican government? In a monarchical government the majority is simply one man who has power.

Mr. Jones. -- But in a republic when you throw this subject into civil affairs, it makes a great deal of difference. Why, sir, we would object to the passage of a law enforcing the observance of the day which we keep, and to accept an exemption clause would only be to contradict ourselves. Allow me to illustrate this: There was a time when we did not keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. While we did not keep it, we had the right not to keep it. We became convinced that we ought to keep it; and we are now doing so. We have the right to keep it. More than this, we have the right again not to keep it if we choose not to keep it. But if, while keeping it, we should consent to the State's assumption of power to compel us to do that which we have the right to omit if we please, we would therein resign our freedom of religious faith and worship. If these people would only think on this question, they would see that they themselves cannot afford to consent to this legislation, much less demand it. No man can ever safely consent to legislation in favor of the form of faith or worship which he himself professes. In so doing he resigns his right to profess some other form of faith if he should become convinced that other form is nearer the truth than his own. He virtually resigns his right to think any further on the subject of religious observances, and must thenceforth accept them ready made from the legislative power; that is, as the majority may dictate. The Sunday observers may thus give away their religious liberty if they choose; but as for us, we do not propose to do it. We are going to assert and maintain our rights. And when these give theirs

121

away, we are going to assert their right to re-assert their rights.

Another thing: An exemption clause is only a toleration clause in disguise. For us to accept it would be but to confess that all religious rights are summed up in the majority, and that we are willing to accept from them whatever religious liberty they think we ought to have. But no such confession, sir, will we ever make. To no such thing will we ever consent or submit. We are Americans, sir, and citizens of the United States, too, and we assert all the rights of American citizens. The vocabulary of American ideas knows no such word as "toleration." It asserts rights. As was said by the Senate Committee on this very subject sixty years ago, so say we, --

"What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised by virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotism may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them."

Nor is this all that there is to be said on this point. There is another principle involved. If we should accept the exemption clause, it would not help the thing. It would be exceedingly short. Suppose an exemption clause were given. There are people who would profess to be Seventh-day Adventists for the express purpose of getting a chance to open saloons or houses of business on Sunday. Therefore in outright self-defense, the majority would have to repeal the exemption clause.

Senator Blair. -- Call Mrs. Bateham's attention to that.

Mr. Jones. -- Let me repeat it. If you give an exemption clause -- it has been tried -- there are reprehensible men, saloon keepers, who know they will get more traffic on Sunday than they can on Saturday, and

122

they will profess to be Seventh-day Adventists, they will profess to be Sabbath keepers. You cannot "go behind the returns," you cannot look into the heart, you cannot investigate the intention, to see whether they are genuine in their profession or not. They will profess to be Sabbath keepers, and then they will open their saloons on Sunday. Then in outright self-defense, to make your position effective, you will have to repeal that exemption clause. It will last but a little while.

Senator Blair. -- I agree with you there.

Mr. Jones. -- For that reason these people cannot afford to offer an exemption clause; and for the reason that it puts the majority in the power of our conscience, we deny the right to do anything of the kind. I ask the organizations represented here to think of this after this hearing is over. It will bear all the investigation they choose to give it.

Senator Blair. -- I should like to call everybody's attention to the point. If you need any legislation of this kind, you would better ask for legislation to carry out your purposes, and be careful that in the effort to get the assistance of the parties against you, you do not throw away the pith and substance of all for which you ask.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes, sir, that is the point. To show the workings of this principle, I will state that Arkansas in 1885 had an exemption clause in its Sunday law. That exemption clause, it was claimed, was taken advantage of by saloon keepers to keep open on Sunday. A delegation went to the legislature of Arkansas, and asked them to repeal the exemption clause, so that they could shut the saloons on Sunday. The legislature did it. If they had shut the saloons on Sunday, that would have been all well enough. But they did not even try it. There was not a saloon keeper arrested under that repealed law; there were only two men not keeping the

123

seventh day, who were arrested under it; there was not a man who did not keep the seventh day fined under it; but there were Seventh-day Baptists and some Seventh-day Adventists, poor almost as Job's turkey, who were prosecuted and fined. One man had his only horse taken from him, and his cow, and at last his brethren contributed money to save him from jail. Such men were prosecuted time and again; and the lawyers of the State, under the leadership of Senator Crockett, succeeded in carrying through the legislature, against the persistent opposition of the church managers, a bill restoring the exemption clause, to save these poor, innocent people from the persecution that was being carried on.*

Senator Blair. -- I am glad you put in that fact, because it is something that happened.

Mr. Jones. -- I ask leave to read the statement made in the Arkansas Legislature by Senator Crockett, upon that very subject: --

"Let me, sir, illustrate the operation of the present law by one or two examples. A Mr. Swearigen came from a Northern State and settled on a farm in -- County. His farm was four miles from town, and far away from any house of religious worship. He was a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and, after having sacredly observed the Sabbath of his people (Saturday) by abstaining from all secular work, he and his son, a lad of seventeen, on the first day of the week went quietly about their usual avocations. They disturbed no one -- interfered with the rights of no one. But they were observed, and reported to the Grand Jury, indicted, arrested, tried, convicted, fined, and having no

124

money to pay the fine, these moral, Christian citizens of Arkansas were dragged to the county jail and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days -- and for what? -- For daring, in this so-called land of liberty, in the year of our Lord 1887, to worship God.

"Was this the end of the story? -- Alas, no, sir! They were turned out; and the old man's only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his children, was levied on to pay the fine and costs, amounting to thirty-eight dollars. The horse sold at auction for twenty-seven dollars. A few days afterward the sheriff came again, and demanded thirty-six dollars, eleven dollars balance due on fine and costs, and twenty-five dollars for board for himself and son while in jail. And when the poor old man -- a Christian, mind you -- told him with tears that he had no money, he promptly levied on his only cow, but was persuaded to accept bond, and the amount was paid by contributions from his friends of the same faith. Sir, my heart swells to bursting with indignation as I repeat to you the infamous story.

"Another, and I am done. Sir, I beg you and these senators to believe that these are neither fancy nor exaggerated sketches. Five years ago a young man, newly married, came to -- County from Ohio. He and his wife were Seventh-day Baptists. The young girl had left father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all the dear friends of her childhood, to follow her young husband to Arkansas -- to them the land of promise. The light of love sparkled in her bright young eyes. The roses of health were upon her cheeks, and her silvery laugh was sweet music, of which her young husband never wearied. They purchased a little farm, and soon by tireless industry and frugal thrift, their home blossomed like a rose in the wilderness. After awhile a fair young babe came to them to brighten the sunshine, and sweeten the bird songs. They were happy in each other's affection and their love for the little one. For them 'all things worked together for good;' for in their humble, trusting way, they worshiped God and loved their fellow-men.

"Two years ago the law under which their prosperity and happiness had had its growth was repealed!

125

Accursed be the day which brought such a foul blot upon our State's fair fame! A change, sudden, cold, and blasting as an Arctic storm, came over their lives, and pitilessly withered all their bright flowers of hope. Under this repeal, persecution lifted its ugly, venomous head. The hero of my sad story was observed by an envious, jealous neighbor, quietly working, as he believed God had commanded him, on Sunday. He was reported to that Inquisitorial relic of barbarism, the Grand Jury, indicted, tried, convicted, and thrown into jail because his conscience would not let him pay the fine.

"Week after week dragged its slow length along. Day after day the young wife, with baby in her arms, watched at the gate for his coming, and, like Tennyson's Marianna --

"She only said: "My life is dreary --
He cometh not," she said.
She said: "I am weary -- weary --
I would that I were dead."

"Then baby sickened and died; the light in the young wife's eyes faded out in tears; her silvery laugh changed to low, wailing sobs. Pale-faced Misery snatched the roses from her cheeks, and planted in their stead her own pallid hue. Sir, how can I go on? At length the cruel law was appeased, and this inoffensive citizen (except that he had loved God and sought to obey him) was released from prison, and dragged his weary feet to the happy home he had left a few short weeks before. He met his neighbors at the gate bearing a coffin. He asked no questions, his heart told him all. No, not all! He knew not -- he could never know -- of her lonely hours, of her bitter tears, of the weary watching and waiting, of the appeals to God, -- that God for whom she had suffered so much, -- for help in the hour of her extremity, of baby's sickness and death. He could not know of these. But he went with them to the quiet country burial-place, and saw beside the open grave a little mound with dirt freshly heaped upon it, and then he knew that God had taken both his heart's idols, and he was left alone. His grief was too deep for tears. With staring eyes, he saw them lower the body of his young

126

wife into the grave. He heard the clods rattle upon the coffin, and it seemed as if they were falling upon his heart. The work was done, and they left him with his dead; and then he threw himself down between the graves, with an arm across each little mound, and the tears came in torrents, and kept his heart from breaking. And then he sobbed his broken farewell to his darlings, and left Arkansas forever, -- left it, sir, as hundreds of others are preparing to leave, if this General Assembly fails to restore to them the protection of their rights under the Constitution, national and State.

"On next Monday, at Malvern, six as honest, good, and virtuous citizens as live in Arkansas, are to be tried as criminals for daring to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences; for exercising a right which this Government, under the Constitution, has no power to abridge. Sir, I plead, in the name of justice, in the name of our republican institutions, in the name of these inoffensive, God-fearing, God-serving people, our fellow-citizens, and last, sir, in the name of Arkansas, I plead that this bill may pass, and this one foul blot be wiped from the escutcheon of our glorious commonwealth."

Arkansas was not alone in this, however, though it was worse there than anywhere else. I myself, with other brethren in California, had to send hundreds of dollars into Tennessee, to support the families of the brethren of our own faith there, while the husbands and fathers who made the money for their support were in jail because they chose to work for their families on Sunday, and make bread for them after having kept

the Sabbath according to their conscience. That has been done, Mr. Chairman, in these United States. That is the care these people have for the laboring man.

Senator Blair. -- You reason from that that there should be no Sunday law whatever?

Mr. Jones. -- If you allow a Sunday law, you must allow it to any extent. It must be enforced. All they

127

did in Arkansas was to enforce the law, simply as in the Roman empire they enforced the law, and put Christians to death. They simply enforced the law, but the law was wrong. Any condition of the law that will allow such things as that is a wrong condition of the law.

Senator Blair. -- This bill proposes that work must not be done to the disturbance of others. This work was done to the disturbance of others.

Mr. Jones. -- I know that this bill for a national Sunday law proposes that work must not be done "to the disturbance of others," and in that very phrase lies one of its worst features. The bill declares that no person shall do any work, or "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." This leaves it entirely with the other man to say whether that which I do disturbs him; and that is only to make every man's action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. And everybody knows that it requires a very slight thing to disturb one who has a spite or prejudice against you. At the Illinois State Sunday-law convention last month (Nov. 20, 21), Dr. R. O. Post, of Springfield, made a speech on the subject of "Sunday Recreation," in which he declared as the sum of his whole speech that, --

"There is no kind of recreation that is proper or profitable on Sunday, outside of the home or the sanctuary."

Only let such a law as is embodied in this bill become of force where R. O. Post, D. D., is, and any kind of recreation outside of the home or the sanctuary would be sure to disturb him, and the one engaged in the recreation could be arrested and prosecuted. But it may be argued that no judge or jury would uphold any such prosecution. That is not at all certain, as we shall

128

yet see; but whether or not it is so, it is certain that if your neighbor should say that what you did disturbed him, under such a law as that he could have you arrested, and put to the inconvenience and expense of defending yourself before the court. In 1887, the city of

San Francisco, Cal., had an ordinance on another subject that embodied the very principle of this clause of this Sunday bill. It reads thus: --

"No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway, or upon adjacent premises."

It is easy to see that the principle of this ordinance is identical with that of the clause in the first section of this bill, which forbids anything "to the disturbance of others."

While that San Francisco ordinance was in force, a man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which not only had a tendency to annoy, but actually "annoyed" a business man across the street. Pape was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of habeas corpus, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says: --

"The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge: -
-

"If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in itself, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other

129

persons. . . . Instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

"But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty, as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar.

Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the Constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment, the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable,"

This decision applies with full force to this proposed national Sunday law. Under this law, all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, game, amusement, or recreation on Sunday; because the National Reformers are as much in favor of this Sunday law as is anybody else, and there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much "disturbed" by any amusement or recreation indulged in on

Sunday, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or caprice of the "disturbed" one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action really has or has not disturbed him.

The California decision is, that such a statute "sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny," as that which is embodied in these words of this Sunday bill.

Nor is this confined to this particular section; the same principle is found in Section 5. This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. When wages are paid for Sunday work, "whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same." Whoever is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except for work of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money.

So much for this bill as it reads. Now, as to the work for which the Seventh-day observers of Arkansas were prosecuted. It was not to the disturbance of others. Let me state some of the facts, the authentic record of which I have, but it is too voluminous to present in detail.

With two exceptions, all the arrests and prosecutions were of people who observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. And in these two exceptions, those who were held for trial were held without bail, -- simply on their own recognizance, -- and although the testimony was direct and positive, the jury "agreed to disagree," and the cases were both dismissed; while in every case of a Seventh-day Adventist, the least bail that was accepted was \$110; the most of them were held under bonds for \$250, and some for as high as \$500. There was not a single case dismissed, and in all the cases the complaint was never made that what was done had disturbed the worship or the rest of any one. But the indictments were all for the crime of "Sabbath-breaking" by the performance of labor on Sunday.

The statute of Arkansas at that time ran thus: --

"SECTION 1883. Every person who shall on the Sabbath, or Sunday, be found laboring, or shall compel his apprentice or servant to labor or perform service other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity, on conviction thereof shall be fined one dollar for each separate offense.

"SEC. 1884. Every apprentice or servant compelled to labor on Sunday shall be deemed a separate offense of the master.

"SEC. 1885. The provision of this act shall not apply to steamboats and other vessels navigating the waters of the State, nor such manufacturing establishments as require to be kept in continual operation."

In the case of Mr. Swearingen, mentioned by Senator Crockett, the conviction was upon the testimony of a witness who swore that the work for which he was convicted was done on a day which proved to be seventeen days before the law was enacted, thus by its enforcement making the law *ex post facto*. The Constitution of the United States forbids the making of *ex post facto* laws. But when a law not being *ex post facto* in itself,

made so by its enforcement, it is time that something was being done to enlighten courts and juries upon that subject, even though it should be by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that no law not being *ex post facto* in itself shall be made so by its enforcement. Then, on the other hand, several cases were tried, and the men convicted and fined after the law was repealed, though for work done before.

In almost every case the informer, the prosecuting witness, or perhaps both, were men who were doing work or business on the same day, and sometimes with the very persons accused; yet the man who kept the seventh day was convicted in every instance,

while the man who did not keep the seventh day, but did work or business with the man who did, was left entirely unmolested, and his evidence was accepted in Court to convict the other man. I give some instances: --

First, a man by the name of Millard Courtney, who was the prosecuting witness against two men, Armstrong and Elmore, had taken a man with him to where these men were working, and there they made a contract for roofing a school-house; and yet Courtney's evidence convicted these two men of Sabbath-breaking at the very time he was doing business with them.

Second, J. L. Shockey was convicted upon the testimony of a man by the name of Hammond, who went to him on Sunday where he was at work, and bargained with him for a Plymouth Rock rooster.

Third, J. L. James, who worked in the rain for nothing on Sunday that a poor widow, a member of another church, might be sheltered, was convicted of Sabbath breaking upon the evidence of a man who carried wood and chopped it up that same day within seven rods of the man who was convicted by his testimony.

Fourth, one La Fever and his wife went to Allen Meeks's house on Sunday to visit. They found Meeks

133

planting potatoes. Meeks stopped planting potatoes, and spent the rest of the day visiting with them; and yet Meeks was convicted of Sabbath-breaking and fined upon the evidence of La Fever.

Fifth, the second case of Mr. Meeks. Riley Warren went to his house on Sunday, to see him about hiring a teacher for the public school. In the social, neighborly conversation that passed between them, Meeks incidentally mentioned that he had mended his wagon-brake that morning; and yet he was convicted of Sabbath-breaking upon the evidence of that same Riley Warren. Meeks was thus virtually compelled to be a witness against himself, -- clearly another violation of both the State and United States Constitution.

Sixth, Mr. Reeves's boys were hauling wood on Sunday. In the timber where they got the wood, they met another boy, a Seventh-day Adventist, John A. Meeks, hunting squirrels. They joined him in the hunt, scaring the squirrels around the trees so he could shoot them. Then the squirrels were divided between the Meeks boy and the Reeves boys. Then the Meeks boy was indicted, prosecuted, and convicted of Sabbath-breaking upon the evidence of the father of those boys who were hauling wood, and who helped to kill the squirrels.

Seventh, James M. Pool, for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, was convicted of Sabbath-breaking, on the evidence of a "sanctified" church member who had gone to Pool's house on Sunday to buy tobacco.

Allow me to mention the methods of prosecution. In the case of Scoles, J. A. Armstrong was called before the Grand Jury. After repeated answers to questions in regard to work done on Sunday by different parties in several different lines of business and traffic, he was asked the direct question whether he knew of any Seventh-day Adventists who worked on

134

Sunday, and when in the nature of the case he answered in the affirmative, every one of the Seventh-day Adventists whom he named was indicted, and not one of any other class or trade.

In the second case of James A. Armstrong; he was arrested at the instance of the mayor. When asked for the affidavit upon which Armstrong was arrested, the mayor said that A. J. Vaughn had called his attention to Armstrong's working, and had said, "Now see that you do your duty," yet Vaughn testified under oath that he did not see Armstrong at all on the day referred to. Armstrong was not only arrested at the instance of the mayor, but he was also tried before the mayor, who acted as Justice of the Peace. And when Vaughn testified that he had not seen Armstrong at all on the day referred to, this made the mayor, virtually, both prosecuting witness and judge; and the questions which he asked show that that was precisely his position, and his own view of the case. The question which he asked to each of the first two witnesses was, "What do you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on Sunday, June 27?" This question assumes all that was expected to be proved on the trial.

This is enough to show the workings of such a Sunday law as is embodied in this Senate bill. There were many other cases, every one in the same line. But throughout the whole list of cases, it is only the record of how people who were performing honest labor on their own premises in a way in which it was impossible to do harm to any soul on earth, were indicted, prosecuted, and convicted upon the evidence of men who, if there were any wrong involved in the case at all, were more guilty than they. If religious persecution could possibly be more clearly demonstrated than it is in this thing, we hope never to see an illustration of it.

It may be asked, Why was not an appeal taken? An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the

135

State, in the first case that was tried. The judgment of the lower Court was confirmed in an opinion closing with these words: --

"The appellant's argument, then, is reduced to this: That because he conscientiously believes he is permitted by the law of God to labor on Sunday, he may violate with impunity the statute declaring it illegal to do so; but a man's religious belief cannot be accepted as a justification for his committing an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. If the law operates harshly, as laws sometimes do, the remedy is in the hands of the legislature. It is not the province of the judiciary to pass upon the wisdom or policy of legislation. That is for the members of the legislative department; and the only appeal from their determination is to the constituency."

This decision of the Supreme Court is of the same piece with the prosecutions and judicial processes throughout. It gives to the legislature all the omnipotence of the British Parliament, and in that does away with all necessity for a Constitution. The decision on this principle alone, is un-American. No legislative body in this country is framed upon the model of the British Parliament in respect to power. In this country, the powers of every legislature are defined and limited by Constitutions. It is the prerogative of Supreme Courts to define the meaning of the Constitution, and to decide whether an act of the legislature is Constitutional or not. If the act is Constitutional, then it must stand, whatever the results may be. And the Supreme Court is the body by which the Constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of any statute is to be discovered. But if, as this decision declares, the legislature is omnipotent, and that which it does must stand as law, then there is no use for a Constitution. "One of the objects for which the judiciary department is established, is the protection of the Constitutional rights of the citizens."

So long as there is a Constitution above the legislature, which defines and limits its powers, and protects and guards the rights of the citizens, so long it is the province of the Supreme Court to pronounce upon the acts of the legislature. The Supreme Court of Arkansas, therefore, in this case, clearly abdicated one of the very functions for which it was created, or else subverted the Constitution of Arkansas; and in either case, bestowed upon the legislature the omnipotence of the British Parliament, which is contrary to every principle of American institutions. Nor is the State of Arkansas an exception in this case; for this is the usual procedure of Supreme Courts in sustaining Sunday laws. They cannot be sustained upon any American principle; resort has to be made in every instance, and has been with scarcely an exception, either to the church-and-state principles of the British Government, or to the British principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. But American principles are far above and far in advance of the principles of the British Government, in that they recognize Constitutional limitations upon the legislative power, and countenance no union of church and state; consequently Sunday laws never have been, and never can be, sustained upon American principles.

That this stricture upon Supreme Court of Arkansas is not unjust, we have the clearest proof. The three judges who then composed the Supreme Court, were all members of the Bar Association of the State of Arkansas. In less than three months after this decision was rendered, the Bar Association unanimously made a report to the State on "law and law reform," an official copy of which I have in my possession. In that report, under the heading "Sunday Laws," is the following: --

"Our statute as it stands in Mansfield's Digest, provides that 'persons who are members of any religious

137

society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act [the Sunday law], so that they observe one day in seven, agreeably to the faith and practice of their church or society.' -- Mans. Dig., sec. 1886.

"This statute had been in force from the time of the organization of the State government; but it was unfortunately repealed by act of March 3, 1885. -- Acts 1885, p. 37.

"While the Jews adhere, of course, to the letter of the original command to remember the seventh day of the week, there is also in the State a small but respectable body of Christians who consistently believe that the seventh day is the proper day to be kept sacred; and in the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience, supported, as he supposed, by good theological arguments. It is very evident that the system now in force, savoring, as it does, very much of religious persecution, is a relic of the Middle Ages, when it was thought that men could be made orthodox by an act of parliament. Even in Massachusetts, where Sabbatarian laws have always been enforced with unusual vigor, exceptions are made in favor of persons who religiously observe any other day in the place of Sunday. We think that the law as it stood in Mansfield's Digest, should be restored, with such an amendment as would prevent the sale of spirits on Sunday, as that was probably the object of repealing the above section."

Now the Arkansas Constitution says: --

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no

138

preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship, above any other."

This report of the Bar Association says, "In the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

The members of the Supreme Court being members of the Bar Association, in that report it is confessed that they confirmed a judgment against a man for doing that which the Constitution explicitly declares all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do.

Senator Blair. -- Then if they had a law like this, they were wrongly convicted under the law, just as innocent men are sometimes hung; but you cannot reason that there should be no law against murder because innocent men are sometimes executed. It is fault in the administration of the law. You cannot reason from that that there should be no law.

Mr. Jones. -- If there had been arrests of other people for working on Sunday, in anything like the numbers that there were of seventh-day observers, and the law had been enforced upon all alike, then the iniquity would not have been so apparent; or if those who were not seventh-day observers, and who were arrested, had been convicted, even then the case would not have been so clearly one of persecution. But when in all the record of the whole two years' existence of the law in this form, there was not a solitary saloon keeper arrested, there was not a person who did not observe the seventh day arrested, with the two exceptions named, then there could be no clearer demonstration that the law was used only as a means to vent religious spite against a class of citizens guiltless of any crime, but only of professing a religion different from that of the majority.

The fact of the matter is, -- and the whole history of these proceedings proves it, -- that from beginning to end these prosecutions were only the manifestation of that persecuting, intolerant spirit that will always make itself felt when any class of religionists can control the civil power. The information upon which the indictments were found, was treacherously given, and in the very spirit of the Inquisition. The indictment itself is a travesty of legal form, and a libel upon justice. The principle was more worthy of the Dark Ages than of any civilized nation or modern time; and the Supreme Court decision that confirmed the convictions, is one which is contrary to the first principles of Constitutional law or Constitutional compacts.

And if Congress should lend its sanction to religious legislation to the extent of passing this national Sunday bill, now under consideration, and its principles should be

made of force in all the States, the history of Arkansas from 1885-86 would be repeated through the whole extent of the nation. This I can prove, at least so far as the intention goes of those who are actively in favor of it. Rev. D. Mc Allister is one of the principal men of the National Reform Association. That Association and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held a joint convention at Lakeside, Ohio, in July, 1887; and speaking on the subject of a national Sunday law, Dr. Mc Allister said: --

"Let a man be what he may, -- Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath, -- let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation. They may hold any other day of rest of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer

140

in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor."

Then some one stated from the audience that --

"There is a law in the State of Arkansas enforcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many good persons have not only been imprisoned, but have lost their property, and even their lives."

To which Mr. Mc Allister coolly replied: --

"It is better that a few should suffer, than that the whole nation should lose its Sabbath."

This argument is identical with that by which the Pharisees in Christ's day justified themselves in killing him. It was said: --

"It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." John 11:50.

And then says the record: --

"Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death." Verse 53.

It is because of these principles, unblushingly avowed by the very men who stand in the lead in the effort to secure the enactment of this national Sunday law; and because of the practical effect of such a law in Arkansas and Tennessee, and to some extent in Pennsylvania, -- it is because of these things that we say to you, gentlemen of the United States Senate, you cannot afford to give to these men the power which they seek in the

enactment of this proposed Sunday law. The speech of Senator Crockett's, which I have read, was made in the legislature of Arkansas, when he was pleading for the restoration of that exemption clause, -- when he was pleading for toleration, in fact.

141

Senator Blair. -- Do you know whether this young man had money or friends?

Mr. Jones. -- Dr. Lewis, can you certify whether he had money?

Dr. Lewis. -- The case was never reported to other churches for relief. I do not know as to his personal estate.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think it was a peculiar man who would allow his child to be killed and his wife to starve?

Dr. Lewis. -- The case was not reported to our churches in the North.

Mr. Jones. -- About that peculiarity I will say that John Bunyan stayed twelve years in Bedford jail when he could have got out by simply saying the word "yes," and agreeing that he would not preach.

Senator Blair. -- It was a very different thing to be called on to say that he would abstain from the performance of a great duty in his church. He preached the gospel, and he would not agree not to preach the gospel. But here is a man who lets his wife and child die rather than pay twenty-five or fifty dollars and get out, and have an opportunity to go to work for them.

Mr. Jones. -- What kind of law is that which puts a man upon his conscience to choose between his wife and child and paying a fine of twenty-five or fifty dollars? But suppose he had paid the fine, and got out and gone to work again, how long could he have worked? When the next Sunday came round, it was his duty to his wife and child to work for their support. Is he to go to work on Sunday, and go through the course of prosecution again, and again pay a fine of twenty-five or fifty dollars? How long could this be kept up? There are not many poor farmers who can clear from twenty-five to fifty dollars every week above all expenses, to be devoted to paying regular fines for the privilege of following

142

their honest occupation on their own premises. But it will be said, "Let him not work on Sunday, then he would not have to pay a fine." Well, if he consents to do no work on Sunday, he consents to be robbed of one-sixth of his time, which he honestly owes to the support of his wife and child. For to rob him of one-sixth of his time is precisely what the

State does in such a case; and it is either confiscation outright, or confiscation under the guise of a fine imposed as punishment for his refusing to allow himself to be robbed of one-sixth of his time. Either this, or else he must give up his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and the word of God, and so surrender his rights of conscience altogether. It comes to this, therefore, that Sunday laws are a direct invasion of the rights of conscience.

More than this, Sunday laws are a direct invasion not only of the Constitutional right, but the inalienable right, of acquiring possessing, and protecting property. I here adopt the language of the Supreme Court of California, -- language which can never be successfully controverted: --

"The right to protect and possess property is not more clearly protected by the Constitution than the right to acquire. The right to acquire must include the right to use the proper means to attain the end. The right itself would be impotent without the power to use the necessary incidents. If the legislature have the authority to appoint a time of compulsory rest, . . . it is without limit, and may extend to the prohibition of all occupations at all times... For the Constitution to declare a right inalienable and at the same time leave the legislature unlimited power over it, would be a contradiction in terms, an idle provision, proving that a Constitution was a mere parchment barrier, insufficient to protect the citizen, delusive and visionary, and the practical result of which would be to destroy,

143

not conserve, the rights which they may assume to protect. The legislature, therefore, cannot prohibit the proper use of the means of acquiring property, except the peace and safety of the State require it." -- *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal., pp. 517,510.

But does the peace and safety of the State require it in any such case as is here involved? Can it ever be against the peace and safety of the State for any man to follow his honest, legitimate, and even laudable occupations? It is against the peace and safety of the State to prohibit it. For, as I have before conclusively proved, for the State to do so is for it to put honest occupations in the catalogue of crimes; to put peaceable and industrious citizens upon a level with criminals; and to put a premium upon idleness and recklessness. It is certainly against the peace and safety of any State to do any such thing. Therefore it is demonstrated that Sunday laws are an invasion of the inalienable right of acquiring and possessing property, and for that man in Arkansas to have obeyed that law, would have been to surrender his inalienable right.

Once more: As the right to acquire property includes the right to use the proper means to attain that end, and as such a law deprives a man of the use of such means during one-sixth of his time, it follows that it is a violation of that provision of the

Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, which declares that "no State shall deprive any citizen of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

All this, sir, is involved in the question as to whether that man shall recognize the law to such an extent as even to pay the fine. If he does, then it follows inevitably that all his property shall go to pay fines, or else he must choose between yielding his rights of conscience, and allowing one-sixth of his time to be confiscated, and in that a certain proportion of property;

144

because to the industrious citizen, time is property. But if the State by a Sunday law or by any other means, may confiscate a part, it may confiscate all. Where, then, shall resistance to oppression begin? -- I say, At the very first appearance of it. Under cover of the word "Loan" Charles I. undertook to confiscate a small sum of money from each of the property owners of England. John Hampden's share was about seven dollars and seventy-five cents. He was a rich man, but he refused to pay it; and his refusal to pay that paltry sum led to all England's being plunged into confusion and civil war: the king lost his head, Hampden himself lost his life, and all this rather than to pay the insignificant sum of seven dollars and seventy-five cents! -- less than one-third of the fine imposed upon this man for refusing to assent to the confiscation of one-sixth of his property. But John Hampden's refusal to pay that money established the Constitutional principle that every man has the inalienable right to acquire, possess, and protect property -- a right which was invaded in this case. Upon this principle alone that man was entirely justified in refusing to pay the fine imposed by that Sunday law. But as there was also involved the inalienable right of conscience, he was doubly justified in refusing to obey the law or to recognize the principle.

Senator Blair. -- Suppose he was a guilty man. Suppose he did not believe it was an offense to steal, and that he conscientiously thought that he could take goods from another in a certain way. He had been convicted under the law, and was under the penalty of paying twenty-five dollars' fine. Is he to put his right of conscience against the demands of wife and child, and against the judgment of the community, and the State in which he lives, and to which he owes all the rights to the enjoyment of property, and everything

145

else he has? In this case a man saw all this evil done rather than pay twenty-five or fifty dollars, and he says he did that by reason of his conscience.

Mr. Jones. -- The cases are not parallel at all, unless indeed you count it as much of a crime for a man to follow his honest occupation as it is for him to steal. This,

however, we have demonstrated is the very thing that Sunday laws do. But we forever protest against honesty industry's being put upon a level with thieving.

The man who steals takes the property of others without compensation and without regard to the question of right. If, then, the State takes from him property or time without compensation, he cannot complain of injustice. But in the case of the man who works on Sunday, he invades no man's right in any degree; he takes no man's property or his time in any way, much less does he take it without compensation. For the State to punish the thief, is just. For the State to punish the industrious citizen, is pre-eminently unjust.

But aside from all this, did you ever hear of a man whose conscience taught him that it was right to steal, that it was a conscientious conviction to steal?

Senator Blair. -- I have heard of great many instances where an individual confessed that he had conscientiously violated the law, yet he was punished.

Mr. Jones. -- Precisely; and the Christians were put to death under the Roman empire for violating the law.

Senator Blair. -- But that does not answer my question, and it is not necessary that it should be answered.

Mr. Jones. -- It is right for any man to violate any law that invades his Constitutional rights; and it is his right conscientiously to violate any law that invades the rights of conscience. God declares the man innocent who violates the law that interferes with man's relationship to God -- the law that invades the rights of conscience. See cases "The King vs. Shadrach, Meshach

146

and Abed-nego;" and "The State vs. Daniel," reported in Daniel, chapters 3 and 6.

The end of the Arkansas case, as reported by Senator Crockett, was that the poor man lost both his wife and his child.

Senator Blair. -- What became of him?

Mr. Jones. -- He left the State.

Senator Blair. -- I should think he ought to leave it.

Mr. Jones. -- So do I, sir. But what can be said of freedom any more in this country, when such things can be? That is also true of six other men who followed the

dictates of their own consciences, -- as good, honest, virtuous citizens, as lived in Arkansas.

Senator Blair. -- There is a good deal of humbug about the dictates of one's own conscience. If a man is to set up his conscience against the obligations to do what is right and to perform his duty toward society, an unintelligent and uninformed conscience of that kind might be allowed to destroy all society. It is not conscience always.

Mr. Jones. -- I beg your pardon, sir. The rights of conscience are eternally sacred. There is no conscience in regard to the State, however; conscience has to do with God, and with what he has commanded; and a man reads in the Bible what God commands. I here adopt the words of the present Associate-justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hon. Stanley Matthews, in his speech in the case of the Cincinnati School Board vs. Minor et al. He says: --

"We may call the eccentricities of conscience, vagaries, if we please; but in matters of religious concern we have no right to disregard or despise them, no matter how trivial and absurd we may conceive them to be. In the days of the early Christian martyrs, the Roman lictors and soldiers despised and ridiculed the fanaticism that refused the trifling conformity of a pinch of incense

147

upon the altar, erected to the Caesar that arrogated to himself the title and honor of 'divine,' or a heathen statue. History is filled with the record of bloody sacrifices which holy men who feared God rather than men, have not withheld, on account of what seemed to cruel persecutors but trifling observances and concessions. . . . Conscience, if your honors please, is a tender thing, and tenderly to be regarded; and in the same proportion in which a man treasures his own moral integrity, -- sets up the light of conscience within him as the glory of God shining in him to discover to him the truth, -- so ought he to regard the conscience of every other man, and apply the cardinal maxim of Christian life and practice, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them.'"

Senator Blair. -- Should those who conscientiously believe in free love be allowed to indulge in it?

Mr. Jones. -- There is no point in that. Where is there any conscientious conviction in free love? I cannot discover it. There is no room for any.

Senator Blair. -- But there must be laws which prohibit immorality?

Mr. Jones. -- I ask you to define what immorality is, and then I will answer your question.

Senator Blair. -- If you do not know what the expression means, I shall not undertake to enlighten you.

Mr. Jones. -- I know what it means.

Senator Blair. -- Then why do you ask me to define it? Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. Jones. -- Because there are modified meanings of the word which make it refer to crime. Immorality is itself a violation of the law of God, and civil government has no right to punish any man for a violation of the law of God as such. I do say, therefore, that that which, properly speaking, is immorality, the civil law cannot prohibit, and that it has no right to attempt it. Morality is defined as follows: --

148

"Morality: The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule. . . . The conformity of an act to the divine law."

As morality is the conformity of an act to the divine law, it is plain that morality pertains solely to God, and with that, civil government can have nothing to do.

Again: Moral law is defined as --

"The will of God, as the supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action as obligatory on the conscience or moral nature." The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai."

These definitions are evidently according to Scripture. The Scriptures show that the ten commandments are the law of God; that they express the will of God; that they pertain to the conscience, and take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and that obedience to these commandments is the duty that man owes to God. Says the Scripture, --

"Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13.

And the Saviour says, --

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca [vain fellow, margin], shall be in danger of

the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Matt. 5:21,22.

The apostle John, referring to the same thing, says, --

0 "Whosoever hateth his brother is murderer." 1 John 3:15.

149

Again, the Saviour says, --

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Matt 5:27, 28.

Other illustrations might be given, but these are sufficient to show that obedience to the moral law is morality; that it pertains to the thoughts and intents of the heart, and therefore, in the very nature of the case, lies beyond the reach or control of the civil power. To hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman is adultery; - - these are all equally immoral, and violations of the moral law, but no civil government seeks to punish for them. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees, -- he may keep it up all his days; but so long as these things are confined to his thought, the civil power cannot touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be; yet the State cannot punish him. It does not attempt to punish him. This demonstrates again that with morality or immorality the State can have nothing to do.

But let us carry this further. Only let that man's hatred lead him, either by word or sign, to attempt an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him; only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his own, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him; only let his impure thought lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet bear in mind that even then the States does not punish him for his immorality, but for his incivility. The immorality lies in the heart, and can be measured by God only. The State punishes no man because he is immoral. If it did, it would have to punish as a murderer

150

the man who hates another, and to punish as an idolater the man who covets, and to punish as an adulterer the one who thinks impurely; because according to the true standard of morality, hatred is murder, covetousness is idolatry, and impurity of thought is adultery. Therefore is clear that in fact the State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is uncivil. It cannot punish immorality; it must punish incivility.

This distinction is shown in the very term by which is designated State or national government; it is called civil government. No person but a theocrat ever thinks of calling it moral government. The government of God is the only moral government. God is the only moral governor. The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governments of men are civil governments, not moral. The laws of States and nations are civil laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government pertains the punishment of incivility, that is, the transgression of civil law. It is not theirs to punish immorality. That pertains solely to the Author of the moral law and of the moral sense, who is the sole judge of man's moral relation. All this must be manifest to every one who will think fairly upon the subject, and it is confirmed by the definition of the word civil, which is this: --

"Civil: Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens, or to the State."

Thus it is made clear that we owe to Caesar (civil government) only that which is civil, and that we owe to God that which is moral or religious, and that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality. Whoever attempts, it, usurps the prerogative of God. The

Inquisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality; because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The papacy, asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequence. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would wring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the Inquisition was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition; for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

Thus much on the subject of morality and the State in the true and genuine sense of the word morality. But as I said at the beginning, there is an accommodated sense in which the word morality is used, in which it is made to refer only to men's relations to their fellow-men; and with reference to this view of morality, it is sometimes said that the civil power is to enforce morality upon a civil basis. But morality on a civil basis is only civility, and the enforcement of morality upon a civil basis is the enforcement of civility, and nothing else. Without the Inquisition, it is impossible for civil government ever to carry its jurisdiction beyond civil things, or to enforce anything but civility.

But it may be asked, Does not the civil power enforce the observance of the commandments of God, which say, "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "Thou shalt not bear false witness"? Does not the civil

152

power punish the violation of these commandments of God? I answer: The civil power does not enforce these, nor does it punish the violation of them, as commandments of God. The State does forbid murder and theft and perjury, and some States forbid adultery, but not as commandments of God. From time immemorial, governments that knew nothing about God, have forbidden these things. If the State is to enforce these things as the commandments of God, it will have to take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; but this is not within the province of any earthly power.

By all these evidences is established the plain, common-sense principle that to civil government pertains only that which the term itself implies, -- that which is civil. The purpose of civil government is civil, and not moral. Its function is to preserve order in society, and to cause all its subjects to rest in assured safety, by guarding them against all incivility. Morality belongs to God; civility, to the State. Morality must be rendered to God; civility, to the State. Immorality must be punished -- can be punished -- only by the Lord. Incivility must be punished -- and no more than that can possibly be punished -- by the State.

Here, then at the close of my remarks, we are brought to the enunciation of the eternal principle with which I began, upon which we now stand, and upon which we forever expect to stand, -- the principle embodied in the United States Constitution forbidding religious tests, and forbidding Congress to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, -- the principle established by Jesus Christ: Render therefore UNTO CAESAR the things which are CAESAR'S; and UNTO GOD THE THINGS THAT ARE GOD'S.

153

REMARKS BY REV. A. II. LEWIS, D. D.

Dr. Lewis. -- Mr. Chairman. The objection raised by Prof. Jones against the exemption in favor of Sabbath-keepers, seems to me wholly imaginary. So far as any Seventh-day Baptists are concerned, I know it would be impossible for any man opening a saloon on Sunday to present the excuse that he was a Seventh-day Baptist. A saloon-keeping Seventh-day Baptist is an unknown thing throughout their history of more than two centuries. Such a man could not obtain recognition, much less church membership, in any Seventh-day Baptist community or church. Nor do I believe from what I know of the Seventh-day Adventists, that such a case could occur in connection with that people. The possibility of any such deceitful claim could easily be guarded against by a provision

requiring that in any case of doubt the one claiming to have observed the seventh day should be required to bring official certificate of his relation to a Sabbath-keeping church. Such a provision would end all difficulty.

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman. It is certainly true that, so far, a saloon-keeping Seventh-day Baptist, or Seventh-day Adventist, either, is an unknown thing. But if Sunday laws are enforced with an exemption clause in favor of those who keep the seventh day, this would not be an unknown thing much longer. It is true, also, that such a man could not obtain membership in any Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist church. But what is to prevent the saloon keepers from organizing Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist churches of their own, and for themselves? What is to prevent them, or any class of business men, from organizing their own churches, electing their own officers, and even ordaining their own pastors, and calling themselves

154

Seventh-day Baptists or Seventh-day Adventists? There is nothing to prevent it unless, indeed, the State itself shall take charge of all seventh-day churches and doctrines, and attend to their organization and the admission of members. This is precisely what was done before. In the days of the New England theocracy, Massachusetts enacted a law that, --

"For the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same."

There were considerable numbers of men who were not members of any of the churches, and who could not be, because they were not Christians. These men then took to forming themselves into churches of their own. Then the next step for the authorities to take, and they took it, was to enact a law that, --

"Forasmuch as it hath bene found by sad experience that much trouble and disturbance hath happened both to the church and civil State by the officers and members of some churches, wch have bene gathered . . . in an undue manner, . . . it is . . . ordered that . . . this Court doeth not, nor will hereafter, approue of any such companyes of men as shall henceforthe ioyne in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first acquainte the magistrates and elders of the greatr pte of the churches fellowship, without their intencons, and have their approbacon herein." -- *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, pp. 28-30.

By this, gentlemen, you will see that the enactment of this Sunday law, though the first step, will not be by any means the last step, and that in more directions than one. Their offer of an exemption clause is a voluntary confession that the enforcement of the

law without one would be unjust; but if that exemption clause be embodied and maintained, the State is

155

inevitably carried beyond its proper jurisdiction; and if the exemption clause is retained and not maintained in its strictness, the whole law is at once nullified. Congress would better learn wisdom from this prospect, and utterly refuse to have anything at all to do with the subject. The whole subject is beyond the jurisdiction of the civil power, and the civil power can do no better than to let it entirely alone.

But Dr. Lewis proposes to guard against all difficulty, by "requiring" every observer of the seventh day "to bring official certificate of his relation to a Sabbath-keeping church." This would not end the difficulty; for, as I have shown, it would inevitably devolve upon the State to decide what was a genuine Sabbath-keeping church. But that is not the worst feature in this suggestion. If Dr. Lewis officially represents the Seventh-day Baptist denomination, and for the denomination proposes thus voluntarily to put himself and all his people on "ticket of leave," I have no particular objection; that is their own business; yet it seems to me an extremely generous proposition, if not an extraordinary proceeding. I say they may do this, if they choose. But as for me and for the Seventh-day Adventists generally, not only as Christians, but as American citizens, we repudiate with scorn and reject with utter contempt every principle of any such suggestion. As citizens of the United States, and as Christians, we utterly and forever refuse to put ourselves upon "ticket of leave" by any such proposition.

NOTE. -- That my argument at first was not so unfounded nor so "wholly imaginary" as Dr. Lewis supposed, has been conclusively demonstrated, even to himself, since this hearing was held. The "Pearl of

156

Days" column of the New York Mail and Express, the official organ of the American Sunday Union, in March, 1889, gave the following statement from the Plainfield [N. J.] Times [no date]: --

"As a rule, Plainfield, N. J., is a very quiet city on Sunday. Liquor, provision, and cigar stores are closed by the enforcement of a city ordinance. If a resident wants a cigar, he will either have it given to him by one of the many pharmacists who refuse to sell on Sunday, or he will go to the two dealers who are allowed to open their places on Sunday because they observe Saturday as their Sabbath. Some time ago a man of Catholic faith, who had an eye to Sunday business in that line, became a regular attendant at the Seventh-day Baptist church. Eventually he asked to be admitted into the fellowship of the church. A member of the official board was advised that the applicant for membership was only working for business ends. He was closely examined by the church officers, and

he finally admitted that he wanted to open a cigar store and do business on Sunday. The man appeared at the wrong place for aid in carrying out his mercenary purposes. He was not received into membership."

It looks somewhat like the "irony of fate" that this thing should fall to they very people whom Dr. Lewis represented, and in the very town where Dr. Lewis himself lives.

REMARKS BY MRS. J. C. BATEHAM.

Mrs. Batcham. -- I should like to say that the point which has been made was a point carefully considered by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and we saw the danger. Yet we wished to be exceedingly fair. I consulted nine persons of different classes of Seventh-day people, to know whether they wished such an exemption, and whether they would be satisfied with what was proposed. They represented themselves as being in approval of some such provision as has been suggested,

157

and we thought it could be done perhaps in such a way as to afford them the exemption which they desire, because they said that such an exemption is necessary.

Senator Blair. -- Let me ask you a few questions, Mrs. Bateham, to see if the Woman's Christian Temperance Union understood exactly the relation of what they propose to do in this legislation. Here is a bill which relates to interstate commerce, to postal work, to the army, and to the navy. It relates to that subject-matter which is carved out of the independent, full jurisdiction of a nation by the States, which were once complete sovereignties, and transferred to the general Government. The occupations I have mentioned are all of public nature; and to carry them on, the nation has such an opportunity to invade the Sabbath-rest laws of every State in such a way as to nullify them. The nation at large is unrestrained by any Sabbath law whatever. If it may carry on its post-office business on the Sabbath, it may go to any extent, and it does go already to a very great extent, and an increasingly great extent; so in regard to interstate commerce, and so with the army and the navy.

Now, you go to our Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist friends, for instance, and propose to introduce a principle by which they can carry on the post-office department on the Sabbath, just as completely as they see fit. In other words, you propose to exempt them from the operation of the law so far as it prohibits post-office work on the Sabbath. Suppose you have a Seventh-day Baptist man for postmaster. Suppose you fill up every post-office in the country on the Sabbath with Seventh-day Baptist people. You have the post-office department in operation by virtue of this exemption, because they can do the work conscientiously on that day. If you limit it by saying the

158

bill shall not apply to the Adventists and others, the bill provides that already.

Mrs. Bateham. -- If you remember the clause, we do not propose to provide that they shall be able to do this work, but that they shall be exempt from the penalty. They are not allowed to do the work, but they are to be exempt from the penalty. Therefore, unless they could prove that they had not done the work to the disturbance of others, it would be impossible for them to carry on post-office matters, for instance, or any other public employment, on Sunday.

Senator Blair. -- Is not that equivalent to saying that if the penalty shall not be enforced against them, there shall be no law against them? Because the law without the penalty is simply an opinion; it is not a law.

Mrs. Bateham. -- The law could provide that they should not open a post-office, for instance, or any place of business; and if there was a fine imposed, they would be compelled to close such places on Sunday. It was, of course, only thrown out as a suggestion from us that if it could be done, we should like to have such a provision in the bill. We are satisfied that people want the law, and if the law can, in your wisdom, be arranged with such an exemption, then we wish it; otherwise we do not. We are all glad, I think, to have the gentlemen admit that they do not want such an exemption, for that releases us from the place where we were.

Senator Blair. -- This is not to be a general Sunday law. These people all live in States, and they can work at their private occupations just the same under similar amendments to the State law, if the State saw fit to make such amendments. Prof. Jones says it did not work well in Arkansas, and I should think it did not, from his description. But these are public occupations, or quasi public occupations, we are dealing with; that of interstate commerce, for instance, carried on by

great corporations which are public in their relation to the working-men, because they are exercising a great public function in carrying on transportation which appertains to everybody all over the country.

This proposed law undertakes to prohibit the nullification of all Sunday-rest laws in the States so far as to provide that interstate commerce shall not be carried on, in violation of the law, upon the Sabbath. When you come to the private occupations which are regulated by the States, if they choose to allow the Seventh-day Baptist people to work on Sunday in those private occupations, on the farm, in the workshop, in the factory, this measure does not interfere with them at all.

Mr. Bateham. -- I have not the words before me, but my impression is that there is a clause in the bill providing that the jurisdiction of Congress shall be exercised over the

Territories in this matter. There is something of that kind in the bill, and this proposed exemption was designed to reach those cases, rather than apply to the general governmental action.

Senator Blair. -- You think the exemption might be made with reference to the Territories?

Mrs. Bateham. -- Yes; that was the point we had in mind in this general action. I have not the words of the bill before me, but there is something of that kind in it which we had in mind. I wish to say also that one of the requests of our National Woman's Christian Union was that the word promote should be changed to protect, in the title of the bill, so that it should have no appearance of what all Americans object to, any union of church and state. That amendment was proposed and accepted by the American Sabbath Union, the organized body which has just been in session in this city.

Senator Blair. -- Do you not think that the word protect implies power to command and compel? An army protects.

160

Mrs. Batcham. -- All our laws protect us, do they not?

Senator Blair. -- You would make this a law?

Mrs. Batcham. -- I suggest that the bill be made a law, and that it be a law which shall protect the civil Sabbath, not promote religious worship, but protect the day as a day of rest and religious worship.

Senator Blair. -- It seems to me that the word protect is a stronger and more interfering word than promote. However, all these suggestions are important.

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Bateham in her first address this morning, in telling who they are that are in favor of this Sunday law, said that she believed "the great majority of the people will approve such a law." She mentioned as opposed to it only "the daily newspaper press," the railroad managers," "steamboat companies," "saloonists and their backers," "a class of foreigners who prefer the continental Sunday," and "the very small sect of Seventh-day Baptists."

Hon. G. P. Lord in his remarks said that "not more than three million of our population work on Sabbath, and most of this number are unwilling workers." He said that "the balance, or more than fifty-seven million of our population, abstain from toil on the Sabbath."

Taking these statements as the truth, it appears that the overwhelming majority of the American people are not only in favor of the Sunday law, but they actually keep that day as a rest day.

Now, gentlemen, is it not rather singular, and a doctrine altogether new in a government of the people, that the majority need to be protected? From whom are they to be protected? -- From themselves, most assuredly, because by their own representation they are so vastly in the majority that it would be impossible for

161

them to be oppressed by anybody else. But in a government of the people, when the majority are oppressing themselves, how can laws prevent it when the laws must be made by the majority, that is, by the very ones who are carrying on the oppression? If to them my argument seems unsound, I would cite, entirely for their benefit, the words of the Supreme Court of Ohio, that the "protection" guaranteed in our Constitutional provisions "means protection to the minority. The majority can protect itself. Constitutions are enacted for the purpose of protecting the weak against the strong, the few against the many."

This is sound sense, as well as sound Constitutional law. Now, suppose in accordance with this sound Constitutional principle, and under cover of their own statements, we, seventh-day observers, whom they themselves designate as being so entirely in the minority as scarcely to be worthy of recognition, -- suppose we should come to Congress asking for protection (and as all my argument has shown, if anybody needs protection in this matter, assuredly it is ourselves), -- suppose, then, we come to Congress asking for protection in the same way that they ask for it, -- suppose we should ask Congress to enact a law compelling all people to do no work on Saturday, in order to protect us in our right to keep Saturday; what would be thought of that? what would these people themselves think of it? what ought anybody to think of it, but that it was a piece of unwarranted assumption of authority to force upon others our ideas of religious observances? That is all it would be, and it would be utterly inexcusable. And I risk nothing in saying that these people themselves, as well as everybody else, would pronounce it unwarrantable and inexcusable. But if that would be so in the case of a minority who actually need to be protected, what, then, ought not to be thought of these people

162

who claim to be in the overwhelming majority, in their mission here, asking Congress to compel everybody to rest on Sunday for their protection!

Gentlemen, it is not protection, but power, that they want.

REMARKS BY JOHN B. WOOD.

Mr. Wood. -- Mr. Chairman. As a member of the society of Friends, a Quaker, I should like to say a few words.

I have a great deal of sympathy with people who talk about the right of conscience. I do not think the United States Government has any right over the conscience. We, as Friends, deny their right over our consciences while we act in accordance with the revealed will of God, the Bible.

In looking at this Sunday question, I see nothing in the Bible -- there is no word in it -- in which it is stated that we shall have to work on the first day of the week. Therefore, I do not think the Seventh-day Baptists have any right to object to the proposed legislation. The only thing they lose is one more day's work out of the week.

The society of Friends has always denied the right to fight. The result has been that in the United States they have never lost a life by that means, not even during the last war. The Lord Jesus Christ has always protected them.

I think that any Saturday Baptist who believes honestly that the Sabbath is Saturday, can depend upon the Lord's providing for him in five days of the week just as well as if he worked six, and he will have two Sundays instead of one, and be that much better off.

163

REPLY.

Mr. Jones. -- In answer to the question raised by Mr. Wood, that conscientious convictions do not require us to work on the first day of the week, one of the six working days, I wish to say, --

First, we deny his right, as well as the right of the State, to assume the prerogative of deciding for us what the Bible teaches, or what our conscientious convictions do, or do not, require.

Secondly, we deny the right of the State to cause us to lose the whole, or any part, of a day's work out of every week. And I turn this point upon him as I turned it upon the others, Why have we not as much right to ask for a law compelling them to rest on the day that we keep, as they have to compel us to rest on the day which they keep? "The only thing they would lose is one more day's work out of the week." Then they could "have two Sundays instead of one, and be that much better off." Why is it not as good for them as it is for us? Or is this a benefit reserved solely for those who do not keep

Sunday? How this invades the Constitutional right of acquiring and possessing property, and does deprive us of property without due process of law, I have already discussed.

Thirdly, upon this point I wish to read Judge Cooley's opinion.

Mr. Wood. -- I referred to the Bible.

Mr. Jones. -- The Bible says, "Six days shalt thou labor." While I do not insist that this is an absolute command that we shall actually work the whole six days, I do insist that it is a God-given permission, and therefore our God-given right, to work six days of every week. And we deny forever the right of the State to forbid us to do that which, to say the very least, God has given us the express right to do.

164

As this is a matter of legislation and therefore of law, Judge Cooley's opinion is of weight upon the subject. He says: --

"The Jew [and the seventh-day Christian as well] who is forced to respect the first day of the week, when his conscience requires of him the observance of the seventh also, may plausibly urge that the law discriminates against his religion, and by forcing him to keep a second Sabbath in each week, unjustly, though by indirection, punishes him for his belief."

I have shown --

Senator Blair. -- He says "plausibly." That word plausibly indicates that there are some counter views somewhere.

Mr. Jones. -- As to the exact sense in which he uses the word plausibly, of course we cannot tell without consulting Mr. Cooley himself; but I do not see why we should put the strongest meaning into the word, especially as farther on he shows that the argument of the Seventh-day keeper is unanswerable. I am inclined to think that the Judge uses the word there in the sense of fairly, rightly, or feasibly.

Next he says: --

"The laws which prohibit ordinary employments on Sunday are to be defendant, either on the same grounds which justify the punishment of profanity, or as establishing sanitary regulations based upon the demonstration of experience that one day's rest in seven is needful to recuperate the exhausted energies of body and mind."

That is one of the pretended grounds of this petition for this national Sunday law; but the answer of the Supreme Court of California to that is this: --

"This argument is founded on the assumption that mankind are in the habit of working too much, and thereby entailing evil upon society; and that, without

165

compulsion, they will not seek the necessary repose which their exhausted natures demand. This is to us a new theory, and is contradicted by the history of the past and the observations of the present. We have heard in all ages of declamations and reproaches against the vice of indolence; but we have yet to learn that there has ever been any general complaint of an intemperate, vicious, unhealthy, or morbid industry. On the contrary, we know that mankind seek cessation from toil, from the natural influences of self-preservation, in the same manner and as certainly as they seek slumber, relief from pain, or food to appease their hunger. . . . If we cannot trust free agents to regulate their own labor, its times and quantity, it is difficult to trust them to make their own contracts. If the legislature could prescribe the days of rest for them, then it would seem that the same power could prescribe the hours to work, rest, and eat." -- Ex parte Newman, 9 Cal. 509, 518.

And Judge Cooley's answer to it is this: --

"The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania have preferred to defend such legislation on the second ground rather than the first, but it appears to us that if the benefit of the individual is alone to be considered, the argument against the law which he may make who has already observed the seventh day of the week, is unanswerable."

Senator Blair. -- But he also holds that for the general, the public good, Sunday laws are Constitutional.

Mr. Jones. -- Yes; and to be sustained upon authority. For the next sentence says: --

"But on the other ground, it is clear that these laws are supportable on authority, notwithstanding the inconvenience which they occasion to those whose religious sentiments do not recognize the sacred character of the first day of the week."

It is something unusual for persons to undertake to answer an unanswerable argument. But Judge Cooley employs here the only means by which an unanswerable

166

argument can ever be answered: and that is, "on authority." That is the way the papacy has done it from the days of Pope Zosimus, A. D., 418, who, when asked for the reasons for certain of this arrogant actions, exclaimed: "So it has pleased the Apostolic See!" That was a sufficient answer to all inquiries, and even to unanswerable arguments.

England fastened upon the American colonies the Stamp Act. Our fathers presented unanswerable arguments against it; but the Stamp Act, like Judge Cooley's Constitutional Sunday laws, was supportable "on authority," and that was enough. England proposed to enforce it. But our revolutionary fathers refused assent to any such method of answering unanswerable arguments. So we refuse our assent to Mr. Cooley's answer to that which he himself pronounces an unanswerable argument.

Senator Blair. -- It does not follow that there is no unanswerable argument in support of Sunday laws, I take it.

Mr. Jones. -- There is the authority.

Senator Blair. -- There is authority for the Sunday laws. It does not follow because the Sunday laws are supported by authority that therefore there is no sufficient argument upon which to base them.

Mr. Jones. -- What authority is there for Sunday laws?

Senator Blair. -- That is what you have been discussing; but you seem to say that because Sunday laws are supported "by authority," it is the only argument in favor of a bad law that there is authority for it. But there may be good authority for the Sunday law.

Mr. Jones. -- That is what is shown here, that there is no good authority for it when it unjustly punishes a man for his belief. There cannot be any good authority

167

for unjustly punishing any man for anything, much less for unjustly punishing him for his belief.

Senator Blair. -- He does not say it is bad.

Mr. Jones. -- But it is bad. Is there any good answer to an unanswerable argument?

Now, I propose to find out what authority there is for Sunday laws.

I before referred to the decision of the Supreme Court of Arkansas, and have shown from a statement of the committee on "law and law reform," of which the members of the Supreme Court were members, that decision was unconstitutional. I have shown that the principle upon which their decision rested was that of the omnipotence of parliament. In this, however, the State of Arkansas only followed the decisions of other States. In 1858, the Constitution of California said, in Section 4: "The free exercise and

enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State." There was a statute passed by the legislature enforcing the observance of "the Christian Sabbath," on the first day of the week. A Jew in Sacramento kept his store open on Sunday; he was arrested, convicted, and sent to jail. He sued out a writ of habeas corpus on the ground of "the illegality of his imprisonment by reason of the unconstitutionality of the law." The majority of the court sustained the plea by decisions separately written, whose soundness, both upon Constitutional principles and upon the abstract principle of justice itself, can never be successfully controverted. Mr. Stephen J. Field, now Associate-Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was then a member of the California Court. He rendered a dissenting opinion, taking the same position as the Supreme Court of Arkansas as to the omnipotence of the legislature, and soberly maintaining that the term "Christian

168

Sabbath" in the act was not a discrimination or preference in favor of any religious profession or worship. He declared that "moralists and statesmen," "men of science and distinguished philosophers," have pronounced the rule of "one day's rest in seven" to be "founded upon a law of our race." But he omitted to state what scientist or philosopher or moralist or statesman has ever pronounced upon what law is founded the rule of two days' rest in seven for the man who chooses to rest some other day than Sunday!

In his written opinion, Mr. Field said that he had found that in twenty-five States of the Union, Sunday laws had been held to be Constitutional. That this is so there can be no doubt. On this subject, as on that of blasphemy, which I have already noticed, the younger States, both in legislation and judicial decisions, have followed the example of the older States; these have followed the decisions of the oldest, and the oldest followed the example and the precedents of the colonies; and every one of the colonies had Sunday laws because every one had an established religions. These followed the precedents of the English system, which is wholly a church-and-state system. The church-and-state system of England severed itself from the papal rule when Henry VIII. renounced allegiance to the pope, and put himself at the head of the church of England in the place of the pope. The British system at that time was the papal system; the papal system was established by the mutual craft, flattery, and policy of Constantine and the ambitious bishops of his time, when the first Sunday law was enacted. This, in a word, is the genealogy of the Sunday laws of the United States. They belong with an established religion, -- a union of church and state. And in this country they have been almost universally sustained, either upon the British principle of the omnipotence of parliament,

169

or upon the church and state principles of the colonies, of the British government, and of the papacy.

The law of Pennsylvania, sustained by the decision referred to by Judge Cooley, was virtually a colonial law, which was a part of the system in which nobody who did "not confess and acknowledge one Almighty God to be the Creator, upholder, and ruler of the world," could be a citizen.

The Supreme Court of New York sustains Sunday laws by at once declaring Christianity to be the established religion of that State. This is based upon Chief Justice Kent's decision before referred to, which cited a law of the colony which declared that "the profanation of the Lord's day was 'the great scandal of the Christian faith.'" That decision of Judge Kent's made Christianity the established religion of the State of New York, by citing the precedents of the papal institutions of modern Europe and the pagan nations of antiquity.

This, again, proves Sunday laws to belong with established religions, with the union of church and state, finding their basis in papal and pagan institutions.

In every statute book in America, with scarcely an exception, Sunday laws are found under the head of "offenses against religion." This springs naturally from the colonial legislation, where each colony deemed itself the special guardian of God and of some particular form of religion.

But according to the word of Christ, the civil power has nothing to do with either God or religion, nor with offenses against God or religion. Religion is defined by Webster as "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience." Another definition, given by the National Reform Association itself, is "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." Civil government has nothing to do with a man's personal

relation of faith and obedience to God. If he has no faith at all, and makes no pretensions to obedience to God, that is nothing to the civil government, so long as the man conducts himself civilly. Neither has civil government anything to do with offenses against God; the Lord himself can attend to that. A man is responsible alone to God for the offenses which he commits against God. Civil government has no business to establish a religion, and then make offenses against it criminal; nor has it any business to put itself in the place of God, and presume to declare that an offense against the governmental idea of God is an offense against God. How is the civil government to know whether an act offends God or not? The fact of the matter is, that just as soon as Sunday laws are investigated at all in the light of truth, or justice, or law it is found that they are inseparable from an established religion, -- inseparable from a union of church and state.

This is further shown by a mere glance at the British system, as set forth by Blackstone in his chapter on "Offenses against God and religion." There "profanation of the Lord's day" is classed with such things as "apostasy," "heresy," "reviling the ordinances

of the church," "non-conformity to the worship of the church," "witchcraft," "conjurament," "enchantment," "sorcery," "religious imposture, such as falsely pretending an extraordinary commission from heaven," adultery as an ecclesiastical offense cognizable by the spiritual court, and such confusion of civil and religious ideas as the punishment of drunkenness as an offense against God and religion. This is the company with which Sunday laws belong. The penalty for apostasy was, first, burning to death; this fell into disuse after a while. Then the penalty was that "for

171

the first offense the offender should be rendered incapable to hold any office or place of trust."

At such legal nonsense as this the United States Constitution struck a death blow in the clause which declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government." And by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, this Government utterly separated itself from the whole system of offenses against God and religion so long maintained by the British government, by the colonies, and even yet by many of the States, and which is characteristic of all church-and-state governments -- governments of established religion -- by declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is sound American principle, and accords with the word of Jesus Christ. And the effort ought to be, throughout this whole nation, to lift the constitutions, the legislation, and the jurisprudence of the States up to the level of that of the national Constitution. But instead of doing that, and so carrying this whole nation bodily onward in the march of liberty, enlightenment, and progress, these people go about to bring down our national system of Constitution and laws to the level of that of the States, which is the level of that of the colonies, which is the level of that of the British system, which is the level that of the papacy, which is the system of paganism under cover of the Christian name.

Dr. Elliott here to-day cited Edgar, Athelstan, and Alfred in support of Sunday laws. To be sure! And with equal force he can cite these and many others of the Dark Ages in support of tithes to the clergy, the supremacy of the monks in civil affairs, the "holy anointing" of kings by the pope, and for any and every

172

other thing that belongs with the papal system. He can carry his Sunday-law precedents farther back than that: he can go back to the time of Theodosius and Constantine. He can find, and so can you or anybody else, that as Pontifex Maximus of the old pagan system, Constantine "had the plenary power of appointing holy days;" he can find that by virtue of this power, Constantine established the first Sunday-law of all time, in honor of the "venerable day of the sun," whose special devotee he was; and also that, as "bishop of externals" of the new pagan system, -- the papal, -- which office he assumed by virtue of

his political conversion to the political Christianity of his time, he played into the hands of the ambitious bishops by giving them in that Sunday law their coveted "use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims" to compel men to accept the decrees, and submit to the dictates, of the church. He, and all others, will find that this is the literal truth of the origin of Sunday laws.

All this is supported by abundance of testimony of undoubted authority. So eminent a divine as Dean Stanley declares plainly that the retention of the old pagan name of "dies solis," or Sunday, for the weekly Christian festival, "is owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution.'

This same mode of harmonizing paganism with Christianity was further illustrated by his imperial coins, bearing on one side the name of Christ, and on the other the figure of the sun god, with the inscription, "the unconquerable sun." This confusion of pagan and Christian ideas and practices is what made the

173

papacy, the union of church and state, and the confusion of civil and religious things, from which, with the exception of the government of the United States, the nations have not even yet freed themselves. This, sir, is the authority, and the only authority, for Sunday laws. Sunday has no basis whatever as a civil institution; it never had any. And the only basis it has, or ever had, as a religious institution is in that confusion of paganism and Christianity which made the papacy, with all that it is or ever was.

As authority for Sunday, and as the basis of this legislation, Dr. Johnson here to-day appealed to the fourth commandment. The "American Sabbath Union," now in session in this city, and which is working for the passage of this bill, likewise declares the basis of their whole movement to be the fourth commandment. It is proper, therefore, to inquire, What authority is there for Sunday laws, in the fourth commandment? As this is a question of legislation and of law, I shall examine it from the stand-point of law. Suppose, then, that this bill has become a law, and the courts in construing it take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment as the basis of the law.

Courts are guided by certain well-established rules in the construction of laws. According to these rules, what would be the result of the judicial construction of such a law upon the basis of the fourth commandment?

1. "What a court is to do, is to declare the law as written."

The fourth commandment as written is as follows; --

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

174

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."

That commandment as written says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Consequently, at the very first step the first day of the week, as declared in the bill, and as these people demand, would be completely shut out. But if any should innocently inquire, The seventh day of what? the commandment itself is ready with an explicit answer. It is the day upon which the Lord rested from the work of creation. In that work he employed six days, and the seventh day he rested, and that alone, as Dr. Johnson has said, established the weekly division of time. As those seven days formed the first week of time, the seventh of those seven was the seventh day of the week, and that is the seventh day fixed in the commandment. This is confirmed by the Scriptures throughout. The New Testament itself declares that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. Mark 16: 1, 2, says: --

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun."

Those people mentioned in this Scripture came to the sepulcher very early in the morning of the first day of the week; yet the Sabbath was past. This national Sunday-bill which is here under discussion proposes to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week. But such a thing can never be done, because according to the scripture, the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. It matters not how early persons may come to the first day of the week and its observance, they will be too late

175

to find the Sabbath in it; because by the word of the Lord it is past before the first day of the week comes.

This is made yet more positive, if need be, by the record in Luke 23:56 and 24:1, which says: --

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

Here it is declared that certain people rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment, and then on the first day of the week did what they would not do on the Sabbath day. This proves conclusively that the Sabbath day according to the commandment which these men cite, and which it is supposed that the courts will have to interpret when this becomes a law, -- this proves that Sabbath day is the day before the first day of the week, and therefore plainly demonstrates that the seventh day named in the commandment is nothing else than the seventh day of the week. Therefore, if courts, in the interpretation of this commandment as the basis of a Sunday law, declare the law as written and as defined by the plain word of the Lord, they will have to declare that the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, is the Sabbath.

2. "In the case of all law, it is the intent of the lawgiver that is to be enforced."

What, then, was the intent of the Lawgiver when the fourth commandment was given? Did the Lawgiver declare or show in any way his intention? -- He did. When the Lord gave that law at Sinai he did not leave it to the people to interpret it to suit themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week, kept up continuously for nearly forth years, he showed his intent in the law. The people were fed by manna in their forth years' wanderings. But on the

176

seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion, and that which was gathered on that day would keep over the seventh, which it could not be made to do at any other period, or over any other day in the week.

By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of observing the day mentioned in that law; and keeping it up continuously for so long a time made it utterly impossible that his intent should be mistaken.

Therefore, if the courts of the United States shall ever take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment, which is held forth by these people as the basis and the authority for their movement, according to this rule, the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared the Sabbath.

3. "When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction: they must be followed."

Are the words of the fourth commandment plain words? -- They are. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the commandment.

Then, according to this rule, if ever that question becomes one of judicial cognizance in the courts of the United States, the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared to be the Sabbath. That is all that the courts can declare.

Therefore, the conclusion of the whole matter thus far is that if our courts are to remain courts of law and are to be guided by the established rules for the construction of law, they never can uphold any law for the enforcement of the Sabbath or the Lord's day on the first day of the week.

Just here, however, another element comes into court, and that is the theological. The theologians step in right here and declare that the intention of the fourth commandment has been changed, and that now, instead of that commandment's requiring the observance of the

177

seventh day in remembrance of creation, it requires the observance of the first day of the week in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ. To reach this point they first declare that the phrase "the seventh day" in the commandment is indefinite; that it does not enjoin the observance of any particular day, but only of one day in seven. But such a construction is not only clearly in violation of established rules for the construction of law, but it involves an assumption of power on their part that can never be allowed. Admitting for argument's sake that that phrase in the commandment is indefinite, it must be admitted that the Lord, when he wrote it, intentionally made it indefinite, because the Scripture says that when he had spoken these words, he added no more; he had nothing more to say on the subject. What he said then was final. If, then, that statement be indefinite, he intended it so, and no other than the Lord ever can, or ever has the right to, make it definite. But the theologians, just as soon as they make it indefinite to escape the obligation which it enjoins to observe the seventh day, then make it definite in order to sustain the supposed obligation to keep the first day of the week. Consequently, when they make it definite after having declared that the Lord made it indefinite, they assume the power and the prerogative to do what the Lord intentionally declined to do; and in that they put themselves above God.

So much for their theological assumptions. Such a course is not only theologically an assumption of almighty power, but on the basis of law it is a violation of the rule which declares that --

4. "No forced or unnatural construction is to be put upon the language of a statute."

To make the phrase "the seventh day" in that commandment indefinite, and mean any one day in seven and not any seventh day in particular, is nothing else

than to put a forced and unnatural construction upon the language, not only of the commandment itself throughout, but on all the language of the Scriptures upon the subject of the commandment.

Further, to make that commandment support the observance of the first day of the week in commemoration of the resurrection, is not only to put a forced and most unnatural construction upon it, but is a direct violation of that other rule of law which declares that --

5. "A constitution [or statute] is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable . . . The meaning of the constitution [or statute] is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it."

As I have clearly proved, the meaning of the fourth commandment when it was given was that the seventh day of the week should be observed, and for the reason that God rested that day from the work of creation, and blessed the day and hallowed it. That Sabbath day for that reason was established before man had sinned, and before there was any need of the resurrection of Christ. If man had never sinned, the day would have been observed, for the reason given, in commemoration of the rest of the Creator from his work of creation. That being the meaning of the commandment when the commandment was given, that must be the meaning of the commandment so long as the commandment remains. And according to this rule it can never be made to mean anything else; although to the theologians who wish to have it so, the circumstances concerning the resurrection may seem to make it desirable.

Here the question very pertinently arises, Shall the Congress and the courts of the United States adopt the wishes of the theologians, and, in violation of the rules

of law, undertake to make the statute of God mean that which it was never intended to mean? In contemplation of this demand which is now made by the theologians, the words of Judge Cooley -- "Constitutional Limitations," p. 67 -- are worthy of consideration by Congress, as well as by the judges of the United States courts. He says: --

"A court of legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

The theologians have given to the fourth commandment a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the Commandment. They come to the national legislature, and ask it to allow itself to be influenced by these theological sentiments in giving to that written constitution of the government of God, a construction which is not warranted by the intention of Founder of that constitution. As Judge Cooley says, such a thing done to a human constitution, an earthly statute, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty. But if this is true in the case of things wholly human and earthly, what should be thought of such an action with reference to the divine constitution, and heavenly law?

Will the national legislature allow this theological sentiment to influence it to commit an act with reference to the constitution and laws of the living God, which, if committed with reference to the laws of men, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty? Not only do I ask, Is the national legislature ready to do this? but is it ready also by doing it to force the United States courts into the sanctioning of it in direct violation of the plainest principles of every rule for the construction of law? Is the national legislature ready to take the step which would turn all

180

our courts of law into courts of theology? For such would be the only effect of the enactment of such a law as is here demanded by the theologians; because when the law comes to be interpreted by the courts upon the basis upon which the law is enacted, the first day of the week as the Sabbath can never be sustained by rules of law or by the principles of interpretation established in law. The only way it can ever be sustained is by principles established by the theologians and by theological distinctions, in total disregard of the rules of law; and the effect of it can be nothing else than to turn our courts of law into courts of theology.

More than this, the Scriptures plainly and logically show the seventh day to be the Lord's day. The actual expression, "the Lord's day," is used but once in the Bible, and that in Rev. 1:10, saying, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." But that text does not say what day of the week the Lord's day is. Other texts in the Bible, however, speak on the subject in such a way as logically to show what day is meant by the expression, "the Lord's day." The Lord himself said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28.

The Lord also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Here are two plain Scripture statements which may form the premises of a syllogism; thus; --

Major: The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath.

Minor: The seventh day is the Sabbath.

The only conclusion that can ever be drawn from these premises is, --

Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

That conclusion is just as sound as these two statements of Scripture are, and the two statements of Scripture are as plain and positive on that subject as any two statements ever can be made. Forming another

181

sylllogism, of which the above conclusion shall be the minor, we have this: --

Major: Whatever day it is of which the Son of man is Lord, is the Lord's day.

Minor: The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

Therefore, the Lord's day is the seventh day.

This logic is unquestionable; this conclusion is just as true as the Scripture itself. Therefore, as surely as courts undertake the interpretation of any statute enforcing the observance of the Lord's day, and enter upon an inquiry as to what day is the Lord's day, they will, if logical, be brought face to face with the fact as demonstrated by the word of the Lord himself, that the seventh day, and not the first day, is the Lord's day.

But it will probably be said that the courts are not to enter upon the interpretation of Scripture; they are to interpret the law as it has been enacted, and as it is written; and the law as enacted says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and that is as far as the courts can go. Suppose that be granted. Then that puts the United States Government into the place where it establishes an institution as the Lord's and enforces its observance, which not only the Lord has not established, but which is directly contrary to the plain word of the Lord upon the subject of this institution and its observance.

One or the other of these alternatives therefore the United States Government will be forced to adopt as surely as this bill or any one like it shall ever become a law. The Government will either have to become the authoritative interpreter of Scripture for all the citizens of the Government, or else it will have to put itself in the place of God, and authoritatively declare that observances established by the State and which it calls the Lord's are the Lord's indeed, although the word of the Lord declares the contrary. Is the United

182

States Government ready to take either of these positions? Is the Congress of the United States ready to force the Government of the United States to the alternative of taking one or the other of these positions?

The taking of either of these positions by the Government would be nothing else than for this enlightened nation, in this period of the nineteenth century, to assume the place, the power, and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the church.

Thus, from whatever point this subject of Sunday laws may be viewed, it plainly appears that aside from the papacy there is no authority whatever for Sunday laws, nor even for Sunday keeping; and that the only effect that a national Sunday law can ever have, will be only evil, and that continually. Let Congress now and forever decidedly and utterly refuse to have anything to do with it in any way whatever; and let all the people, instead of sanctioning a movement to bring the national legislation down to the degraded level of the States on this subject, put forth every effort to bring the legislation of the States up to that place where it shall be limited as the power of Congress is limited by the declaration of the national Constitution, that it "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Now, in the name of law, Constitutional and statutory, moral and civil; in the name of enlightenment and progress; in the name of reason and the revelation of Jesus Christ, I seriously ask, Why should the people of such a nation as this, living under such a constitution as is our national Constitution, be asked to return to the papal system in the Dark Ages, which was only the inevitable outcome of the wicked scheme that was conceived in sin, -- "the man of sin," -- and brought forth

183

in iniquity, -- "the mystery of iniquity," -- in the days of Constantine? Why should such a people as this, dwelling under the best Constitution and the most enlightened influences of all ages, be asked to return to the wicked system that characterized the Middle Ages?

No, sir; the noble men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, when they established our Constitution, separated, as they supposed forever, this nation from all the wicked influences of the church-and-state systems of the colonies, of England, and of all other nations of all times. And under this Constitution, in true liberty, civil and religious, in genuine enlightenment and progress, this nation has deservedly stood as the beacon light of the world for a hundred years. Let this splendid nation ever still look forward and not backward; let it still hold its honored place before all the nations; and God forbid that by any such effort as is now being made in behalf of this Sunday law, this glorious nation should be brought down from her high place, and made to follow in the papal train.

Gentlemen, no further argument is needed to show that the Sunday laws of all the States, and the principles of the decisions of the Supreme Courts which sustain them, are wholly wrong, springing from the papal principle of church and state, and supported by the equally un-American principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. They are

totally subversive of American principles. Yet Sunday laws have never been, and can never be, sustained on any other principle. And this is only to say that which is the sum of all this discussion: There is no foundation in justice, in right, or even in expediency, for any Sunday laws, or Lord's-day laws, or Sabbath laws, UNDER ANY GOVERNMENT ON THIS EARTH.

*Page 123 Yet in the very legislature, that of 1889, the church managers tried their best again to repeal the exemption clause. It was then discovered that they had elected men to the legislature pledged to repeal the exemption clause. The bill passed the Senate, but was killed in the House. This proves my position, that there is no liberty in an exemption clause.

APPENDIX A

THE American Sabbath Union in its "Monthly Documents," has tried to make it appear that, in my argument before the Senate Committee, I admitted the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good. The effort was not only made by the Association in its own documents, but the document and statements were reprinted in *Our Day*. To counteract the influence of this effort, as well as to make the point yet clearer, if possible, and expose another method which the Sunday-law workers employ to secure support for their movement, I insert the following --

OPEN LETTER

To the Rev. J. H. Knowles, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union.

DEAR SIR: In the monthly documents of the American Sunday Association, edited by yourself, you have chosen to charge me with insincerity; and you have also done your best to make it appear that I "admit all that the friends of the Sunday-rest law generally claim -- the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good."

You have garbled extracts from the report of my speech before the Senate Committee on the Sunday law, and then have italicized certain words and sentences in one passage to try to make it appear that I admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good.

You have quoted from my speech the following words in the following way --

"Whenever any civil government attempts to enforce anything in regard to any one of the first four commandments, it invades the prerogative of God, and is to be disobeyed (I do not say resisted, but disobeyed). . . . The State, in its legislation, can never legislate properly in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue; but if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments he invades the rights of his neighbor, then the civil government says that is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious or because it is immoral? -- Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only. [Italics ours. -- ED]"

It is in the italicizing of these words that your effort is made to make me admit what I continually and consistently denied before the committee, and do deny everywhere else. You have inserted in the above quotation three periods, indicating that a portion has been left out; and you know full well, sir, that in the portion which is there left out, is the following: --

Senator Blair. -- 'You oppose all the Sunday laws of the Country, then?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Yes, sir.'

"Senator Blair. -- 'You are against all Sunday laws?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed.'

"Senator Blair. -- 'State and national alike?'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'State and national, sir.'"

Not only were these words there, but in that portion which you have printed following the italicized words, you yourself have printed my plain denial of the right of any nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of a thousand to compel the thousandth man to rest on the day on which the majority rest, in the following from: --

0 "Senator Blair. -- 'The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society; and if

Caesar regulates society, then the majority has a right in this country to say what shall be rendered to Caesar.'

"Mr. Jones. -- 'If nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of every thousand in the United States kept the seventh day, that is, Saturday, and I deemed it my choice and right to keep Sunday, I would insist on it, and they would have no right to compel me to rest on Saturday.'"

"Senator Blair. -- 'In other words, you take the grounds that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath, if it disturbs others?'"

"Mr. Jones. -- 'No, sir.'"

"Senator Blair. -- 'You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.'"

That last expression of mine, saying "No, sir," is in accord, and was intended when spoken to be in accord, with Senator Blair's inquiring statement whether society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath. My answer there means, and when it was spoken it was intended to mean, that society may not do so. As to its disturbing others, I had just before proved that the common occupations of men who choose to work on Sunday or any other day do not disturb and cannot disturb the rest of the majority who choose to rest that day.

Again: A little farther along you print another passage in which are the following words: --

"Senator Blair. -- You would abolish any Sabbath in human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?"

"Mr. Jones. -- 'Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.'"

Now, I should like for you in a monthly document, or by some other means, to show how by any fair means, or by any sincere purpose, you can, even by the use of

italics, make in that speech admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good. You know, sir, that in that speech I distinctly stated that any human laws for the enforcement of the Sabbath, instead of being "for the good of society, are for the ruin of society."

Again: You know, for you printed it in one of your documents, that Senator Blair said to me: "You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath." You know that in another place he said again to me: "You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or nation either."

Now, sir, I repeat, you have charged me with insincerity. Any one making such a charge as that ought to be sincere. Will you, therefore, explain upon what principle it is that you claim to be sincere in this thing, when in the face of these positive and explicit statements to the contrary and Senator Blair's confirmation of them to that effect, you can deliberately attempt to force into my words a meaning that was never there, that was never intended to be there, and that never can by any honest means be put there?

More than this: It can hardly be thought that Senator Blair will very highly appreciate the compliment that you have paid to his logical discernment, when in the fact of his repeated statement that I was logical all the way through, you force into my words a meaning that could have no other effect than to make me illogical all the way through.

I have no objection to your printing my words as they were spoken; but I do object to your forcing into them a meaning directly contrary to that which the words themselves convey, and which they were intended to convey; and I further object to your so garbling my statements as to make it possible for you

188

to force into them a meaning that they never can honestly be made to bear.

In that speech also I said that if an idol-worshiper in this country should attempt to offer a human sacrifice, the Government should protect the life of its subject from the exercise of that man's religion; that he has the right to worship any idol that he chooses, but that he has not the right to commit murder in the worship of his idol, and the State forbids the murder without any reference at all to the question as to whether that man is religious or whether he worships or not, with no reference at all to the commandment which forbids idol-worship, and with no thought whatever of forbidding his idolatry. I stated also that if anybody claiming apostolic example should practice community of property, and in carrying out that practice should take your property or mine without our consent, the State would forbid the theft without any reference at all to the man's religious opinions, and with no thought of forbidding the practice of community of property. You know that it was with direct reference to these words that I used the words which you have italicized. I there distinctly denied that the State can ever of right legislate in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But, if any man in the exercise of his rights under the first four commandments, and in this case under the fourth commandment, should invade the right of his neighbor, as I have expressed it, by endangering his life, his liberty, or his property, or attack his character, or invade his rights in any way, the government has the right to prohibit it, because of the incivility; but with never any question as to whether the man is religious or irreligious, and with never a purpose or a thought of forbidding the free exercise of any man's right to work on any day or all days, as he chooses.

189

This is precisely what every State in this Union already does by statutes which punish disturbances of religious worship or religious meetings, or peaceable assemblies of any sort. But there is a vast difference between such statutes as these and the ones which you desire shall be enacted. These are strictly civil statutes, prohibiting incivility, and are far from anything like the enforcement of religious observances. The Sunday-law workers complain of the disturbance of their worship on Sunday. If they are sincere in this, why don't they enforce the laws already on the statute books prohibiting disturbance of worship? California, for instance, prohibits disturbance of worship, under penalty of five hundred dollars' fine and six months in jail. But instead of having such legitimate laws enforce, you propose to prohibit the disturbance of your worship on Sunday by compelling everybody to keep Sunday. Upon this same principle you would have the State forbid the offering of human sacrifices by an idolworshiper, by compelling him to keep the second commandment. In short, the principle is that you would have the State prohibit incivility by compelling everybody to be religious. And you are so enraptured with this distorted view, that you have chosen in your sincerity and by italics to force me to sanction the wicked principle. But it will not work. I say always, If your worship is disturbed on Sunday or at any other time, let the State punish the person or persons who create the disturbance. Let the State punish them by such strictly legitimate statutes as the States already have on this subject. But let the State never attempt to prohibit disturbance of worship by trying to compel men to worship, nor attempt to prohibit incivility by enforcing religious observances. This is just what I had in view, and is precisely what I meant, in the words which you have italicized.

All this is further shown in the argument which I made, in that, Immediately following the words which you have italicized I proved that Sunday work does not disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday. And the conclusion of that is, therefore, that there is no basis for Sunday laws on that ground. This I prove by the fact that the people who make this the ground of their demand for Sunday laws, do not recognize for an instant that work on Saturday disturbs the rest or the worship of the people who keep Saturday. I there showed that if your work on Saturday does not disturb my rest or my worship, my work on Sunday cannot disturb your rest or your worship. I made this argument not only on this principle, but from actual experience. I know, from an experience of fifteen years, that other people's work on Saturday does not disturb either my rest or my worship on that day. There are Seventh-day Adventists in every State and Territory of this nation, in Canada, nearly every country of Europe, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, South America, China, South Africa, and other places. They all rest every Saturday; they all keep it as the Sabbath unto the Lord. But no person has ever yet heard of a Seventh-day Adventist who ever complained that his rest on the Sabbath was disturbed by other men's work. Not only is this so, but the Seventh-day Adventists have organized churches in the great majority of the States and Territories of this Union. These churches are found in country places, in villages, in towns, and in cities. They meet for worship every Saturday; and although, as everybody knows, Saturday is the busiest day

This, dear sir, is only an additional argument, but one which rests on the living experience of thousands of people every seventh day, conclusively showing that your whole theory and claim for Sunday laws break down utterly at every point.

ALONZO T. Jones.

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, } 408 NORTH CHARLES ST.,
BALTIMORE, Md., } Feb. 27, 1889.

"MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor dated Feb. 25, 1889, duly received, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons desires me to write to you, that whatsoever countenance His Eminence has given to the 'Sunday law' referred to in your favor, as he had not the authority. so he had not the intention, of binding the archbishops, the bishops, or the Catholic laity of the United States. His Eminence bids me say to you that he was moved to write a letter favoring the passage of the bill, mainly from a consideration of the rest

National Sunday Law- A.T Jones

and recreation which would result to our poor overworked fellow-citizens, and of the facility which it would then afford them of observing the Sunday in a religious and decorous way.

"It is incorrect to assume that His Eminence, in the alleged words of Senator Blair set forth in your favor `singed the bill, thus pledging seven millions two hundred thousand Catholics as indorsing the bill.'

"I have the honor to remain, with much respect yours faithfully, J. P.
DONAHUE, "Chancellor.

"To D. E. Lindsey, Esq., 708 Rayner Avenue, Baltimore, Md."

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH and FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK

By J. N. Andrews

PREFACE

THE history of the Sabbath embraces the period of 6000 years. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. The acts which constituted it such were, first, the example of the Creator; secondly, his placing his blessing upon the day; and thirdly, the sanctification or divine appointment of the day to a holy use. The Sabbath, therefore, dates from the beginning of our world's history. The first who Sabbatized on the seventh day is God the Creator; and the first seventh day of time is the day which he thus honored. The highest of all possible honors does, therefore, pertain to the seventh day. Nor is this honor confined to the first seventh day of time; for so soon as God had rested upon that day, he appointed the seventh day to a holy use, that man might hallow it in memory of his Creator.

This divine appointment grows out of the nature and fitness of things, and must have been made directly to Adam, for himself and wife were then the only beings who had the days of the week to use. As it was addressed to Adam while yet in his uprightness, it must have been given to him as the head of the human family. The fourth commandment bases all its authority upon this original mandate of the Creator, and must, therefore, be in substance what God commanded to Adam and Eve as the representatives of mankind.

The patriarchs could not possibly have been ignorant of the facts and the obligation which the fourth commandment shows to have originated in the beginning, for Adam was present with them for a period equal to more than half the Christian dispensation. Those, therefore, who walked with God in the observance of his commandments did certainly hallow his Sabbath.

The observers of the seventh day must therefore include the ancient godly patriarchs, and none will deny that they include also the prophets and the apostles. Indeed, the entire church of God embraced within the records of inspiration were Sabbath-keepers. To this number must be added the Son of God.

What a history, therefore, has the Sabbath of the Lord! It was instituted in Paradise, honored by several miracles each week for the space of forty years, proclaimed by the great Lawgiver from Sinai, observed by the Creator, the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the Son of God! It constitutes the very heart of the law of God, and so long as that law endures, so long shall the authority of this sacred institution stand fast.

Such being the record of the seventh day, it may well be asked, How came it to pass that this day has been abased to the dust, and another day elevated to its sacred honors? The Scriptures nowhere attribute this work to the Son of God. They do, however, predict the great apostasy in the Christian church, and that the little horn, or man of sin, the lawless one, should think to change times and laws.

It is the object of the present volume to show, 1. The Bible record of the Sabbath; 2. The record of the Sabbath in secular history; 3. The record of the Sunday festival, and of the several steps by which it has usurped the place of the ancient Sabbath.

The writer has attempted to ascertain the exact truth in the case by consulting the original authorities as far as it has been possible to gain access to them. The margin will show to whom he is mainly indebted for the facts presented in this work, though it indicates only a very small part of the works consulted. He has given the exact words of the historians, and has endeavored, conscientiously, to present them in such a light as to do justice to the authors quoted.

It is not the fault of the writer that the history of the Sunday festival presents such an array of frauds and of iniquities in its support. These are, in the nature of the case, essential to its very existence, for the claim of a usurper is necessarily based in fraud. The responsibility for these rests with those who dare commit or uphold such acts. The ancient Sabbath of the Lord has never needed help of this kind, and never has its record been stained by fraud or falsehood.

Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 18, 1873 J. N. A.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

PART I - BIBLE HISTORY

CHAPTER I - THE CREATION

Time and eternity - The Creator and his work - Events of the first day of time - Of the second - Of the third - Of the fourth - Of the fifth - Of the sixth.

TIME, as distinguished from eternity, may be defined as that part of duration which is measured by the Bible. From the earliest date in the book of Genesis to the resurrection of the unjust at the end of the millennium, the period of about 7000 years is measured off.¹ Before the commencement of this great week of time, duration without beginning fills the past; and at the expiration of this period, unending duration opens before the people of God. Eternity is that word which embraces duration without beginning and without end. And that Being whose existence comprehends eternity, is he who only hath immortality, the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God.²

When it pleased this infinite Being, he gave existence to our earth. Out of nothing God created all things;³ "so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." This act of creation is that event which marks the commencement of the first week of time. He who could accomplish the whole work with one word chose rather to employ six days, and to accomplish the result by successive steps. Let us trace the footsteps of the Creator from the time when he laid the foundation of the earth until the close of the sixth day, when the heavens and the earth were finished, "and God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good."⁴

On the first day of time God created the heaven and the earth. The earth thus called into existence was without form, and void; and total darkness covered the Creator's work. Then "God said, Let there be light; and there was light." "And God divided the light from the darkness," and called the one day, and other night.⁵

On the second day of time "God said, Let there be a firmament [margin, Heb., expansion] in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." The dry land had not yet appeared; consequently the earth was covered with water. As no atmosphere existed, thick vapors rested upon the face of the water; but the atmosphere being now called into existence by the word of the Creator, causing those elements to unite which compose the air we breathe, the fogs and vapors that had rested upon the bosom of the water were borne aloft by it. This atmosphere or expansion is called heaven.⁶

On the third day of time God gathered the waters together and caused the dry land to appear. the gathering together of the waters God called seas; the dry land, thus rescued from the waters, he called earth. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so." "And God saw that it was good."⁷

On the fourth day of time "God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years." "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also." Light had been created on the first day of the week; and now on the fourth day he causes the sun and moon to appear as light-bearers, and places the light under their rule. And they continue unto this day according to his ordinances, for all are his servants. Such was the work of the fourth day. And the Great Architect, surveying what he had wrought, pronounced it good.⁸

On the fifth day of time "God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good."⁹

On the sixth day of time "God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good." Thus the earth, having been fitted for the purpose, was filled with every order of living creature, while the air and waters teemed with animal existence. To complete this noble work of creation, God next provides a ruler, the representative of himself, and places all in subjection under him. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Last of all, God created Eve, the mother of all living. The work of the Creator was now complete. "The heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." Adam and Eve were in paradise; the tree of life bloomed on earth; sin had not entered our world, and death was not here, for there was no sin. "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Thus ended the sixth day.¹⁰

¹ For the scriptural and traditional evidence on this point, see Shimeall's Bible Chronology, part i. chap. vi; Taylor's Voice of the Church, pp. 25-30; and Bliss' Sacred Chronology, pp. 199-203.

² Isa.57:15; 1Sam.15:29, margin; Jer.10:10, margin; Micah 5:2, margin; 1Tim.6:16; 1:17; Ps.90:2.

³ Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary on Gen.1:1, uses the following language: "[Created] Caused that to exist which previously to this moment, had no being. The rabbis, who are legitimate judges in a case of verbal criticism on their own language, are unanimous in asserting that word bara, expresses the commencement of the existence of a thing: or its egression from nonentity to entity These words should be translated: 'God in the beginning created the substance of the heavens and the substance of the earth; i.e., the prima materia, or first elements, out of which the heavens and the earth were successively formed.' "

Purchase's Pilgrimage, b. i. chap. ii., speaks thus of the creation: "Nothing but nothing had the Lord Almighty, whereof, wherewith, whereby, to build this city" [that is the world].

Chapter One – The Creation

Dr. Gill says: "These are said to be created, that is, to be made out of nothing; for what pre-existent matter to this chaos [of verse 2] could there be out of which they could be formed?"

"Creation must be the work of God, for none but an almighty power could produce something out of nothing." Commentary on Gen.1:1.

John Calvin, in his Commentary on this chapter, thus expounds the creative act: "His meaning is, that the world was made out of nothing. Hence the folly of those is refuted who imagine that unformed matter existed from eternity."

The work of creation is thus defined in 2 Maccabees 7:28: "Look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not; and so was mankind made likewise."

That this creative act marked the commencement of the first day instead of preceding it by almost infinite ages is thus stated in 2 Esdras 6:38: "And I said, O Lord, thou spakest from the beginning of the creation, even the first day, and saidst thus: Let heaven and earth be made; and thy word was a perfect work."

Wycliffe's translation, the earliest of the English versions, renders Gen.1:1, thus: "In the first, made God of naught heaven and earth.

⁴ Gen. 1:31

⁵ Gen.1:1-5; Heb.1.

⁶ Gen.1:6-8; Job 37:18.

⁷ Gen.1:9-13; Ps.136:6; 2Pet.3:5.

⁸ Gen.1:14-19; Ps.119:91; Jer.33:25.

⁹ Gen.1:20-23.

¹⁰ Gen.1:24:31; 2:7-9, 18-22; 3:20; Job 38:7.

CHAPTER 2

THE INSTITUTION OF THE SABBATH

Event of the seventh day - Why the Creator rested - Acts by which the Sabbath was made - Time and order of their occurrence - Meaning of the word sanctified - The fourth commandment refers the origin of the Sabbath to creation - The second mention of the Sabbath confirms this fact - The Saviour's testimony - When did God sanctify the seventh day - Object of the Author of the Sabbath - Testimony of Josephus and of Philo - Negative argument from the book of Genesis considered - Adam's knowledge of the Sabbath not difficult to be known by the patriarchs.

The work of the creator was finished, but the first week of time was not yet completed. Each of the six days had been distinguished by the Creator's work upon it; but the seventh was rendered memorable in a very different manner. "And on the seventh¹ day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." In yet stronger language it is written: "On the seventh day he rested, and was REFRESHED."²

Thus the seventh day of the week became the rest-day of the Lord. How remarkable is this fact! "The everlasting God, The Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary."³ He needed no rest; yet it is written, "On the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Why does not the record simply state the cessation of the Creator's work? Why did he at the close of that work employ a day in rest? The answer will be learned from the next verse. He was laying the foundation of a divine institution, the memorial of his own great work.

"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." The fourth commandment states the same fact: He "rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."⁴

The blessing and sanctification of the seventh day were because that God had rested upon it. His resting upon it, then, was to lay the foundation for blessing and sanctifying the day. His being refreshed with this rest, implies that he delighted in the act which laid the foundation for the memorial of his great work.

The second act of the Creator in instituting this memorial was to place his blessing upon the day of his rest. Thence forward it was the blessed rest-day of the Lord. A third act completes the sacred institution. The day already blessed of God is now, last of all, sanctified or hallowed by him. To sanctify is "to separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use." To hallow is "to make holy; to consecrate; to set apart for a holy or religious use."⁵

The time when these three acts were performed is worthy of especial notice. The first act was that of rest. This took place on the seventh day; for the day was employed in rest. The second and third acts took place when the seventh day was past. "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work." Hence it was on the first day

of the second week of time that God blessed the seventh day, and set it apart to a holy use. The blessing and sanctification of the seventh day, therefore, relate not to the first seventh day of time, but to the seventh day of the week for time to come, in memory of God's rest on that day from the work of creation.

With the beginning of time, God began to count days, giving to each an ordinal number for its name. Seven different days receive as many different names. In memory of that which he did on the last of these days, he sets that apart by name to a holy use. This act gave existence to weeks, or periods of seven days. For with the seventh day, he ceased to count, and, by the divine appointment of that day to a holy use in memory of his rest thereon, he causes man to begin the count of a new week so soon as the first seventh day had ceased. And as God has been pleased to give man, in all, but seven different days, and has given to each one of these days a name which indicates its exact place in the week, his act of setting apart one of these by name, which act created weeks and gave man the Sabbath, can never - except by sophistry - be made to relate to an indefinite or uncertain day.

The days of the week are measured off by revolution of our earth on its axis; and hence our seventh day, as such, can come only to dwellers on this globe. To Adam and Eve, therefore, as inhabitants of this earth, and not to the inhabitants of some other world, were the days of the week given to use. Hence, when God set apart one of these days to a holy use in memory of his own rest on that day of the week, the very essence of the act consisted in his telling Adam that this day should be used only for sacred purposes. Adam was then in the garden of God, placed there by the Creator to dress it and to keep it. He was also commissioned of God to subdue the earth.⁶ When therefore the rest-day of the Lord should return, from week to week, all this secular employment, however proper in itself, must be laid aside, and the day observed in memory of the Creator's rest.

Dr. Twisse quotes Martin Luther thus:

"And Martin Luther professeth as much (tome vi, in Gen.2:3). 'It follows from hence,' saith he, 'that, if Adam had stood in his innocency, yet he should have kept the seventh day holy, that is, on that day he should have taught his children, and children's children, what was the will of God, and wherein his worship did consist; he should have praised God, given thanks, and offered. On other days he should have tilled his ground, looked to his cattle.' "⁷

The Hebrew verb, *kadash*, here rendered sanctified, and in the fourth commandment rendered hallowed, is defined by Gesenius, "To pronounce holy, to sanctify; to institute any holy thing, to appoint."⁸ It is repeatedly used in the Old Testament for a public appointment or proclamation. Thus, when the cities of refuge were set apart in Israel, it is written: "They appointed [margin, Heb., sanctified] Kedesh in Galilee in Mount Naphtali, and Shechem in Mount Ephraim," &c. This sanctification or appointment of the cities of refuge was by a public announcement to Israel that these cities were set apart for that purpose. This verb is also used for the appointment of a public fast, and for the gathering of a solemn assembly. Thus it is written: "Sanctify [i.e., appoint] ye a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your God." "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify [i.e., appoint] a fast, call a solemn assembly." "And Jehu said, Proclaim [margin, Heb., sanctify] a solemn assembly for Baal."⁹ This appointment for Baal was so public that all the worshipers of Baal in all Israel were gathered together. These fasts and solemn assemblies were sanctified or set apart by a public appointment or proclamation of the fact. When therefore God set apart the seventh day to a holy use, it was necessary that he

should state that fact to those who had the days of the week to use. Without such announcement the day could not be set apart from the others.

But the most striking illustration of the meaning of this word may be found in the record of the sanctification of Mount Sinai.¹⁰ When God was about to speak the ten commandments in the hearing of all Israel, he sent Moses down from the top of Mount Sinai to restrain the people from touching the mount. "And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it." Turning back to the verse where God gave this charge to Moses, we read: "And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount or touch the border of it." Hence to sanctify the mount was to command the people not to touch even the border of it; for God was about to descend in majesty upon it. In other words, to sanctify or set apart to a holy use Mount Sinai, was to tell the people that God would have them treat the mountain as sacred to himself. And thus also to sanctify the rest-day of the Lord was to tell Adam that he should treat the day as holy to the Lord.

The declaration, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," is not indeed a commandment for the observance of that day; but it is the record that such a precept was given to Adam.¹¹ For how could the Creator "set apart to a holy use" the day of his rest, when those who were to use the day knew nothing of his will in the case? Let those answer who are able.

This view of the record in Genesis we shall find to be sustained by all the testimony in the Bible relative to the rest-day of the Lord. The facts which we have examined are the basis of the fourth commandment. Thus spake the great Law-giver from the summit of the flaming mount: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." "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."¹²

The term Sabbath is transferred from the Hebrew language, and signifies rest.¹³ The command, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," is therefore exactly equivalent to saying, "Remember the rest-day, to keep it holy." The explanation which follows sustains this statement: "The seventh day is the Sabbath [or rest-day] of the Lord thy God." The origin of this rest-day is given in these words: "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." That which is enjoined in the fourth commandment is to keep holy the rest-day of the Lord. And this is defined to be the day on which he rested from the work of creation. Moreover, the fourth commandment calls the seventh day the Sabbath day at the time when God blessed and hallowed that day; therefore the Sabbath is an institution dating from the foundation of the world. The fourth commandment points back to the creation for the origin of its obligation; and when we go back to that point, we find the substance of the fourth commandment given to Adam: "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;" i.e., set it apart to a holy use. And in the commandment itself, the same fact is stated: "The Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it;" i.e., appointed it to a holy use. The one statement affirms that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;" the other, that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." These two statements refer to the same acts. Because the word Sabbath does not occur in the first statement, it has been contended that the Sabbath did not originate at creation, it being the seventh day merely which was hallowed. From the second statement, it has been contended that God did not bless the seventh day at all, but simply the Sabbath institution. But both statements embody all the truth. God blessed the seventh day,

and sanctified it; and this day thus blessed and hallowed was his holy Sabbath, or rest-day. Thus the fourth commandment establishes the origin of the Sabbath at creation.

The second mention of the Sabbath in the Bible furnishes a decisive confirmation of the testimonies already adduced. On the sixth day of the week, Moses, in the wilderness of Sin, said to Israel, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."¹⁴ What had been done to the seventh day since God blessed and sanctified it as his rest-day in paradise? Nothing. What did Moses do to the seventh day to make it the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord? Nothing. Moses on the sixth day simply states the fact that the morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. The seventh day had been such ever since God blessed and hallowed the day of his rest.

The testimony of our divine Lord relative to the origin and design of the Sabbath is of peculiar importance. He is competent to testify, for he was with the father in the beginning of the creation.¹⁵ "The Sabbath was made for man," said he, "not man for the Sabbath."¹⁶ The following grammatical rule is worthy of notice: "A noun without an adjective is invariably taken in its broadest extension, as: Man is accountable."¹⁷ The following texts will illustrate this rule, and also this statement of our Lord's: "Man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man." "It is appointed unto men once to die."¹⁸ In these texts man is used without restriction, and, therefore, all mankind are necessarily intended. The Sabbath was therefore made for the whole human family, and consequently originated with mankind. But the Saviour's language is even yet more emphatic in the original: "The Sabbath was made for THE man, not THE man for the Sabbath." This language fixes the mind on the man Adam, who was made of the dust of the ground just before the Sabbath was made for him, of the seventh day.

This is a striking confirmation of the fact already pointed out that the Sabbath was given to Adam, the head of the human family.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; yet he made the Sabbath for man. "God made the Sabbath his by solemn appropriation, that he might convey it back to us under the guarantee of a divine charter, that none might rob us of it with impunity."

But is it not possible that God's act of blessing and sanctifying the seventh day did not occur at the close of creation week? May it not be mentioned then because God designed that the day of his rest should be afterward observed? Or rather, as Moses wrote the book of Genesis long after the creation, might he not insert this account of the sanctification of the seventh day with the record of the first week, though the day itself was sanctified in his own time?

It is very certain that such an interpretation of the record cannot be admitted, unless the facts in the case demand it. For it is, to say the least, a forced explanation of the language. The record in Genesis, unless this be an exception, is a plain narrative of events. Thus what God did on each day is recorded in its order down to the seventh. It is certainly doing violence to the narrative to affirm that the record respecting the seventh day is of a different character from that respecting the other six. He rested the seventh day; he sanctified the seventh day because he had rested upon it. The reason why he should sanctify the seventh day existed when his rest was closed. To say, therefore, that God did not sanctify the day at that time, but did it in the days of Moses, is not only to distort the narrative, but to affirm that he neglected to do that for which the reason existed at creation, until twenty-five hundred years after.¹⁹

But we ask that the facts be brought forward which prove that the Sabbath was sanctified in the wilderness of Sin, and not at creation. And what are the facts that show this? It is confessed that such facts are not upon record. Their existence is assumed in order to sustain the theory that the Sabbath originated at the fall of the manna, and not in paradise.

Did God sanctify the Sabbath in the wilderness of Sin? There is no intimation of such fact. On the contrary, it is mentioned at that time as something already set apart of God. On the sixth day Moses said, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."²⁰ Surely this is not the act of instituting the Sabbath, but the familiar mention of an existing fact. We pass on to Mount Sinai. Did God sanctify the Sabbath when he spoke the ten commandments? No one claims that he did. It is admitted by all that Moses spoke of it familiarly the previous month.²¹ Does the Lord at Sinai speak of the sanctification of the Sabbath? He does; but in the very language of Genesis he goes back for the sanctification of the Sabbath, not to the wilderness of Sin, but to the creation of the world.²² We ask those who hold the theory under examination, this question: If the Sabbath was not sanctified at creation, but was sanctified in the wilderness of Sin, why does the narrative in each instance²³ record the sanctification of the Sabbath at creation and omit all mention of such fact in the wilderness of Sin? Nay, why does the record of events in the wilderness of Sin, show that the holy Sabbath was at that time already in existence? In a word, How can a theory subversive of all the facts in the record, be maintained as the truth of God?

We have seen the Sabbath ordained of God at the close of the creation week. The object of its Author is worthy of especial attention. Why did the Creator set up this memorial in paradise? Why did he set apart from the other days of the week that day which he had employed in rest? "Because that in it," says the record, "he had rested from all his work which God created and made." A rest necessarily implies a work performed. And hence the Sabbath was ordained of God as a memorial of the work of creation. And therefore that precept of the moral law which relates to this memorial, unlike every other precept of that law, begins with the word, "Remember." The importance of this memorial will be appreciated when we learn from the Scriptures that it is the work of creation which is claimed by its Author as the great evidence of his eternal power and Godhead, and as that great fact which distinguishes him from all false gods. Thus it is written:

"He that built all things is God." "The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens."
"But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King."
"He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion." "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead."
"For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." Thus "the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."²⁴

Such is the estimate which the Scriptures place upon the work of creation as evincing the eternal power and Godhead of the creator. The Sabbath stands as the memorial of this great work. Its observance is an act of grateful acknowledgment on the part of his intelligent creatures that he is their Creator, and that they owe all to him; and that for his pleasure they are and were created. How appropriate this observance for Adam! And when man had fallen, how important for his well being that he should "remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." He would thus have been preserved from atheism and from idolatry; for he could never forget

that there was a God from whom all things derived their being; nor could he worship as God any other being than the Creator.

The seventh day, as hallowed by God in Eden, was not Jewish, but divine; it was not the memorial of the flight of Israel from Egypt, but of the Creator's rest. Nor is it true that the most distinguished Jewish writers deny the primeval origin of the Sabbath, or claim it as a Jewish memorial. We cite the historian Josephus and his learned contemporary, Philo Judaeus. Josephus, whose "Antiquities of the Jews" run parallel with the Bible from the beginning, when treating of the wilderness of Sin, makes no allusion whatever to the Sabbath, a clear proof that he had no idea that it originated in that wilderness. But when giving the account of creation, he bears the following testimony:

"Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein was made. And that the seventh day was a rest and a release from the labor of such operations; WHENCE it is that we celebrate a rest from our labor on that day, and call it the Sabbath; which word denotes rest in the Hebrew tongue." ²⁵

And Philo bears an emphatic testimony relative to the character of the Sabbath as a memorial. Thus he says:

"But after the whole world had been completed according to the perfect nature of the number six, the Father hallowed the day following, the seventh, praising it and calling it holy. For that day is the festival, not of one city or one country, but of all the earth; a day which alone it is right to call the day of festival for all people, and the birth-day of the world." ²⁶

Nor was the rest-day of the Lord a shadow of man's rest after his recovery from the fall. God will ever be worshiped in an understanding manner by his intelligent creatures. When therefore he set apart his rest-day to a holy use, if it was not as a memorial of his work, but as a shadow of man's redemption from the fall, the real design of the institution must have been stated, and, as a consequence, man in his unfallen state could never observe the Sabbath as a delight, but ever with deep distress, as reminding him that he was soon to apostatize from God. Nor was the holy of the Lord and honorable, one of the "carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation;" ²⁷ for there could be no reformation with unfallen beings.

But man did not continue in his uprightness. Paradise was lost, and Adam was excluded from the tree of life. The curse of God fell upon the earth, and death entered by sin, and passed upon all men. ²⁸ After this sad apostasy, no further mention of the Sabbath occurs until Moses on the sixth day said, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."

It is objected that there is no precept in the book of Genesis for the observance of the Sabbath, and consequently no obligation on the part of the patriarchs to observe it. There is a defect in this argument not noticed by those who use it. The book of Genesis was not a rule given to the patriarchs to walk by. On the contrary, it was written by Moses 2500 years after creation, and long after the patriarchs were dead. Consequently the fact that certain precepts were not found in Genesis is no evidence that they were not obligatory upon the patriarchs. Thus the book does not command men to love God with all their hearts, and their neighbours as themselves; nor does it prohibit idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, adultery, theft, false witness or covetousness. Who will affirm from this that the patriarchs were under no restraint in these things? As a mere record of events, written long after their occurrence, it was not necessary that the book should contain a moral code. But had the book been given to the patriarchs as a rule of life, it must of necessity have contained such a code. It is a fact worthy of especial

notice that as soon as Moses reaches his own time in the book of Exodus, the whole moral law is given. The record and the people were then contemporary, and ever afterward the written law is in the hands of God's people, as a rule of life, and a complete code of moral precepts.

The argument under consideration is unsound, 1. Because based upon the supposition that the book of Genesis was the rule of life for the patriarchs; 2. Because if carried out it would release the patriarchs from every precept of the moral law except the sixth.²⁹ 3. Because the act of God in setting apart his rest-day to a holy use, as we have seen, necessarily involves the fact that he gave a precept concerning it to Adam, in whose time it was thus set apart. And hence, though the book of Genesis contains no precept concerning the Sabbath, it does contain direct evidence that such precept was given to the head and representative of the human family.

After giving the institution of the Sabbath, the book of Genesis, in its brief record of 2370 years, does not again mention it. This has been urged as ample proof that those holy men, who, during this period, were perfect, and walked with God in observance of his commandments, statutes and laws,³⁰ all lived in open profanation of that day which God had blessed and set apart to a holy use. But the book of Genesis also omits any distinct reference to the doctrine of future punishment, the resurrection of the body, the revelation of the Lord in flaming fire, and the Judgment of the great day. Does this silence prove that the patriarchs did not believe these great doctrines? Does it make them any the less sacred?

But the Sabbath is not mentioned from Moses to David, a period of five hundred years, during which it was enforced by the penalty of death. Does this prove that it was not observed during this period?³¹ The jubilee occupied a very prominent place in the typical system, yet in the whole Bible a single instance of its observance is not recorded. What is still more remarkable, there is not on record a single instance of the observance of the great day of atonement, notwithstanding the work in the holiest on that day was the most important service connected with the worldly sanctuary. And yet the observance of the other and less important festivals of the seventh month, which are so intimately connected with the day of atonement, the one preceding it by ten days, the other following it in five, is repeatedly and particularly recorded.³² It would be sophistry to argue from this silence respecting the day of atonement, when there were so many instances in which its mention was almost demanded, that that day was never observed; and yet it is actually a better argument than the similar one urged against the Sabbath from the book of Genesis.

The reckoning of time by weeks is derived from nothing in nature, but owes its existence to the divine appointment of the seventh day to a holy use in memory of the Lord's rest from the six days' work of creation.³³ This period of time is marked only by the recurrence of the sanctified rest-day of the Creator. That the patriarchs reckoned time by weeks and by sevens of days, is evident from several texts.³⁴ That they should retain the week and forget the Sabbath by which alone the week is marked, is not a probable conclusion. That the reckoning of the week was rightly kept is evident from the fact that in the wilderness of Sin on the sixth day the people, of their own accord, gathered a double portion of manna. And Moses said to them, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."³⁵

The brevity of the record in Genesis causes us to overlook many facts of the deepest interest. Adam lived 930 years. How deep and absorbing the interest that must have existed in the human family to see the first man! To converse with one who had himself talked with God! To hear from his lips a description of that paradise in which he had lived! To learn from one

created on the sixth day the wondrous events of the creation week! To hear from his lips the very words of the creator when he set apart his rest-day to a holy use! And to learn, alas! the sad story of the loss of paradise and the tree of life!³⁶

It was therefore not difficult for the facts respecting the six days of creation and the sanctification of the rest-day to be diffused among mankind in the patriarchal age. Nay, it was impossible that it should be otherwise, especially among the godly. From Adam to Abraham a succession of men - probably inspired of God--preserved the knowledge of God upon earth. Thus Adam lived till Lamech, the father of Noah, was 56 years of age; Lamech lived till Shem, the son of Noah, was 93; Shem lived till Abraham was 150 years of age. Thus are we brought down to Abraham, the father of the faithful. Of him it is recorded that he obeyed God's voice and kept his charge, his commandments, his statutes, and his laws. And of him the Most High bears the following testimony: "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment."³⁷ The knowledge of God was preserved in the family of Abraham; and we shall next find the Sabbath familiarly mentioned among his posterity, as an existing institution.

¹ "On the sixth day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day," &c., is the reading of the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Samaritan; "and this should be considered the genuine reading," says Dr. A. Clarke. See his Commentary on Gen.2.

² Gen.2:2; Ex.31:17.

³ Isa.40:28.

⁴ Gen.2:3; Ex.20:11. In an anonymous work entitled "Morality of the Fourth Commandment," London, 1652, but not the same with that of Dr. Twisse, of the same title, is the following striking passage: "The Hebrew root for seven, signifies fullness, perfection, and the Jews held many mysteries to be in the number seven: so John in his Apocalypse useth much that number. As, seven churches, seven stars, seven spirits, seven candlesticks, seven angels, seven seals, seven trumpets; and we no sooner meet with a seventh day, but it is blessed; no sooner with a seventh man [Gen.5:24; Jude 14], but he is translated." Page 7.

⁵ Webster's Unabridged Dictionary on the words sanctify and hallow. Ed. 1859. The revised edition edition of 1864 gives this definition: "To make sacred or holy; to set apart to a holy or religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rites; to hallow. God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it. Gen.2:3. Moses . . . sanctified Aaron and his garments. Lev.8:30." Worcester defines it thus: "To ordain or set apart to sacred ends; to consecrate; to hallow. God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Gen.2:3."

⁶ Gen.2:15; 1:28.

⁷ Morality of the Fourth Commandment, pp. 56, 57, London, 1641.

⁸ Hebrew Lexicon, p. 914, ed. 1854.

⁹ Josh.20:7; Joel 1:14; 2:15; 2Kings10:20,21; Zeph.1:7, margin.

¹⁰ Ex.19:12,23.

¹¹ Dr. Lange's Commentary speaks on this point thus, in vol. i, p. 197: "If we had no other passage than this of Gen.2:3, 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." Dr. Nicholas Bound, in his "True Doctrine of the Sabbath," London, 1606, page 7, thus states the antiquity of the Sabbath precept: "The first commandment of Sabbath was no more then first given when it was pronounced from Heaven by the Lord, than any other one of the moral precepts, nay, that it hath so much antiquity as the seventh day hath being; for, so soon as the day was, so soon was it sanctified, that we might know that, as it came in with the first man, so it must not go out but with the last man; and as it was in the beginning of the world, so it must continue to the end of the same; and, as the first seventh day was sanctified, so must the last be. And this is that which one saith, that the Sabbath was commanded by God, and the seventh day was sanctified of him even from the beginning of the world; where (the latter words expounding the former) he sheweth that, when God did sanctify it, then also he commanded it to be kept holy; and therefore look how ancient the sanctification of the day is, the same antiquity also as the commandment of keeping it holy; for they two are all one."

¹² Ex.20:8-11.

¹³ Buck's Theological Dictionary, article, Sabbath; Calmet's Dictionary, article, Sabbath.

¹⁴ Ex.16:22,23.

¹⁵ John 1:1-3; Gen.1:1,26; Col.1:13-16.

¹⁶ Mark 2:27.

¹⁷ Barrett's Principles of English Grammar, p. 29.

¹⁸ Job 14:12; 1 Cor.10:13; Heb.9:27.

¹⁹ Dr. Twisse illustrates the absurdity of that view which makes the first observance of the Sabbath in memory of creation to have begun some 2500 years after that event: "We read that when the Ilienses, inhabitants of Ilium, called anciently by the name of Troy, sent an embassy to Tiberius, to condole the death of his father Augustus, he, considering the unseasonableness thereof, it being a long time after his death, requited them accordingly, saying that he was sorry for their heaviness also, having lost so renowned a knight as Hector was, to wit, above a thousand years before, in the wars of Troy." - Morality of the Fourth Commandment, p. 198.

²⁰ Ex.16:23.

²¹ Ex.16.

²² Ex.20:8-11.

²³ Compare Gen.2:1-3; Ex.20:8-11.

²⁴ Heb.3:4; Jer.10:10-12; Rom.1:20; Ps.33:9; Heb.11:3.

²⁵ Antiquities of the Jews, b. i. chap. i. sect. 1.

²⁶ Works, vol. i. The Creation of the World, sect. 30.

²⁷ Isa.58:13,14; Heb.9:10.

²⁸ Gen.3; Rom.5:12.

²⁹ Gen.9:5,7.

³⁰ Gen.5:24; 6:9; 26:5.

³¹ See the beginning of chap. viii. of this work.

³² Ezra.3:1-6; Neh.8:2, 9-12, 14-18; 1Kings 8:2,65; 2Chron.5:3; 7:8,9; John 7:2-14,37.

³³ "The week, another primeval measure, is not a natural measure of time, as some astronomers and chronologers have supposed, indicated by the phases or quarters of the moon. It was originated by divine appointment at the creation - six days of labor and one of rest being wisely appointed for man's physical and spiritual well-being." - Bliss' Sacred Chronology, p. 6; Hale's Chronology, vol. i. p. 19. "Seven has been the ancient and honored number among the nations of the earth. They have measured their time by weeks from the beginning. The original of this was the Sabbath of God, as Moses has given the reasons of it in his writings." - Brief Dissertation on the first three Chapters of Genesis, by Dr. Coleman, p. 26.

³⁴ Gen.29:27,28; 8:10,12; 7:4,10; 50:10; Ex.7:25; Job 2:13.

³⁵ Ex.16:22,23.

³⁶ The interest to see the first man is thus stated: "Sem and Seth were in great honor among men, and so was Adam above every living thing in the creation." Ecclesiasticus 49:16.

³⁷ Gen.26:5; 18:19.

CHAPTER 3

THE SABBATH COMMITTED TO THE HEBREWS

Object of this chapter - Total apostasy of the human family in the antediluvian age - Destruction of mankind - The family of Noah spared - Second apostasy of mankind in the patriarchal age - The apostate nations left to their own ways - The family of Abraham chosen - Separated from the rest of mankind - Their history - Their relation to God - The Sabbath in existence when they came forth from Egypt - Analysis of Ex.16 - The Sabbath committed to the Hebrews.

We are now to trace the history of divine truth for many ages in almost the exclusive connection with the family of Abraham. That we may vindicate the truth from the reproach of pertaining only to the Hebrews - a reproach often urged against the Sabbath - and justify the dealings of God with mankind in leaving to their own ways the apostate nations, let us carefully examine the Bible for the reasons which directed divine Providence in the choice of Abraham's family as the depositaries of divine truth.

The antediluvian world had been highly favored of God. The period of life extended to each generation was twelve-fold that of the present age of man. For almost one thousand years, Adam, who had conversed with God in paradise, had been with them. Before the death of Adam, Enoch began his holy walk of three hundred years, and then he was translated that he should not see death. This testimony to the piety of Enoch was a powerful testimony to the antediluvians in behalf of truth and righteousness. Moreover the Spirit of God strove with mankind; but the perversity of man triumphed over all the gracious restraints of the Holy Spirit. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Even the sons of God joined in the general apostasy. At last a single family was all that remained of the worshipers of the Most High.¹

Then came the deluge, sweeping the world of its guilty inhabitants with the besom of destruction.² So terrible a display of divine justice might well be thought sufficient to restrain impiety for ages. Surely the family of Noah could not soon forget this awful lesson. But alas, revolt and apostasy speedily followed, and men turned from God to the worship of idols. Against the divine mandate separating the human family into nations,³ mankind united in one great act of rebellion in the plain of Shinar. "And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." Then God confounded them in their impiety and scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth.⁴ Men did not like to retain God in their knowledge; wherefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind, and suffered them to change the truth of God into a lie, and to worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator. Such was the origin of idolatry and of the apostasy of the Gentiles.⁵

In the midst of this wide-spread apostasy on man was found whose heart was faithful with God. Abraham was chosen from an idolatrous family, as the depositary of divine truth, the father of the faithful, the heir of the world, and friend of God.⁶ When the worshipers of God were found alone in the family of Noah, God gave up the rest of mankind to perish in the

flood. Now that the worshipers of God are again reduced almost to a single family, God gives up the idolatrous nations to their own ways, and takes the family of Abraham as his peculiar heritage. "For I know him," said God, "that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to justice and judgment."⁷ That they might preserve in the earth the knowledge of divine truth and the memory and worship of the Most High, they were to be a people walled off from all mankind, and dwelling in a land of their own. That they might thus be separated from the heathen around, God gave to Abraham the rite of circumcision, and afterward to his posterity the whole ceremonial law.⁸ But they could not possess the land designed for them until the iniquity of the Amorites, its inhabitants, was full that they should be thrust out before them. The horror of great darkness, and the smoking seen by Abraham in vision, foreshadowed the iron furnace and the bitter servitude of Egypt.

The family of Abraham must go down thither. Brief prosperity and long and terrible oppression follow.⁹ At length the power of the oppressor is broken, and the people of God are delivered. The expiration of four hundred and thirty years from the promise to Abraham marks the hour of deliverance to his posterity.¹⁰ The nation of Israel is brought forth from Egypt as God's peculiar treasure, that he may give them his Sabbath, and his law, and himself. The psalmist testifies that God "brought forth his people with joy, and his chosen with gladness: and gave them the lands of the heathen: and they inherited the labor of the people: that they might observe his statutes and keep his laws. And the Most High says, "I am the Lord which hallow you, that brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God."¹¹ Not that the commandments of God, his Sabbath and himself, had no prior existence, nor that the people were ignorant of the true God and his law; for the Sabbath was appointed to a holy use before the fall of man; and the commandments of God, his statutes and his laws, were kept by Abraham; and the Israelites themselves, when some of them had violated the Sabbath, were reprov'd by the question, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?"¹² And as to the Most High, the psalmist exclaims, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God."¹³ But there must be a formal public espousal of the people by God, and of his law and Sabbath and himself by the people.¹⁴ But neither the Sabbath, nor the law, nor the great Law-giver, by their connection with the Hebrews, became Jewish. The Law-giver indeed became the God of Israel,¹⁵ and what Gentile shall refuse him adoration for that reason? but the Sabbath still remained the Sabbath of the Lord,¹⁶ and the law continued to be the law of the Most High.

In the month following their passage through the Red Sea, the Hebrews came into the wilderness of Sin. It is at this point in his narrative that Moses for the second time mentions the sanctified rest-day of the Creator. The people murmured for bread:

"Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. . . . I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel: speak unto them, saying, At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God. And it came to pass, that at even the quails came up, and covered the camp; and in the morning the dew lay round about the host. And when the dew that lay was gone up, behold, upon the face of the wilderness there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar frost on the ground. And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna; for they wist not

what it was. And Moses said unto them, This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat. This is the thing which the Lord hath commanded, Gather of it every man according to his eating, an omer for every man, according to the number of your persons; take ye every man for them which are in his tents. And the children of Israel did so, and gathered, some more, some less. And when they did mete it with an omer, he that gathered much had nothing left over, and he that gathered little had no lack; they gathered every man according to his eating. And Moses said, Let no man leave of it till the morning. Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto Moses; but some of them left of it until the morning and it bred worms, and stank; and Moses was wroth with them. And they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating; and when the sun waxed hot, it melted. And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread,¹⁷ two omers for one man; and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said,¹⁸ To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord:¹⁹ to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."²⁰

This narrative shows, 1. That God had a law and commandments prior to the giving of the manna. 2. That God in giving his people bread from heaven designed to prove them respecting his law. 3. That in this law was the holy Sabbath; for the test relative to walking in the law pertained directly to the Sabbath; and when God said, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" it was the Sabbath which they had violated. 4. That in proving the people respecting this existing law, Moses gave no new precept respecting the Sabbath, but remained silent relative to the preparation for the Sabbath until after the people, of their own accord, had gathered a double portion on the sixth day. 5. That by this act the people proved not only that they were not ignorant of the Sabbath, but that they were disposed to observe it.²¹ 6. That the reckoning of the week, traces of which appear through the patriarchal age,²² had been rightly kept, for the people knew when the sixth day had arrived. 7. That had there been any doubt existing on that point, the fall of the manna on the six days, the withholding of it on the seventh, and the preservation of that needed for the Sabbath over that day, must have settled that point incontrovertibly.²³ 8. That there was no act of instituting the Sabbath in the wilderness of Sin; for God did not then make it his rest-day, nor did he then bless and sanctify the day. On the contrary, the record show that the seventh day was already the sanctified rest-day of the Lord.²⁴ 9. That the obligation to observe the Sabbath existed and was known before the fall of the manna. For the language used implies the existence of such an obligation, but does not contain a new enactment until after some of the people had violated the Sabbath. Thus God says to Moses, "On the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in," but he does not speak of the seventh. And on the sixth day Moses says, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord," but he does not command them to

observe it. On the seventh day he says that it is the Sabbath, and that they should find no manna in the field. "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." But in all this there is no precept given, yet the existence of such a precept is plainly implied. 10. That when some of the people violated the Sabbath they were reproved in language which plainly implies a previous transgression of this precept. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" 11. And that this rebuke of the Law-giver restrained for the time the transgression of the people.

"See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days."²⁵ abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day."²⁶ As a special trust, God committed the Sabbath to the Hebrews. It was now given them, not now made for them. It was made for man at the close of the first week of time; but all other nations having turned from the Creator to the worship of idols, it is given the Hebrew people. Nor does this prove that all the Hebrews had hitherto disregarded it. For Christ uses the same language respecting circumcision. Thus he says, Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers."²⁷ Yet God had enjoined that ordinance upon Abraham and his family four hundred years previous to this gift of it by Moses, and it had been retained by them.²⁸

The language, "The Lord hath given you the Sabbath," implies a solemn act of committing a treasure to their trust. How was this done? No act of instituting the Sabbath here took place. No precept enjoining its observance was given until some of the people violated it, when it was given in the form of a reproof; which evinced a previous obligation, and that they were transgressing an existing law. And this view is certainly strengthened by the fact that no explanation of the institution was given to the people; a fact which indicates that some knowledge of the Sabbath was already in their possession.

But how then did God give them the Sabbath? He did this, first, by delivering them from the abject bondage of Egypt, where they were a nation of slaves. And second, by providing them food in such a manner as to impose the strongest obligation to keep the Sabbath. Forty years did he give them bread from heaven, sending it for six days, and withholding it on the seventh, and preserving food for them over the Sabbath. Thus was the Sabbath especially intrusted to them.

As a gift to the Hebrews, the Creator's great memorial became a sign between God and themselves. "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." As a sign, its object is stated to be, to make known the true God; and we are told why it was such a sign. "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."²⁹ The institution itself signified that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh. Its observance by the people signified that the Creator was their God. How full of meaning was this sign!

The Sabbath was a sign between God and children of Israel, because they alone were the worshipers of the Creator. All other nations had turned from him to "the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth."³⁰ For this reason the memorial of the great Creator was committed to the Hebrews, and it became a sign between the Most High and themselves. Thus was the Sabbath a golden link uniting the Creator and his worshipers.

1 Gen.2-6; Heb.11:4-7; 1Pet.3:20; 2Pet.2:5.

2 Gen.7; Matt.24:37-39; Luke 17:26,27; 2Pet.3:5,6.

3 Deut.32:7,8; Acts 17:26.

4 Gen.11:1-9; Josephus' Ant., b. i. chap. iv. This took place in the days of Peleg, who was born about one hundred years after the flood. Gen.10:25, compared with 11:10-16; Ant., b. i. chap. 6. sect. 4.

5 Rom.1:18-32; Acts 14:16,17; 17:29,30.

6 Gen.12:1-3; Josh.24:2,3,14; Neh.9:7,8; Rom.4:13-17; 2Chron.20:7; Isa.41:8; James 2:23.

7 Gen.18:19.

8 Gen.17:9-14; 34:14; Acts 10:28; 11:2,3; Eph.2:12-19; Num23:9; Deut.33:27,28.

9 Gen.15; Ex.1-5; Deut.4:20.

10 Ex.12:29-42; Gal.3:17.

11 Ps.105:43-45; Lev.22:32,33; Num.15:41.

12 Gen.2:2,3; 26:5; Ex.16:4,27,28; 18:16.

13 Ps.90:2.

14 Ex.19:3-8, 24:3-8; Jer.3:14, compared with last clause of Jer.31:32.

15 Ex.20:2; 24:10.

16 Ex.20:10; Deut.5:14; Neh.9:14.

17 On this verse Dr. A. Clarke thus comments:- "On the sixth day they gathered twice as much - This they did that they might have a provision for the Sabbath."

18 The Douay Bible reads: "To-morrow is the rest of the Sabbath sanctified unto the Lord." Dr. Clarke comments as follows upon this text: "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath. There is nothing either in the text or context that seems to intimate that the Sabbath was now first given to the Israelites, as some have supposed; on the contrary, it is here spoken of as being perfectly well known, from its having been generally observed. The commandment, it is true, may be considered as being now renewed; because they might have supposed, that in their unsettled state in the wilderness, they might have been exempted from the observance of it. Thus we find, 1. That when God finished his creation he instituted the Sabbath; 2. When he brought the people out of Egypt, he insisted on the strict observance of it; 3. When he gave the LAW, he made it a tenth part of the whole: such importance has this institution in the eyes of the Supreme Being!" Richard Baxter, a famous divine of the seventeenth century, and a decided advocate of the abrogation of the fourth commandment, in his "Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day," thus clearly states the origin of the Sabbath: Why should God begin two thousand years after [the creation of the world] to give men a Sabbath upon the reason of his rest from the creation of it, if he had never called man to that commemoration before? And it is certain that the Sabbath was observed at the falling of the manna before the giving of the law; and let any considering Christian judge. . . . 1. Whether the not falling of the manna, or

the rest of God after the creation, was like to be the original reason of the Sabbath. 2. And whether if it had been the first, it would not have been said, Remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day; for on six days the manna fell, and not on the seventh; rather than 'for in six days God created heaven and earth, &c., and rested the seventh day.' And it is casually added, 'Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.' Nay, consider whether this annexed reason intimates not that the day on this ground being hallowed before, therefore it was that God sent not down the manna on that day, and that he prohibited the people from seeking it." - Practical Works, Vol. iii, p. 784. ed. 1707.

19 The Douay Bible reads: "Because it is the Sabbath of the Lord."

20 Ex.16.

21 It has indeed been asserted that God by a miracle equalized the portion of every one on five days, and doubled the portion of each on the sixth, so that no act of the people has any bearing on the Sabbath. But the equal portion of each on the five days was not thus understood by Paul. He says: "But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want; that there may be equality; as it is written, He that gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had not lack." 2Cor.8:14,15. And that the double portion on the sixth day was the act of the people, is affirmed by Moses. He says that "on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread." Verse 22.

22 Gen.7:4,10; 8:10,12,; 29:27,28; 50:10; Ex.7:25; Job 2:13.

23 By this three-fold miracle, occurring every week for forty years, the great Law-giver distinguished his hallowed day. The people were therefore admirably prepared to listen to the fourth commandment enjoining the observance of the very day on which he had rested. Ex.16:35; Josh.5:12; Ex.20:8-11.

24 The twelfth chapter of Exodus relates the origin of the passover. It is in striking contrast with Ex.16, which is supposed to give the origin of the Sabbath. If the reader will compare the two chapters he will see the difference between the origin of an institution as given in Ex.12, and a familiar reference to an existing institution as in Ex.16. If he will also compare Gen.2 with Ex.12, he will see that the one gives the origin of the Sabbath in the same manner that the other gives the origin of the passover.

25 This implies, first, the fall of a larger quantity on that day, and second, its preservation for the wants of the Sabbath.

26 This must refer to going out for manna, as the connection implies; for religious assemblies on the Sabbath were commanded and observed. Lev.23:3; Mark 1:21; Luke 4:16; Acts 1:12; 15:21.

27 John 7:22.

28 Gen. 17; 34; Ex.4. Moses is said to have given circumcision to the Hebrews; yet it is a singular fact that his first mention of that ordinance is purely incidental, and plainly implies an existing knowledge of it on their part. Thus it is written: "This is the ordinance of the passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof; but every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof." Ex.12:43,44. And in like manner when the Sabbath was given to Israel, that people were not ignorant of the sacred institution.

29 Eze.20:12; Ex.31:17.

30 Jer.10:10-12.

CHAPTER 4

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT

The holy One upon Mount Sinai - Three great gifts bestowed upon the Hebrews - The Sabbath proclaimed by the voice of God - Position assigned it in the moral law - Origin of the Sabbath - Definite character of the commandment - Revolution of the earth upon its axis - Name of the Sabbatic institution - Seventh day of the commandment identical with the seventh day of the New Testament week - Testimony of Nehemiah - Moral obligation of the fourth commandment.

And now we approach the record of that sublime event, the personal descent of the Lord upon mount Sinai.¹ The sixteenth chapter of Exodus, as we have seen, is remarkable for the fact that God gave to Israel the Sabbath; the nineteenth chapter, for the fact that God gave himself to that people in solemnly espousing them as a holy nation unto himself; while the twentieth chapter will be found remarkable for the act of the Most High in giving to Israel his law.

It is customary to speak against the Sabbath and the law as Jewish, because thus given to Israel. As well might the Creator be spoken against, who brought them out of Egypt to be their God, and who styles himself the God of Israel.² The Hebrews were honored by being thus intrusted with the Sabbath and the law, not the Sabbath and the law and the Creator rendered Jewish by this connection. The sacred writers speak of the high exaltation of Israel in being thus intrusted with the law of God.

"He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation: and as for his judgments, they have not known them. Praise ye the Lord!" "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."³

After the Most High had solemnly espoused the people unto himself, as his peculiar treasure in the earth,⁴ they were brought forth out of the camp to met with God. "And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." Out of the midst of this fire did God proclaim the ten words of his law.⁵

The fourth of these precepts is the grand law of the Sabbath. Thus spake the great Lawgiver:-

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,

and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

The estimate which the Law-giver placed upon his Sabbath is seen in that he deemed it worthy of a place in his code of ten commandments, thus causing it to stand in the midst of nine immutable moral precepts. Nor is this to thought a small honor that the Most High, naming one by one the great principles of morality until all are given, and he adds no more,⁶ should include in their number the observance of his hallowed rest-day. This precept is expressly given to enforce the observance of the Creator's great memorial; and unlike all the others, this one traces its obligation back to the creation, where that memorial was ordained.

The Sabbath is to be remembered and kept holy because that God hallowed it, i.e., appointed it to a holy use, at the close of the first week. And this sanctification or hallowing of the rest-day, when the first seventh day of time was past, was the solemn act of setting apart the seventh day for time to come in memory of the Creator's rest. Thus the fourth commandment reaches back and embraces the institution of the Sabbath in paradise, while the Sanctification of the Sabbath in paradise extends forward to all coming time. The narrative respecting the wilderness of Sin admirably cements the union of the two. Thus in the wilderness of Sin, before the fourth commandment was given, stands the Sabbath, holy to the Lord, with an existing obligation to observe it, though no commandment in that narrative creates the obligation. This obligation is derived from the same source as the fourth commandment, namely, the sanctification of the Sabbath in paradise, showing that it was an existing duty, and not a new precept. For it should never be forgotten that the fourth commandment does not trace its obligation to the wilderness of Sin, but to the creation; a decisive proof that the Sabbath did not originate in the wilderness of Sin.

The fourth commandment is remarkably definite. It embraces, first, a precept: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;" second, and explanation of this precept: "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates;" third, the reasons on which the precept is based, embracing the origin of the institution, and the very acts by which it was made, and enforcing all by the example⁷ of the Law-giver himself: "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."

The rest-day of the Lord is thus distinguished from the six days on which he labored. The blessing and sanctification pertain to the day of the Creator's rest. There can be, therefore, no indefiniteness in the precept. It is not merely one day in seven, but that day in the seven on which the Creator rested, and upon which he placed his blessing, namely, the seventh day.⁸ And this day is definitely pointed out in the name given it by God: "The seventh day is the Sabbath [i.e., the rest-day] of the Lord thy God."

That the seventh day in the fourth commandment is the seventh day of the New Testament week may be plainly proved. In the record of our Lord's burial, Luke writes thus:

"And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto

the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."⁹

Luke testifies that these women kept "the Sabbath day according to the commandment."

The Commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This day thus observed was the last or seventh day of the week, for the following¹⁰ day was the first day of the week. Hence the seventh day of the commandment is the seventh day of the New Testament week.

The testimony of Nehemiah is deeply interesting. "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant."¹¹ It is remarkable that God is said to have made known the Sabbath when he thus came down upon the mount; for the children of Israel had the Sabbath in possession when they came to Sinai. This language must therefore refer to that complete unfolding of the Sabbatic institution which is given in the fourth commandment. And mark the expression: "Madest known¹² unto them thy holy Sabbath;" not madest the Sabbath for them: language which plainly implies its previous existence, and which cites the mind back to the Creator's rest for the origin of the institution.¹³

The moral obligation of the fourth commandment which is so often denied may be clearly shown by reference to the origin of all things. God created the world and gave existence to man upon it. To him he gave life and breath, and all things. Man therefore owes everything to God. Every faculty of his mind, every power of his being, all his strength and all his time belong of right to the Creator. It was therefore the benevolence of the Creator that gave to man six days for his own wants. And in setting apart the seventh day to a holy use in memory of his own rest, the Most High was reserving unto himself one of the seven days, when he could rightly claim all as his. The six days therefore are the gift of God to man, to be rightly employed in secular affairs, not the seventh day, the gift of man to God. The fourth Commandment, therefore, does not require man to give something of his own to God, but it does require that man should not appropriate to himself that which God has reserved for his own worship. To observe this day then is to render to God of the things that are his; to appropriate it to ourselves is simply to rob God.

1 That the Lord was there in person with his angels, see besides the narrative in Ex.19:20; 32-34, the following testimonies: Deut.33:2; Judges 5:5; Nehemiah 9:6-13; Ps.68:17.

2 Ex.24:10; Lev.22:32,33; Num.15:41; Isa.41:17.

3 Ps.147:19,20; Rom.3:1,2; 9:4,5. The following from the pen of Mr. Wm. Miller presents the subject in a clear light: "I say, and believe I am supported by the Bible, that the moral law was never given to the Jews as a people exclusively; but they were for a season the keepers of it in charge. And through them the law, oracles, and testimony, have been handed down to us. See Paul's clear reasoning in Rom. chapters 2, 3, and 4, on that point." - Miller's Life and Views, p. 161.

4 Ex.19; Deut.7:6; 14:2; 2Sam.7:23; 1Kings 8:53; Amos 3:1,2.

5 Ex.20:1-17; 34:28, margin; Deut.5:4-22; 10:4, margin.

6 Deut.5:22

7 He who created the world on the first day of the week, and completed its organization in six days, rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed. Gen.1; 2; Ex.31:17.

8 To this, however, it is objected that in consequence of the revolution of the earth on its axis, the day begins earlier in the East than with us; and hence that there is no definite seventh day to the world of mankind. To suit such objectors, the earth ought not to revolve. But in that case, so far from removing the difficulty, there would be no seventh day at all; for one side of the globe would have perpetual day and the other side perpetual night. The truth is, everything depends upon the revolution of the earth. God made the Sabbath for man [Mark 2:27]; he made man to dwell on all the face of the earth [Acts 17:26]; he caused the earth to revolve on its axis that it might measure off the days of the week; causing that the sun should shine of the earth, as it revolves from west to east, thus causing the day to go round the world from east to west. Seven of these revolutions constitute a week; the seventh one brings the Sabbath to all the world.

9 Luke 23: 54-56; 24:1.

10 See also Matt.28:1; Mark 16:1,2.

11 Neh.9,13,14.

12 This expression is strikingly illustrated in the statement of Eze.20:5, where God is said to have made himself known unto Israel in Egypt. This language cannot mean that the people were ignorant of the true God, however wicked some of them might be, for they had been God's peculiar people from the days of Abraham. Ex.2:23-25; 3:6,7; 4:31. The language implies the prior existence both of the Law-giver and of his Sabbath, when it is said that they were "made known" to his people.

13 It should never be forgotten that the term Sabbath day signifies rest-day; that the Sabbath of the Lord is the rest-day of the Lord; and hence that the expression, "Thy holy Sabbath," refers the mind to the Creator's rest-day, and to his act of blessing and hallowing it.

CHAPTER 5

THE SABBATH WRITTEN BY THE FINGER OF GOD

Classification of the precepts given through Moses - The Sabbath renewed - Solemn ratification of the covenant between God and Israel - Moses called up to receive the law which God had written upon stone - The ten commandments probably proclaimed upon the Sabbath - Events of the forty days - The Sabbath becomes a sign between God and Israel - The penalty of death - The tables of testimony given to Moses - And broken when he saw the idolatry of the people - The idolaters punished - Moses goes up to renew the tables - The Sabbath again enjoined - The tables given again - The ten commandments were the testimony of God - Who wrote them - Three distinguished honors which pertain to the Sabbath - The ten commandments a complete code - Relation of the fourth commandment to the atonement - Valid reason why God himself should write that law which was placed beneath the mercy-seat.

When the voice of the Holy One had ceased, "the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was." A brief interview follows¹ in which God gives to Moses a series of precepts, which, as a sample of the statutes given through him, may be classified thus: Ceremonial precepts, pointing to the good things to come; judicial precepts, intended for the civil government of the nation; and moral precepts, stating anew in other forms the ten commandments. In this brief interview the Sabbath is not forgotten:

"Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed."²

This scripture furnishes incidental proof that the Sabbath was made for mankind, and for those creatures that share the labors of man. The stranger and the foreigner must keep it, and it was for their refreshment.³ But the same persons could not partake of the passover until they were made members of the Hebrew church by circumcision.⁴

When Moses had returned unto the people, he repeated all the words of the Lord. With one voice all the people exclaim, "All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." Then Moses wrote all the words of the Lord. "And he took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Then Moses "sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you."⁵

The way was thus prepared for God to bestow a second signal honor upon his law:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them. . . . And Moses went up into the mount, and a cloud covered the mount. And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days: and the seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud."⁶

And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel. And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and gat him up into the mount; and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights."⁷

During this forty days God gave to Moses a pattern of the ark in which to place the law that he had written upon stone, and of the mercy-seat to place over that law, and of the sanctuary in which to deposit the ark. He also ordained the priesthood, which was to minister in the sanctuary before the ark.⁸ These things being ordained, and the Law-giver about to commit his law as written by himself into the hands of Moses, he again enjoins the Sabbath:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, 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. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed. And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God."⁹

This should be compared with the testimony of Ezekiel, speaking in the name of God:

"I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them. . . . I am the Lord your God: walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them; and hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."¹⁰

It will be observed that neither of these scriptures teach that the Sabbath was made for Israel, nor yet do they teach that it was made after the Hebrews came out of Egypt. In neither of these particulars do they even seem to contradict those texts that place the institution of the Sabbath at creation. But we do learn, 1. That it was God's act of giving to the Hebrews his Sabbath that made it a sign between them and himself. "I gave them my Sabbaths TO BE a sign between me and them." This act of committing to them the Sabbath has been noticed already.¹¹ 2. That it was to be a sign between God and the Hebrews, "that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Wherever the word LORD in the Old Testament is in small capitals, as in the texts under consideration, it is in the Hebrew, Jehovah. The Sabbath then as a sign signified that it was Jehovah, i.e., the infinite, self-existent God, who had sanctified them. To sanctify is to separate, set apart, or appoint, to a holy, sacred or religious use.¹² That the Hebrew nation had thus been set apart in the most remarkable manner from all mankind, was sufficiently evident. But who was it that had thus separated them from all other people? As a gracious answer to this important question, God gave to the Hebrews his own hallowed rest-day. But how could the great memorial of the Creator determine such a question? Listen to the words of the Most High: "Verily my Sabbaths," i.e., my rest-days, "ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you. . . . It is a sign between me and the children

of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." The Sabbath as a sign between God and Israel, was a perpetual testimony that he who had separated them from all mankind as his peculiar treasure in the earth, was that Being who had created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh. It was therefore the strongest possible assurance that he who sanctified them was indeed Jehovah.

From the days of Abraham God had set apart the Hebrews. He who had previously borne no local, national or family name, did from that time until the end of his covenant relation with the Hebrew race, take to himself such titles as seemed to show him to be their God alone. From his choice of Abraham and his family forward he designates himself as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; the God of the Hebrews, and the God of Israel.¹³ He brought Israel out of Egypt to be their God,¹⁴ and at Sinai did join himself to them in solemn espousal. He did thus set apart or sanctify unto himself the Hebrews, because that all other nations had given themselves to idolatry. Thus the God of Heaven and earth condescended to give himself to a single race, and to set them apart from all mankind. It should be observed that it was not the Sabbath which had set Israel apart from all other nations, but it was the idolatry of all other nations that caused God to set the Hebrews apart for himself; and that God gave to Israel the Sabbath which he had hallowed for mankind at creation as the most expressive sign that he who thus sanctified them was indeed the living God.

It was the act of God in giving his Sabbath to the Israelites that rendered it a sign between them and himself. But the Sabbath did not derive its existence from being thus given to the Hebrews; for it was the ancient Sabbath of the Lord when given to them, and we have seen¹⁵ that it was not given by a new commandment. On the contrary, it rested at that time upon existing obligation. But it was the providence of God in behalf of the Hebrews, first in rescuing them from abject servitude, and second, in sending them bread from heaven for six days, and preserving food for the Sabbath, that constituted the Sabbath a gift to that people. And mark the significance of the manner in which this gift was bestowed, as showing who it was that sanctified them. It became a gift to the Hebrews by the wonderful providence of the manna: a miracle that ceased not openly to declare the Sabbath every week for the space of forty years; thus showing incontrovertibly that He who led them was the author of the Sabbath, and therefore the Creator of heaven and earth. That the Sabbath which was made for man should thus be given to the Hebrews is certainly not more remarkable than that the God of the whole earth should give his oracles and himself to that people. The Most High and his law and Sabbath did not become Jewish; but the Hebrews were made the honored depositaries of divine truth; and the knowledge of God and of his commandments was preserved in the earth.

The reason on which this sign is based, points unmistakably to the true origin of the Sabbath. It did not originate from the fall of the manna for six days and its cessation on the seventh - for the manna was given thus because the Sabbath was in existence - but because that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." Thus the Sabbath is shown to have originated with the rest and refreshment of the Creator, and not at the fall of the manna. As an INSTITUTION, the Sabbath declared its Author to be the Creator of heaven and earth; as a sign¹⁶ between God and Israel, it declared that he who had set them apart was indeed Jehovah.

The last act of the Law-giver in this memorable interview was to place in the hands of Moses the "two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." Then he revealed to Moses the sad apostasy of the people of Israel, and hastened him down to them.

"And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand: the table were written on both their sides: on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables. . . . And it came to pass, as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf, and the dancing: and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount."

Then Moses inflicted retribution upon the idolaters, "and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men." And Moses returned unto God and interceded in behalf of the people. Then God promised that his angel should go with them, but that he himself would not go up in their midst lest he should consume them.¹⁷ Then Moses presented an earnest supplication to the Most High that he might see his glory. This petition was granted, saving that the face of God should not be seen.¹⁸

But before Moses ascended that he might behold the majesty of the infinite Law-giver, the Lord said unto him:

"Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest. . . . And he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first; and Moses rose up early in morning, and went up unto Mount Sinai, as the Lord had commanded him, and took in his hand the two tables of stone. And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him."

Then Moses beheld the glory of the Lord, and he "made haste and bowed his head toward the earth and worshiped." This interview lasted forty days and forty nights, as did the first, and seems to have been spent by Moses in intercession that God would not destroy the people for their sin.¹⁹ The record of this period is very brief, but in this record the Sabbath is mentioned. "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest."²⁰ Thus admonishing them not to forget in their busiest season the Sabbath of the Lord.

This second period of forty days ends like the first with the act of God in placing the tables of stone in the hands of Moses. "And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he²¹ wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Thus it appears that the tables of testimony were two tables of stone with the commandments written upon them by the finger of God. Thus the testimony of God is shown to be the ten commandments. The writing on the second tables was an exact copy of that on the first. "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write," said God, "upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest." And of the first tables Moses says: "He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone."²²

Thus did God commit to his people the ten commandments. Without human or angelic agency he proclaimed them himself; and not trusting his most honored servant Moses, or even an angel of his presence, himself wrote them with his own finger. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," is one of the ten words thus honored by the Most High. Nor are these two high honors the only ones conferred upon this precept. While it shares them in common with the other nine commandments, it stands in advance of them in that it is established by the

EXAMPLE of the Law-giver himself. These precepts were given upon two tables with evident reference to the two-fold division of the law of God; supreme love to God, and the love of our neighbor as ourselves. The Sabbath commandment, placed at the close of the first table, forms the golden clasp that binds together both divisions of the moral law. It guards and enforces that day which God claims as his; it follows man through the six days which God has given him to be properly spent in the various relations of life, thus extending over the whole of human life, and embracing in its loan of six days to man all the duties of the second table, while itself belonging to the first.

That these ten commandments form a complete code of moral law is proved by the language of the Law-giver when he called Moses up to himself to receive them. "Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written."²³ This law and commandments was the testimony of God engraven upon stone. The same great fact is presented by Moses in his blessing pronounced upon Israel: "And he said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them: he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them."²⁴ There can be no dispute that in this language the Most High is represented as personally present with ten thousands of his holy ones, or angels. And that which he wrote with his own right hand is called by Moses "a fiery law," or as the margin has it, "a fire of law." And now the man of God completes his sacred trust. And thus he rehearses what God did in committing his law to him, and what he himself did in its final disposition: "And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me." Thus was the law of God deposited in the ark beneath the mercy-seat.²⁵ Nor should this chapter close without pointing out the important relation of the fourth commandment to the atonement.

The top of the ark was called the mercy-seat, because all those who had broken the law contained in the ark beneath the mercy-seat, could find pardon by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement upon it.

The law within the ark was that which demanded an atonement; the ceremonial law which ordained the Levitical priesthood and the sacrifices for sin, was that which taught men how the atonement could be made. The broken law was beneath the mercy-seat; the blood of sin-offering was sprinkled upon its top, and pardon was extended to the penitent sinner. There was actual sin, and hence a real law which man had broken; but there was not a real atonement, and hence the need of the great antitype to the Levitical sacrifices. The real atonement when it is made must relate to that law respecting which an atonement had been shadowed forth. In other words, the shadowy atonement related to that law which was shut up in the ark, indicating that a real atonement was demanded by that law. It is necessary that the law which demands atonement, in order that its transgressor may be spared, should itself be perfect, else the fault would in part at least rest with the Law-giver, and not wholly with the sinner. Hence, the atonement when made does not take away the broken law, for that is perfect, but is expressly designed to take away the guilt of the transgressor.²⁶ Let it be remembered then that the fourth commandment is one of the ten precepts of God's broken law; one of the immutable holy principles that made the death of God's only Son necessary before pardon could be extended to guilty man. these facts being borne in mind, it will not be thought strange that the Law-giver should reserve the proclamation of such a law to himself; and that he should intrust to no created being the writing of that law which should demand as its atonement the death of the Son of God.

1 Ex.20-24

2 Ex.23:12

3 See also Ex.20:10; Deut.5:14; Isa.56

4 Ex.12:43-48

5 Ex.24:3-8; Heb.9:18-20

6 Dr. Clarke has the following note on this verse: "It is very likely that Moses went up into the mount on the first day of the week; and having with Joshua remained in the region of the cloud during six days, on the seventh, which was the Sabbath, God spake to him." - Commentary on Ex.24:16. The marking off of a week from the forty days in this remarkable manner goes far toward establishing the view of Dr. C. And if this be correct, it would strongly indicate that the ten commandments were given upon the Sabbath; for there seems to be good evidence that they were given the day before Moses went up to receive the tables of stone. For the interval in which chapters 21-23 were given would require but a brief space, and certainly followed immediately upon the giving of the ten commandments. Ex.20:18-21. When the interval closed, Moses came down to the people and wrote all the words of the Lord. In the morning he rose up early, and, having ratified the covenant, went up to receive the law which God had written. Ex.24:3-13.

7 Ex.24:12 18

8 Ex.25 31

9 Ex.31:12-18

10 Eze.20:11,12,19,20

11 See third chapter of this work.

12 "To sanctify, kadash, signifies to consecrate, separate, and set apart a thing or person from all secular purposes to some religious use." Clarke's Commentary on Ex.13:2. The same writer says, on Ex.19:23, "Here the word kadash is taken in its proper, literal sense, signifying the separating of a thing, person, or place, from all profane or common uses, and devoting it to sacred purposes.

13 Gen.17:7,8; 26:24; 28:13; Ex.3:6,13-16,18; 5:3; Isa.45:3.

14 Lev.11:45.

15 See chapter third.

16 As a sign it did not thereby become a shadow and a ceremony, for the Lord of the Sabbath was himself a sign. "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion. Isa.8:18. In Heb.2:13, this language is referred to Christ. "And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against." Luke 2:34. That the Sabbath was a sign between God and

Israel throughout their generations, that is, for the time that they were his peculiar people, no more proves that it is now abolished than the fact that Jesus is now a sign that is spoken against proves that he will cease to exist when he shall no longer be such a sign. Nor does this language argue that the Sabbath was made for them, or that its obligation ceased when they ceased to be the people of God. For the prohibition against eating blood was a perpetual statute for their generations; yet it was given to Noah when God first permitted the use of animal food, and was still obligatory upon the Gentiles when the apostles turned to them. Lev.3:17; Gen.9:1-4; Acts 15.

The penalty of death at the hand of the civil magistrate is affixed to the violation of the Sabbath. The same penalty is affixed to most of the precepts of the moral law. Lev.20:9,10; 24:15-17; Deut.13:6-18; 17:2-7. It should be remembered that the moral law embracing the Sabbath formed a part of the CIVIL code of the Hebrew nation. As such, the great Law-giver annexed penalties to be inflicted by the magistrate, thus doubtless shadowing forth the final retribution of the ungodly. Such penalties were suspended by that remarkable decision of the Saviour that those who were without sin should cast the first stone. But such a Being will arise to punish men, when the hailstones of his wrath shall desolate the earth. Our Lord did not, however, set aside the real penalty of the law, the wages of sin, nor did he weaken that precept which had been violated. John 8:1-9; Job 38:22,23; Isa.28:17; Rev.16:17-21; Rom.6:23.

17 This fact will shed light upon those texts which introduce the agency of angels in the giving of the law. Acts 7:38,53; Gal.3:19; Heb.2:2.

18 Ex.32; 33.

19 Ex.34; Deut.9.

20 Ex.34:21.

21 The idea has been suggested by some from this verse that it was Moses and not God who wrote the second tables. This view is thought to be strengthened by the previous verse: "Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." But it is to be observed that the words upon the tables of stone were the ten commandments; while the words here referred to were those which God spoke to Moses during this interview of forty days, beginning with verse 10 and extending to verse 27. That the pronoun he in verse 28 might properly enough refer to Moses, if positive testimony did not forbid such reference, is readily admitted. That it is necessary to attend to the connection in deciding the antecedents of pronouns, is strikingly illustrated in 2Sam.24:1, where the pronoun he would naturally refer to the Lord, thus making God the one who moved David to number Israel. Yet the connection shows that this was not the case; for the anger of the Lord was kindled by the act; and 1Chron.21:1, positively declares that he who thus moved David was Satan. For positive testimony that it was God and not Moses who wrote upon the second tables, see Ex.34:1; Deut.10:1-5. These texts carefully discriminate between the work of Moses and the work of God, assigning the preparation of the tables, the carrying of them up to the mount and the bringing of them down from the mount, to Moses, but expressly assigning the writing on the tables to God himself.

22 Ex.34:1,28; Deut.4:12,13; 5:22.

23 Ex.24:12.

24 Deut.33:2. That angels are sometimes called saints or holy ones, see Dan.8:13-16. That angels were present with God at Sinai, see Ps.68:17.

25 Deut.10:4,5; Ex.25:10-22.

26 1John 3:4,5.

CHAPTER 6

THE SABBATH DURING THE DAY OF TEMPTATION

General history of the Sabbath in the wilderness - Its violation one cause of excluding that generation from the promised land - Its violation by their children in the wilderness one of the causes of their final dispersion from their own land - The statute respecting fires upon the Sabbath - Various precepts relative to the Sabbath - The Sabbath not a Jewish feast - The man who gathered sticks upon the Sabbath - Appeal of Moses in behalf of the decalogue - The Sabbath not derived from the covenant at Horeb - Final appeal of Moses in behalf of the Sabbath - The original fourth commandment - The Sabbath not a memorial of the flight from Egypt - What words were engraven upon stone - General summary from the books of Moses.

The history of the Sabbath during the provocation in the day of temptation in the wilderness when God was grieved for forty years with his people may be stated in few words. Even under the eye of Moses, and with the most stupendous miracles in their memory and before their eyes, they were idolaters,¹ neglecters of sacrifices, neglecters of circumcision,² murmurers against God, despisers of his law³ and violators of his Sabbath.

Of their treatment of the Sabbath while in the wilderness, Ezekiel gives us the following graphic description:

"But the house of Israel rebelled against me in the wilderness: they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them; and my Sabbaths they greatly polluted: then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them. But I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen, in whose sight I brought them out."⁴

This language shows a general violation of the Sabbath, and evidently refers to the apostasy of Israel during the first forty days that Moses was absent from them. God did then purpose their destruction; but at the intercession of Moses, spared them for the very reason assigned by the prophet.⁵ A further probation being granted them they signally failed a second time, so that God lifted up his hand to them that they should not enter the promised land. Thus the prophet continues:

"Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands; BECAUSE they despised my judgments, and walked not in my statutes, but polluted my Sabbaths: for their heart went after their idols. Nevertheless mine eye spared them from destroying them, neither did I make an end of them in the wilderness."

This language has undoubted reference to the act of God in excluding all that were over twenty years of age from entering the promised land.⁶ It is to be noticed that the violation of the Sabbath is distinctly stated as one of the reasons for which that generation were excluded

from the land of promise. God spared the people so that the nation was not utterly cut off; for he extended to the younger part a further probation. Thus the prophet continues:

"But I said unto their children in the wilderness, Walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols: I am the Lord your God; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them; and hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God. Notwithstanding the children rebelled against me: they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgments to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them; they polluted my Sabbaths: then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger against them in the wilderness. Nevertheless I withdrew mine hand, and wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted in the sight of the heathen, in whose sight I brought them forth. I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries; because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their father's idols."

Thus it appears that the younger generation, which God spared when he excluded their fathers from the land of promise, did, like their fathers, transgress God's law, pollute his Sabbath, and cleave to idolatry. God did not see fit to exclude them from the land of Canaan, but he did lift up his hand to them in the wilderness, that he would give them up to dispersion among their enemies after they had entered the land of promise. Thus it is seen that the Hebrews while in the wilderness laid the foundation for their subsequent dispersion from their own land; and that one of the acts which led to their final ruin as a nation was the violation of the Sabbath before they had entered the promised land. Well might Moses say to them in the last month of his life: "Ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you."⁷ In Caleb and Joshua was another spirit, for they followed the Lord fully.⁸

Such is the general history of Sabbatic observance in the wilderness. Even the miracle of the manna, which every week for forty years bore public testimony to the Sabbath,⁹ became to the body of Hebrews a mere ordinary event, so that they dared to murmur against the bread thus sent from heaven;¹⁰ and we may well believe that those who were thus hardened through the deceitfulness of sin, had little regard for the testimony of the manna in behalf of the Sabbath.¹¹ In the Mosaic record we next read of the Sabbath as follows:

And Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel together, and said unto them, These are the words which the Lord hath commanded, that ye should do them. 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.¹² Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day."¹³

The chief feature of interest in this text relates to the prohibition of fires on the Sabbath. As this is the only prohibition of the kind in the Bible, and as it is often urged as a reason why the Sabbath should not be kept, a brief examination of the difficulty will not be out of place. It should be observed, 1. That this language does not form part of the fourth commandment, the grand law of the Sabbath. 2. That as there were laws pertaining to the Sabbath, that were no part of the Sabbatic institution, but that grew out of its being intrusted to the Hebrews, such as the law respecting the presentation of the shew-bread on the Sabbath; and that respecting the burnt-offering for the Sabbath:¹⁴ so it is at least possible that this is a precept pertaining only

to that nation, and not a part of the original institution. 3. That as there were laws peculiar only to the Hebrews, so there were many that pertained to them only while they were in the wilderness. Such were all those precepts that related to the manna, the building of the tabernacle and the setting of it up, the manner of encamping about it, &c. 4. That of this class were all the statutes given from the time that Moses brought down the second tables of stone until the close of the book of Exodus, unless the words under consideration form an exception. 5. That the prohibition of fires was a law of this class, i.e., a law designed only for the wilderness, is evident from several decisive facts.

1. That the land of Palestine during a part of the year is so cold that fires are necessary to prevent suffering.¹⁵

2. That the Sabbath was not designed to be a cause of distress and suffering, but of refreshment, of delight, and of blessing.¹⁶

3. That in the wilderness of Sinai, where this precept respecting fires on the Sabbath was given, it was not cause of suffering, as they were two hundred miles south of Jerusalem, in the warm climate of Arabia.

4. That this precept was of a temporary character, is further applied in that while other laws are said to be perpetual statutes and precepts to be kept after they should enter the land,¹⁷ no hint of this kind here appears. On the contrary, this seems to be similar in character to the precept respecting the manna,¹⁸ and to be co-existent with, and adapted to it.

5. If the prohibition respecting fires did indeed pertain to the promised land, and not merely to the wilderness, it would every few years conflict directly with the law of the passover. For the passover was to be roasted by each family of the children of Israel on the evening following the fourteenth day of the first month,¹⁹ which would fall occasionally upon the Sabbath. The prohibition of fires upon the Sabbath would not conflict with the passover while the Hebrews were in the wilderness; for the passover was not to be observed until they reached that land.²⁰ But if that prohibition did extend forward to the promised land, where the passover was to be regularly observed, these two statutes would often come in direct conflict. This is certainly a strong confirmation of the view that the prohibition of fires upon the Sabbath was a temporary statute, relating only to the wilderness.²¹

From these facts it follows that the favorite argument drawn from the prohibition of fires, that the Sabbath was a local institution, adapted only to the land of Canaan, must be abandoned; for it is evident that that prohibition was a temporary statute not even adapted to the land of promise, and not designed for that land. We next read of the Sabbath as follows:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy. Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father, and keep my Sabbaths: I am the Lord your God. . . . Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord."²²

These constant references to the Sabbath contrast strikingly with the general disobedience of the people. And thus God speaks again:

"Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings."²³

Thus does God solemnly designate his rest-day as a season of holy worship, and as the day of weekly religious assemblies. Again the great Law-giver sets forth his Sabbath:

"Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it; for I am the Lord your God. Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord." ²⁴

Happy would it have been for the people of God had they thus refrained from idolatry and sacredly regarded the rest-day of the Creator. Yet idolatry and Sabbath-breaking were so general in the wilderness that the generation which came forth from Egypt were excluded from the promised land. ²⁵ After God had thus cut off from the inheritance of the land the men who had rebelled against him, ²⁶ we next read of the Sabbath as follows:

"And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him inward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." ²⁷

The following facts should be considered in explaining this text: 1. That this was a case of peculiar guilt; for the whole congregation before whom this man stood in judgment, and by whom he was put to death, were themselves guilty of violating the Sabbath, and had just been excluded from the promised land for this and other sins. ²⁸ 2. That this was not a case which came under the existing penalty of death for work upon the Sabbath; for the man was put in confinement that the mind of the Lord respecting his guilt might be obtained. The peculiarity of his transgression may be learned from the context. The verses which next precede the case in question read thus:

"But the soul that doeth aught presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him." ²⁹

These words being followed by this remarkable case were evidently designed to be illustrated by it. It is manifest, therefore, that this was an instance of presumptuous sin, in which the transgressor intended despite to the Spirit of grace and to the statutes of the Most High. This case cannot therefore be quoted as evidence of extraordinary strictness on the part of the Hebrews in observing the Sabbath; for we have direct evidence that they did greatly pollute it during the whole forty years of their sojourn in the wilderness. ³⁰ It stands therefore as an instance of transgression in which the sinner intended to show his contempt for the Law-giver, and in this consisted his peculiar guilt. ³¹

In the last month of his long and eventful life Moses rehearsed all the great acts of God in behalf of his people, with the statutes and precepts that he had given them. This rehearsal is contained in the book of Deuteronomy, a name which signifies second law, and which is applied to that book, because it is a second writing of the law. It is the farewell of Moses to a disobedient and rebellious people; and he endeavors to fasten upon them the strongest

possible sense of personal obligation to obey. Thus, when he is about to rehearse the ten commandments, he uses language evidently designed to impress upon the minds of the Hebrews a sense of their individual obligation to do what God had commanded. Thus he says:

"Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."³²

It was not the act of your fathers that placed this responsibility upon you, but your own individual acts that brought you into the bond of this covenant. You have personally pledged yourselves to the Most High to keep these precepts.³³ Such is the obvious import of this language; yet it has been gravely adduced as proof that the Sabbath of the Lord was made for the Hebrews, and was not obligatory upon the patriarchs. The singularity of this deduction appears in that it is brought to bear against the fourth commandment alone; whereas, if it is a just and logical argument, it would show that the ancient patriarchs were under no obligation in respect to any precept of the moral law. But it is certain that the covenant at Horeb was simply an embodiment of the precepts of the moral law, with mutual pledges respecting them between God and the people, and that that covenant did not give existence to either of the ten commandments. At all events, we find the Sabbath ordained of God at the close of creation³⁴ and obligatory upon the Hebrews in the wilderness before God had given them a new precept on the subject.³⁵ As this was before the covenant at Horeb it is conclusive proof that the Sabbath did no more originate from that covenant than did the prohibition of idolatry, theft or murder.

The man of God then repeats the ten commandments. And thus he gives the fourth:

"Keep the Sabbath day, to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labor and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, not any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou was a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."³⁶

It is a singular fact that this scripture is uniformly quoted by those who write against the Sabbath, as the original fourth commandment; while the original precept itself is carefully left out. Yet there is the strongest evidence that this is not the original precept; for Moses rehearses these words at the end of the forty years' sojourn, whereas the original commandment was given in the third month after the departure from Egypt.³⁷ The commandment itself, as here given, contains direct proof on the point. Thus it reads; "Keep the Sabbath day, to sanctify it, AS the Lord thy God HATH COMMANDED thee;" thus citing elsewhere for the original statute. Moreover the precept as here given is evidently incomplete. It contains no clue to the origin of the Sabbath of the Lord, nor does it show the acts by which the Sabbath came into existence. This is why those who represent the Sabbath as made in the wilderness and not at creation quote this as the fourth commandment, and omit the original precept, which God himself proclaimed, where all these facts are distinctly stated.³⁸

But while Moses in this rehearsal omits a large part of the fourth commandment, he refers to the original precept of the whole matter, and then appends to this rehearsal a powerful plea of obligation on the part of the Hebrews to keep the Sabbath. It should be remembered that many of the people had steadily persisted in the violation of the Sabbath, and that this is the last time that Moses speaks in its behalf. Thus he says:

"And remember that thou was a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

These words are often cited as proof that the Sabbath originated at the departure of Israel from Egypt, and that it was ordained at that time as a memorial of their deliverance from thence. But it will be observed, 1. That this text says not one word respecting the origin of the Sabbath or rest-day of the Lord. 2. That the facts on this point are all given in the original fourth commandment, and are there referred to creation. 3. That there is no reason to believe that God rested upon the seventh day at the time of this flight from Egypt; nor did he then bless and hallow the day. 4. That the Sabbath has nothing in it of a kind to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, as that was a flight and this is a rest; and that flight was upon the fifteenth of the first month, and this rest, upon the seventh day of each week. Thus one would occur annually; the other, weekly. 5. But God did ordain a fitting memorial of that deliverance to be observe by the Hebrews: the passover, on the fourteenth day of the first month, in memory of God's passing over them when he smote the Egyptians; and the feast of unleavened bread, in memory of their eating this bread when they fled out of Egypt.³⁹

But what then do these words imply? Perhaps their meaning may be more readily perceived by comparing them with an exact parallel found in the same book and from the pen of the same writer:

"Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widow's raiment to pledge; but thou shalt remember that thou was a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; therefore I command thee to do this thing."⁴⁰

It will be seen at a glance that this precept was not given to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; nor could that deliverance give existence to the moral obligation expressed in it. If the language in the one case proves that men were not under obligation to keep the Sabbath before the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, it proves with equal conclusiveness in the other that before that deliverance they were not under obligation to treat with justice and mercy the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. And if the Sabbath is shown in the case to be Jewish, in the other, the statute of the great Law-giver in behalf of the needy and the helpless must share the same fate. It is manifest that this language is in each case an appeal to their sense of gratitude. You were slaves in Egypt, and God rescued you; therefore remember others who are in distress, and oppress them not. You were bondmen in Egypt, and God redeemed you; therefore sanctify unto the Lord the day which he has reserved unto himself; a most powerful appeal to those who had hitherto persisted in polluting it. Deliverance from abject servitude was necessary, indeed, in each case, in order that the things enjoined might be fully observed; but that deliverance did not give existence to either of theses duties. It was indeed one of the acts by which the Sabbath of the Lord was given to that nation, but it was not one of the acts by which God made the Sabbath, nor did it render the rest-day of the Lord a Jewish institution.

That the words engraven upon stone were simply the ten commandments is evident.

It is said of the first tables:

"And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone."⁴¹

2. Thus the first tables of stone contained the ten commandments alone. That the second tables were an exact copy of what was written upon the first, is plainly stated:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou breakest." "And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou breakest and thou shalt put them in the ark."⁴²

This is confirmed by the following decisive testimony:

"And he wrote upon the table the words of the covenant, the ten commandments," margin, Heb., "words." "And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments [margin, words], which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me."⁴³

These texts will explain the following language: "And the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone written with the finger of God; and on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spake with you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly."⁴⁴ Thus God is said to have written upon the tables according to all the words which he spoke in the day of the assembly; and these words which he thus wrote, are said to have been TEN WORDS. But the preface to the decalogue was not one of these ten words, and hence was not written by the finger of God upon stone. That this distinction must be attended to, will be seen by examining the following text and its connection:

"THESE WORDS the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me."⁴⁵

THESE WORDS here brought to view as written by the finger of God after having been uttered by him in the hearing of all the people, must be understood as one of two things. 1. They are simply the ten words of the law of God; or, 2. They are the words used by Moses in this rehearsal of the decalogue. But they cannot refer to the words used in this rehearsal; for, 1. Moses omits an important part of the fourth precept as given by God in its proclamation from the mount. 2. In this rehearsal of that precept he cites back to the original for that which is omitted.⁴⁶ 3. He appends to this precept an appeal in its behalf to their gratitude which was not made by God in giving it. 4. This language only purports to be a rehearsal and not the original itself; and this is further evinced by many verbal deviations from the original decalogue.⁴⁷ These facts are decisive as to what was placed upon the tables of stone. It was not an incomplete copy, citing elsewhere for the original, but the original code itself. And hence when Moses speaks of THESE WORDS as engraven upon the tables, he refers not to the words used by himself in this rehearsal, but to the TEN WORDS of the law of God, and excludes all else.

Thus have we traced the Sabbath through the books of Moses. We have found its origin in paradise when man was in his uprightness; we have seen the Hebrews set apart from all mankind as the depositaries of divine truth; we have seen the Sabbath and the whole moral law committed as a sacred trust to them; we have seen the Sabbath proclaimed by God as one of the ten commandments; we have seen it written by the finger of God upon stone in the bosom of the moral law; we have seen that law possessing no Jewish, but simply moral and divine, features, placed beneath the mercy-seat in the ark of God's testament; we have seen that various precepts pertaining to the Sabbath were given to the Hebrews and designed only for them; we have seen that the Hebrews did greatly pollute the Sabbath during their sojourn in the wilderness; and we have heard the final appeal made in its behalf by Moses to that rebellious people.

We rest the foundation of the Sabbatic institution upon its sanctification before the fall of man; the fourth commandment is its great citadel of defense; its place in the midst of the moral law beneath the mercy-seat shows its relation to the atonement and its immutable obligation.

1 Ex.32; Josh.24:2, 14, 23; Eze.20:7,8,16,18,24.

2 Amos 5:25-27; Acts 7:41-43; Josh.5:2-8.

3 Num.14; Ps.95; Eze.20:13.

4 Eze.20:13-24.

5 Ex.32.

6 Num.14.

7 Deut.9:24.

8 Num.14; Heb.3:16.

9 Ex.16; Josh.5:12.

10 Num.11;21.

11 A comparison of Ex.19; 20:18-21; 24:3-8, with chapter 32, will show the astonishing transitions of the Hebrews from faith and obedience to rebellion and idolatry. See a general history of these acts in Ps.78; 106.

12 For a notice of this penalty see chapter 5.

13 Ex.35:1-3.

14 Lev.24:5-9; Num.28:9, 10.

15 The Bible abounds with facts which establish this proposition. Thus the psalmist in an address to Jerusalem, uses the following language: "He giveth snow like wool; he scattereth the hoarfrost like ashes. He casteth forth his ice like morsels; who can stand before his cold? He sendeth out his word, and melteth them; he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow. He showeth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel." Ps.147:16-19. Dr. Clarke has the following note on this text: "At particular times the cold in the East is so

very intense as to kill man and beast. Jacobus de Vitriaco, one of the writers in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, says that in an expedition in which he was engaged against Mount Tabor, on the 24th of December, the cold was so intense that many of the poor people, and the beasts of burthen died by it. And Albertus Aquensis, another of these writers, speaking of the cold in Judea, says that thirty of the people who attended Baldwin I., in the mountainous districts near the Dead Sea, were killed by it; and that in that expedition they had to contend with horrible hail and ice; with unheard of snow and rain. From this we find that the winters are often very severe in Judea; and that in such cases as the above we may well call out, "Who can stand against his cold!" See his commentary on Ps.147. See also Jer.36:22; John 18:18; Matt.24:20; Mark 13:18. 1 Maccabees 13:22, mentions a very great snow storm in Palestine, so that horsemen could not march.

16 The testimony of the Bible on this point is very explicit. Thus we read: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thine handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed." Ex.23:12. To be without fire in the severity of winter would cause the Sabbath to be a curse and not a refreshment. It would ruin the health of those who should thus expose themselves, and render the Sabbath anything but a source of refreshment. The prophet uses the following language: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day: and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." etc. The Sabbath then was designed by God to be a source of delight to his people, and not a cause of suffering. The merciful and beneficent character of the Sabbath is seen in the following texts: Matt.12:10-13; Mark 2:27,28; Luke 14:3-6. From them we learn that God regards the sufferings of the brute creation, and would have them alleviated upon the Sabbath; how much more the distress and the needs of his people, for whose refreshment and delight the Sabbath was made.

17 Ex.29:9; 31:16; Lev.3:17; 24:9; Num.19:21; Deut.5:31; 6:1; 7. The number and variety of these allusions will surprise the inquirer.

18 Ex.16:23.

19 Ex.12; Deut.16.

20 The law of the passover certainly contemplated the arrival of the Hebrews in the promised land before its regular observance. Ex.12:25. Indeed, it was only once observed in the wilderness: namely, in the year following their departure from Egypt; and after that, was omitted until they entered the land of Canaan. Num.9; Josh.5. This is proved, not merely from the fact that no other instances are recorded, but because that circumcision was omitted during the whole period of their sojourn in the wilderness; and without this ordinance the children would have been excluded from the passover. Ex.12; Josh.5.

21 Dr.Gill, who considered the seventh-day Sabbath as a Jewish institution, beginning with Moses, and ending with Christ, and one with which Gentiles have no concern, has given his judgment concerning this question of fire on the Sabbath. He certainly had no motive in this case to answer this popular objection only that of stating the truth. He says:

"This law seems to be a temporary one, and not to be continued, nor is it said to be throughout their generations, as elsewhere, where the law of the Sabbath is given or repeated; it is to be restrained to the building of the tabernacle, and while that was about to which it is prefaced; and it is designed to prevent all public or private working on the Sabbath day in anything belonging to that;" etc. - Commentary on Ex.35:3.

Dr. Bound gives us St. Augustine's idea of this precept: "He doth not admonish them of it without cause; for that he speaketh in making the tabernacle, and all things belonging to it,

and showeth that, notwithstanding that, they must rest upon the Sabbath day, and not under the color of that (as it is said in the text) so much as kindle a fire." - True Doctrine of the Sabbath, p. 140.

22 Lev.19:1-3,30.

23 Lev.23:3. It has been asserted from verse 2, that the Sabbath was one of the feasts of the Lord. But a comparison of verses 2 and 4, shows that there is a break in the narrative, for the purpose of introducing the Sabbath as a holy convocation; and that verse 4 begins the theme anew in the very language of verse 2; and it is to be observed that the remainder of the chapter sets forth the actual Jewish feasts; viz., that of unleavened bread, the Pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles. What further clears this point of all obscurity is the fact that verses 37, 38, carefully discriminate between the feasts of the Lord and the Sabbaths of the Lord. But Ex.23:14, settles the point beyond controversy: "Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year." And then verses 15-17 enumerate these feasts as in Lev.23:4-44. See also 2Chron.8:13.

24 Lev.26:1,2.

25 Eze.20:15,16.

26 Num.13; 14.

27 Num.15:32-36.

28 Eze.20:15, 16 comp. with Num.14:35.

29 Num.15:30.

30 Ezek.20.

31 Hengstenberg, a distinguished German Anti-Sabbatarian, thus candidly treats this text: "A man who had gathered wood on the Sabbath is brought forth at the command of the Lord, and stoned by the whole congregation before the camp. Calvin says rightly, 'The guilty man did not fall through error, but through gross contempt of the law, so that he treated it as a light matter to overthrow and destroy all that is holy.' It is evident from the manner of its introduction that the account is not given with any reference to its chronological position; it reads, 'And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day.' It stands simply as an example of the presumptuous breach of the law, of which the preceding verses speak. He was one who despised the word of the Lord and broke his commandments [verse 31]; one who with a high hand sinned and reproached the Lord. Verse 30." - The Lord's Day, pp. 31, 32.

32 Deut.5:1-3.

33 See the pledges of this people in Ex.19; 24.

34 See the second chapter of this work.

35 See chapter third.

36 Deut.5:12-15.

37 Compare Ex.19; 20; Deut.1.

38 Ex.20:8-11.

39 Ex.12; 13.

40 Deut.24:17,18.

41 Deut.4:12,13.

42 Ex.34:1; Deut.10:2.

43 Ex.34:28; Deut.10:4.

44 Deut.9:10.

45 Deut.5:22.

46 Deut.5:12-15, compared with Ex.20:8-11.

47 Deut.5, compared with Ex.20.

CHAPTER 7

THE FEASTS, NEW MOONS AND SABBATHS OF THE HEBREWS

Enumeration of the Hebrew festivals - The passover - The pentecost - The feast of tabernacles - The new moons - The first and second annual sabbaths - The third - The fourth - The fifth - The sixth and seventh - The sabbath of the land - The jubilee - None of these festivals in force until the Hebrews entered their own land - The contrast between the Sabbath of the Lord and the sabbaths of the Hebrews - Testimony of Isaiah - Of Hosea - Of Jeremiah - Final cessation of these festivals.

We have followed the Sabbath of the Lord through the books of Moses. A brief survey of the Jewish festivals is necessary to the complete view of the subject before us. Of these there were three feasts: the passover, the Pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles; each new moon, that is, the first day of each month throughout the year; then there were seven annual sabbaths, namely, 1. The first day of unleavened bread. 2. The seventh day of that feast. 3. The day of Pentecost. 4. The first day of the seventh month. 5. The tenth day of that month. 6. The fifteenth day of that month. 7. The twenty-second day of the same. In addition to all these, every seventh year was to be the sabbath of the land, and every fiftieth year the year of jubilee.

The passover takes its name from the fact that the angel of the Lord passed over the houses of the Hebrews on that eventful night when the firstborn in every Egyptian family was slain. This feast was ordained in commemoration of the deliverance of that people from Egyptian bondage. It began with the slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month, and extended through a period of seven days, in which nothing but unleavened bread was to be eaten. Its great antitype was reached when Christ our passover was sacrificed for us.¹

The Pentecost was the second of the Jewish feasts, and occupied but a single day. It was celebrated on the fiftieth day after the first-fruits of barley harvest had been waved before the Lord. At the time of this feast the first-fruits of wheat harvest were offered unto God. The antitype of this festival was reached on the fiftieth day after the resurrection of Christ, when the great outpouring of the Holy Ghost took place.²

The feast of tabernacles was the last of the Jewish feast. It was celebrated in the seventh month when they had gathered in the fruit of the land, and extended from the fifteenth to the twenty-first day of that month. It was ordained as a festival of rejoicing before the Lord; and during this period the children of Israel dwelt in booths in commemoration of their dwelling thus during their sojourn in the wilderness. It probably typifies the great rejoicing after the final gathering of all the people of God into his kingdom.³

In connection with these feast it was ordained that each new moon, that is, the first day of every month, should be observed with certain specified offerings, and with tokens of rejoicing.⁴ The annual sabbaths of the Hebrews have been already enumerated. The first two of these sabbaths were the first and seventh days of the feast of unleavened bread, that is, the fifteenth and twenty-first days of the first month. they were thus ordained by God:

"Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses. . . . And in the first day there shall be an holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be an holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you."⁵

The third in order of the annual sabbaths was the day of Pentecost. This festival was ordained as a rest-day in the following language:

"And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein; it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings throughout your generations."⁶

The first day of the seventh month was the fourth annual sabbath of the Hebrews. It was thus ordained:

"Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein; but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord."⁷

The great day of atonement was the fifth of these sabbaths. Thus spake the Lord unto Moses:

"Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement; it shall be an holy convocation unto you. . . . Ye shall do no manner of work; it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath."⁸

The sixth and seventh of these annual sabbaths were the fifteenth and twenty-second days of the seventh month, that is, the first day of the feast of tabernacles, and the day after its conclusion. Thus were they enjoined by God:

"Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days; on the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be sabbath."⁹

Besides all these, every seventh year was a sabbath of rest unto the land. The people might labor as usual in other business, but they were forbidden to till the land, that the land itself might rest¹⁰ After seven of these sabbaths, the following or fiftieth year was to be the year of jubilee, in which every man was to be restored unto his inheritance¹¹ There is no evidence that the jubilee was ever observed, and it is certain that the sabbatical year was almost entirely disregarded¹²

Such were the feasts, new moons, and sabbaths, of the Hebrews. A few words will suffice to point out the broad distinction between them and the Sabbath of the Lord. The first of the three feasts was ordained in memory of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and was to be observed when they should enter their own land¹³ The second feast, as we have seen, could not be observed until after the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan; for it was to be celebrated when the first fruits of wheat harvest should be offered before the Lord. The third feast was ordained in memory of their sojourn in the wilderness, and was to be celebrated by them each year after the ingathering of the entire harvest. Of course this feast, like the others,

could not be observed until the settlement of the people in their own land. The new moons, as has been already seen, were not ordained until after these feasts had been instituted. The annual sabbaths were part and parcel of these feasts, and could have no existence until after the feasts to which they belonged had been instituted. Thus the first and second of these sabbaths were the first and seventh days of the paschal feast. The third annual sabbath was identical with the feast of Pentecost. The fourth of these sabbaths was the same as the new moon in the seventh month. The fifth one was the great day of atonement. The sixth and the seventh of these annual sabbaths were the fifteenth and twenty-second days of the seventh month, that is, the first day of the feast of tabernacles, and the next day after the close of that feast. As these feasts were not to be observed until the Hebrews should possess their own land, the annual sabbaths could have no existence until that time. And so of the sabbaths of the land. These could have no existence until after the Hebrews should possess and cultivate their own land; after six years of cultivation, the land should rest the seventh year, and remain untilled. After seven of these sabbaths of the land came the year of jubilee.

The contrast between the Sabbath of the Lord and these sabbaths of the Hebrew¹⁴ is strongly marked.

1. The Sabbath of the Lord was instituted at the close of the first week of time; while these were ordained in connection with the Jewish feasts.
2. The one was blessed and hallowed by God, because that he had rested upon it from the work of creation; the others have no such claim to our regard.
3. When the children of Israel came into the wilderness, the Sabbath of the Lord was an existing institution, obligatory upon them; but the annual sabbaths then came into existence. It is easy to point to the very act of God, while leading that people, that gave existence to these sabbaths; while every reference to the Sabbath of the Lord shows that it had been ordained before God chose that people.
4. The children of Israel were excluded from the promised land for violating the Sabbath of the Lord in the wilderness; but the annual sabbaths were not to be observed until they should enter that land. This contrast would be strange indeed were it true that the Sabbath of the Lord was not instituted until the children of Israel came into the wilderness of Sin; for it is certain that two of the annual sabbaths were instituted before they left the land of Egypt¹⁵
5. The Sabbath of the Lord was made for man; but the annual sabbaths were designed only for residents in the land of Palestine.
6. The one was weekly, a memorial of the Creator's rest; the others were annual, connected with the memorials of the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt.
7. The one is termed "the Sabbath of the Lord," "my Sabbaths," "my holy day," and the like; while the others are designated as "your sabbaths," "her sabbaths," and similar expressions¹⁶
8. The one was proclaimed by God as one of the ten commandments, and was written with his finger in the midst of the moral law upon the tables of stone, and was deposited in the ark beneath the mercy-seat; the others did not pertain to the moral law, but were embodied in that hand-writing of ordinances that was a shadow of good things to come.
9. The distinction between these festivals and the Sabbaths of the Lord was carefully marked by God when he ordained the festivals and their associated sabbaths. Thus he said:

"These are the feast of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, . . . BESIDE the Sabbaths of the Lord.¹⁷

The annual sabbaths are presented by Isaiah in a very different light from that in which he presents the Sabbath of the Lord. Of the one he says:

"Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them.¹⁸

In striking contrast with this, the same prophet speaks of the Lord's Sabbath;

"Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice: for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people; neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters; I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people.¹⁹

Hosea carefully designates the annual sabbaths in the following prediction:

"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast-days, her new moons, and HER sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.²⁰

This prediction was uttered about B.C. 785. It was fulfilled in part about two hundred years after this, when Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. Of this event, Jeremiah, about B.C. 588, speaks as follows:

"Her people fell into the hand of the enemy, and none did help her: the adversaries saw her, and did mock at HER sabbaths. . . . The Lord was as an enemy; he hath swallowed up Israel, he hath swallowed up all her palaces; he hath destroyed his strongholds, and hath increased in the daughter of Judah mourning and lamentation. And he hath violently taken away his tabernacle, as if it were of a garden; he hath destroyed his places of the assembly; the Lord hath caused the solemn feasts and sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion, and hath despised in the indignation of his anger the king and the priest. The Lord hath cast off his altar, he hath abhorred his sanctuary, he hath given up into the hand of the enemy the walls of her palaces; they have made a noise in the house of the Lord, as in the day of a solemn feast.²¹

The feasts of the Lord were to be holden in the place which the Lord should choose, namely, Jerusalem²² and when that city, the place of their solemn assemblies, was destroyed and the

people themselves carried into captivity, the complete cessation of their feasts, and, as a consequence, of the annual sabbaths, which were specified days in those feasts, must occur. The adversaries mocked at her sabbaths, by making a "noise in the house of the Lord as in the day of a solemn feast." But the observance of the Lord's Sabbath did not cease with the dispersion of the Hebrews from their own land; for it was not a local institution, like the annual sabbaths. Its violation was one chief cause of the Babylonish captivity²³ and their final restoration to their own land was made conditional upon their observing it in their dispersion²⁴ The feasts, new moons, and annual sabbaths, were restored when the Hebrews returned from captivity, and with some interruptions, were kept up until the final destruction of their city and nation by the Romans. But ere the providence of God thus struck out of existence these Jewish festivals, the whole typical system was abolished, having reached the commencement of its antitype, when our Lord Jesus Christ expired upon the cross. The handwriting of ordinances being thus abolished, no one is to be judged respecting its meats, or drinks, or holy days, or new moons, or sabbaths," which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." But the Sabbath of the Lord did not form a part of this handwriting of ordinances; for it was instituted before sin had entered the world, and consequently before there was any shadow of redemption; it was written by the finger of God, not in the midst of types and shadows, but in the bosom of the moral law; and the day following that on which the typical sabbaths were nailed to the cross, the Sabbath commandment of the moral law is expressly recognized. Moreover, when the Jewish festivals were utterly extinguished with the final destruction of Jerusalem, even then was the Sabbath of the Lord brought to the minds of his people²⁵ Thus have we traced the annual sabbaths until their final cessation, as predicted by Hosea. It remains that we trace the Sabbath of the Lord until we reach the endless ages of the new earth, when we shall find the whole multitude of the redeemed assembling before God for worship on each successive Sabbath.

1 Ex.12; 1Cor.5:7,8.

2 Lev.23:10-21; Num.28:26-31; Deut.16:9-12; Acts 2:1-18.

3 Lev.23:34-43; Deut.16:13-15; Neh.8; Rev.7:9-14.

4 Num.10:10; 28:11-15; 1Sam.20:5,24,27; Ps.81:8.

5 Ex.12:15,16; Lev.23:7,8; Num.28:17,18,25.

6 Lev.23:21; Num.28:26.

7 Lev.23:24,25; Num.29:1-6.

8 Lev.23:27-32; 16:29-31; Num.29:7.

9 Lev.23:39.

10 Ex.23:10,11; Lev.25:2-7.

11 Lev.25:8-54.

12 Lev.26:34,35,43; 2Chron.36:21.

13 Ex.12:25.

14 On this point Mr. Miller uses the following language: "Only one kind of Sabbath was given to Adam, and one only remains for us. See Hosea 2:11. 'I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.' All the Jewish sabbaths did cease when Christ nailed them to his cross. Col.2:14-17. These were properly called Jewish sabbaths. Hosea says, 'her sabbaths.' But the Sabbath of which we are speaking, God calls 'my Sabbath.' Here is a clear distinction between the creation Sabbath and the ceremonial. The one is perpetual; the others were merely shadows of good things to come." - *Life and Views*, pp. 161, 162.

15 Ex.12:16.

16 Ex.20:10; 31:13; Isa.58:13; compared with Lev.23:24,32,39; Lam.1:7; Hosea 2:11.

17 Lev.23:37,38.

18 Isa.1:13,14.

19 Isa.56:1-7; 58:13,14.

20 Hosea 2:11.

21 Lam.1:7; 2:5-7.

22 Deut.16:16; 2Chron.7:12; Ps.122.

23 Jer.17:19-27; Neh.13:15-18.

24 Isa.56. See the eighth chapter of this work.

25 See Chapter 10

CHAPTER 8.

THE SABBATH FROM DAVID TO NEHEMIAH

Silence of six successive books of the Bible relative to the Sabbath - This silence compared to that of the book of Genesis - The siege of Jericho - The standing still of the sun - David's act of eating the shew-bread - The Sabbath of the Lord, how connected with and how distinguished from the annual sabbaths - Earliest reference to the Sabbath after the days of Moses - Incidental allusions to the Sabbath - Testimony of Amos - Of Isaiah - The Sabbath a blessing to MANKIND - The condition of being gathered to the holy land - Not a local institution - Commentary on the fourth commandment - Testimony of Jeremiah - Jerusalem to be saved if she would keep the Sabbath - This gracious offer despised - The Sabbath distinguished from the other days of the week - The Sabbath after the Babylonish captivity - Time for the commencing of the Sabbath - The violation of the Sabbath caused the destruction of Jerusalem.

When we leave the books of Moses there is a long-continued break in the history of the Sabbath.¹ No mention of it is found in the book of Joshua, nor in that of Judges, nor in the book of Ruth, nor in that of first Samuel, nor in the book of second Samuel, nor in that of first Kings. It is not until we reach the book of second Kings¹ that the Sabbath is even mentioned. In the book of first Chronicles, however, which as a narrative is parallel to the two books of Samuel, the Sabbath is mentioned² with reference to the events of David's life. Yet this leaves a period of five hundred years, which the Bible passes in silence respecting the Sabbath.

During this period we have a circumstantial history of the Hebrew people from their entrance into the promised land forward to the establishment of David as their king, embracing many particulars in the life of Joshua, of the elders and judges of Israel, of Gideon, of Barak, of Jephthah, of Samson, of Eli, of Naomi and Ruth, of Hannah and Samuel, of Saul, of Jonathan and of David. Yet in all this minute record we have no direct mention of the Sabbath.

It is a favorite argument with anti-Sabbatarians in proof of the total neglect of the Sabbath in the patriarchal age, that the book of Genesis, which does give a distinct view of the origin of the Sabbath in Paradise, at the close of the first week of time, does not in recording the lives of the patriarchs, say anything relative to its observance. Yet in that one book are crowded the events of two thousand three hundred and seventy years. What then should they say of the fact that six successive books of the Bible, relating with comparative minuteness the events of five hundred years, and involving many circumstances that would call out a mention of the Sabbath, do not mention it at all? Does the silence of one book, which nevertheless does give the institution of the Sabbath at its very commencement, and which brings into its record almost twenty-four hundred years, prove that there were no Sabbath-keepers prior to Moses? What then is proved by the fact that six successive books of the Bible, confining themselves to the events of five hundred years, an average of less than one hundred years apiece, the whole period covered by them being about one-fifth that embraced in the book of Genesis, do nevertheless preserve total silence respecting the Sabbath?

No one will adduce this silence as evidence of total neglect of the Sabbath during this period; yet why should they not? Is it because that when the narrative after this long silence brings in the Sabbath again, it does this incidentally and not as a new institution? Precisely such is the

case with the second mention of the Sabbath in the Mosaic record, that is, with its mention after the silence in Genesis.³ Is it because the fourth commandment had been given to the Hebrews whereas no such precept had previously been given to mankind? This answer cannot be admitted, for we have seen that the substance of the fourth commandment was given to the head of the human family; and it is certain that when the Hebrews came out of Egypt they were under obligation to keep the Sabbath in consequence of existing law.⁴ The argument therefore is certainly more conclusive that there were no Sabbath-keepers from Moses to David, than that there were none from Adam to Moses; yet no one will attempt to maintain the first position, however many there will be to affirm the latter.

Several facts are narrated in the history of this period of five centuries that have a claim to our notice. The first of these is found in the record of the siege of Jericho.⁵ By the command of God the city was encompassed by the Hebrews each day for seven days; on the last day of the seven they encompassed it seven times, when by divine interposition the walls were thrown down before them and the city taken by assault. One day of this seven must have been the Sabbath of the Lord. Did not the people of God therefore violate the Sabbath in their acting thus? Let the following facts answer: 1. That which they did in this case was by direct command of God. 2. That which is forbidden in the fourth commandment is OUR OWN work: "Six days shalt thou labor, and do ALL THY WORK; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." He who reserved the seventh day unto himself, had the right to require its appropriation to his service as he saw fit. 3. The act of encompassing the city was strictly as a religious procession. The ark of the covenant of the Lord was borne before the people; and before the ark went seven priests blowing with trumpets of rams' horns. 4. Nor could the city have been very extensive, else the going round it seven times on the last day, and their having time left for its complete destruction, would have been impossible. 5. Nor can it be believed that the Hebrews, by God's command carrying the ark before them, which contained simply the ten words of the Most High, were violating the fourth of those words, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." It is certain that one of those seven days on which they encompassed Jericho was the Sabbath; but there is no necessity for supposing this to have been the day in which the city was taken. Nor is this a reasonable conjecture when all the facts in the case are considered. On this incident Dr. Clarke remarks as follows:

"It does not appear that there could be any breach in the Sabbath by the people simply going round the city, the ark in company, and the priests sounding the sacred trumpets. This was a mere religious procession, performed at the command of God, in which no servile work was done."⁶

At the word of Joshua it pleased God to arrest the earth in its revolution, and thus to cause the sun to remain stationary for a season, that the Canaanites might be overthrown before Israel.⁷ Did not this great miracle derange the Sabbath? Not at all; for the lengthening of one of the six days by God's intervention could not prevent the actual arrival of the seventh day, though it would delay it; nor could it destroy its identity. The case involves a difficulty for those who hold the theory that God sanctified the seventh part of time, and not the seventh day; for in this case the seventh part of time was not allotted to the Sabbath; but there is no difficulty involved for those who believe that God set apart the seventh day to be kept as it arrives, in memory of his own rest. One of the six days was allotted a greater length than ever before or since; yet this did not in the slightest degree conflict with the seventh day, which nevertheless did come. Moreover all this was while inspired men were upon the stage of action; and it was by the direct providence of God; and what is also to be particularly remembered, it was at a time when no one will deny that the fourth commandment was in full force.

The case of David's eating the shew-bread is worthy of notice, as it probably took place upon the Sabbath, and because it is cited by our Lord in a memorable conversation with the Pharisees.⁸ The law of the shew-bread enjoined the setting forth of twelve loaves in the sanctuary upon the pure table before the Lord EVERY Sabbath.⁹ When new bread was thus placed before the Lord each Sabbath, the old was taken away to be eaten by the priests¹⁰ It appears that the shew-bread which was given to David had that day been taken from before the Lord to put hot bread in its place, and consequently that day was the Sabbath. Thus, when David asked bread, the priest said, "There is no common bread under mine hand, but there is hallowed bread." And David said, "The bread is in a manner common, especially [as the margin has it] when THIS DAY there is other sanctified in the vessel." And so the sacred writer adds: "The priest gave him hallowed bread; for there was no bread there but the shew-bread, that was taken from before the Lord, to put hot bread in the day when it was taken away." The circumstances of this case all favor the view that this was upon the Sabbath. 1. There was NO COMMON bread with the priest. This is not strange when it is remembered that the shew-bread was to be taken from before the Lord each Sabbath and eaten by the priests. 2. That the priest did not offer to prepare other bread is not singular if it be understood that this was the Sabbath. 3. The surprise of the priest in meeting David may have been in part owing to the fact that it was the Sabbath. 4. This also may account for the detention of David that day before the Lord. 5. When our Lord was called upon to pronounce upon the conduct of his disciples who had plucked and eaten the ears of corn upon the Sabbath to satisfy their hunger, he cited this case of David, and that of the priests offering sacrifices in the temple upon the Sabbath as justifying the disciples. There is a wonderful propriety and fitness in this citation, if it be understood that this act of David's took place upon the Sabbath. It will be found to present the matter in a very different light from that in which anti-Sabbatarians present it¹¹

A distinction may be here pointed out, which should never be lost sight of. The presentation of the shew-bread and the offering of burnt sacrifices upon the Sabbath as ordained in the ceremonial law, formed no part of the original Sabbatic institution. For the Sabbath was made before the fall of man; while burnt-offerings and ceremonial rites in the sanctuary were introduced in consequence of the fall. While these rites were in force they necessarily, to some extent, connected the Sabbath with the festivals of the Jews in which the like offerings were made. This is seen only in those scriptures which record the provision made for these offerings¹² When the ceremonial law was nailed to the cross, all the Jewish festivals ceased to exist; for they were ordained by it¹³ but the abrogation of that law could only take away those rites which it had appended to the Sabbath, leaving the original institution precisely as it came at first from its author.

The earliest reference to the Sabbath after the days of Moses is found in what David and Samuel ordained respecting the offices of the priests and Levites at the house of God. It is as follows:

"And other of their brethren, of the sons of the Kohathites, were over the shew-bread, to prepare it every Sabbath."¹⁴

It will be observed that this is only an incidental mention of the Sabbath. Such an allusion, occurring after so long a silence, is decisive proof that the Sabbath had not been forgotten or lost during the five centuries in which it had not been mentioned by the sacred historians. After this no direct mention of the Sabbath is found from the days of David to those of Elisha the prophet, a period of about one hundred and fifty years. Perhaps the ninety-second psalm is an exception to this statement, as its title, both in Hebrew and English, declares that it was

written for the Sabbath day¹⁵ and it is not improbable that it was composed by David, the sweet singer of Israel.

The son of the Shunammite woman being dead, she sought the prophet Elisha. Her husband not knowing that the child was dead said to her:

"Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon, nor Sabbath. And she said, It shall be well."¹⁶

It is probable that the Sabbath of the Lord is here intended, as it is thrice used in a like connection.¹⁷ If this be correct, it shows that the Hebrews were accustomed to visit the prophets of God upon that day for divine instruction; a very good commentary upon the words used relative to gathering the manna: "Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day."¹⁸ Incidental allusion is made to the Sabbath at the accession of Jehoash to the throne of Judah,¹⁹ about B.C. 778. In the reign of Uzziah, the grandson of Jehoash, the prophet Amos, B.C. 787, uses the following language:

"Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat?"²⁰

These words were spoken more directly concerning the ten tribes, and indicate the sad state of apostasy which soon after resulted in their overthrow as a people. About fifty years after this, at the close of the reign of Ahaz, another allusion to the Sabbath is found.²¹ In the days of Hezekiah, about B.C. 712, the prophet Isaiah uses the following language in enforcing the Sabbath:

"Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people; neither let the eunuch say, Behold I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant, even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls, a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people. The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to him, beside those that are gathered unto him."²²

This prophecy presents several features of peculiar interest. 1. It pertains to a time when the salvation of God is near at hand.²³ 2. It most distinctly shows that the Sabbath is not a Jewish institution; for it pronounces a blessing upon that man without respect of nationality who shall

keep the Sabbath; and it then particularizes the son of the stranger, that is, the Gentile,²⁴ and makes a peculiar promise to him if he will keep the Sabbath. 3. And this prophecy relates to Israel when they are outcasts, that is, when they are in their dispersion, promising to gather them, and others, that is, the Gentiles, with them. Of course the condition of being gathered to God's holy mountain must be complied with, namely, to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, and to keep the Sabbath from polluting it. 4. And hence it follows that the Sabbath is not a local institution, susceptible of being observed in the promised land alone, like the annual sabbaths,²⁵ but one made for mankind and capable of being observed by the outcasts of Israel when scattered in every land under heaven.²⁶

Isaiah again presents the Sabbath; and this he does in language most emphatically distinguishing it from all ceremonial institutions. Thus he says:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."²⁷

This language is an evangelical commentary upon the fourth commandment. It appends to it an exceeding great and precious promise that takes hold upon the land promised to Jacob, even the new earth.²⁸

In the year B. C. 601, thirteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, God made to the Jewish people through Jeremiah the gracious offer, that if they would keep his Sabbath, their city should stand forever. At the same time he testified unto them that if they would not do this, their city should be utterly destroyed. Thus said the prophet:

"Hear ye the word of the Lord, ye kings of Judah, and all Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that enter in by these gates: Thus saith the Lord: Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem;²⁹ neither carry forth a burden³⁰ out of your houses on the Sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the Sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers. But they obeyed not, neither inclined their ears, but made their necks stiff, that they might not hear, nor receive instruction.³¹ And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day, to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall *REMAIN FOREVER.* And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt-offerings, and sacrifices, and meat-offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise, unto the house of the Lord. But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."³²

This gracious offer of the Most High to his rebellious people was not regarded by them; for eight years after this Ezekiel testifies thus:

"In thee have they set light by father and mother: in the midst of thee have they dealt by oppression with the stranger: in thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow. Thou hast despised mine holy things, and hast profaned my Sabbaths. . . . Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them. . . . Moreover this they have done unto me: they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my Sabbaths. For when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it; and, lo, thus have they done in the midst of mine house."³³

Idolatry and Sabbath-breaking, which were besetting sins with the Hebrews in the wilderness, and which there laid the foundation for their dispersion from their own land,³⁴ had ever cleaved unto them. And now when their destruction was impending from the overwhelming power of the king of Babylon, they were so deeply attached to these and kindred sins, that they would not regard the voice of warning. Before entering the sanctuary of God upon his Sabbath, they first slew their own children in sacrifice to their idols!³⁵ Thus iniquity came to its hight, and wrath came upon them to the uttermost.

"They mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age: he gave them all into his hand. And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the kind, and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon, and they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the king of Persia."³⁶

While the Hebrews were in captivity at Babylon, God made to them an offer of restoring them to their own land and giving them again a city and a temple under circumstances of wonderful glory.³⁷ The condition of that offer being disregarded,³⁸ the offered glory was never inherited by them. In this offer were several allusions to the Sabbath of the Lord, and also to the festivals of the Hebrews.³⁹ One of these allusions is worthy of particular notice for the distinctness with which it discriminates between the Sabbath and the other days of the week:

"Thus saith the Lord God: The gate of the inner court that looketh toward the east, shall be shut THE SIX WORKING DAYS; but on the Sabbath it shall be opened, and in the day of the new moon it shall be opened."⁴⁰

Six days of the week are by divine inspiration called "the six working days;" the seventh is called the Sabbath of the Lord. Who shall dare confound this marked distinction?

After the Jews had returned from their captivity in Babylon, and had restored their temple and city, in a solemn assembly of the whole people they recount in an address to the Most High all

the great events of God's providence in their past history. Thus they testify respecting the Sabbath:

"Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandest them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant."⁴¹

Thus were all the people reminded of the great events of Mount Sinai - the giving of the ten words of the law of God, and the making known of his holy Sabbath. So deeply impressed was the whole congregation with the effect of their former disobedience, that they entered into a solemn covenant to obey God.⁴² They pledged themselves to each other thus:

"And if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath, or on the holy day; and that we would leave the seventh year, and the exaction of every debt."⁴³

In the absence of Nehemiah at the Persian court, this covenant was in part, at least, forgotten. Eleven years having elapsed, Nehemiah thus testifies concerning things at his return about B.C. 434:

"In those days saw I in Judah some treading winepresses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. And it came to pass, that, when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath,⁴⁴ I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath: and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the Sabbath day. So the merchants and sellers of all kind of ware lodged without Jerusalem once or twice. Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? if ye do so again, I will lay hands on you. From that time forth came they no more on the Sabbath. And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates, to sanctify the Sabbath day. Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy."⁴⁵

This scripture is an explicit testimony that the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of the Jews at Babylon were in consequence of their profanation of the Sabbath. It is a striking confirmation of the language of Jeremiah, already noticed, in which he testified to the Jews that if they would hallow the Sabbath their city should stand forever; but that it should be utterly destroyed if they persisted in its profanation. Nehemiah bears testimony to the accomplishment of Jeremiah's prediction concerning the violation of the Sabbath; and with his solemn appeal in its behalf ends the history of the Sabbath in the Old Testament.

1 2Kings 4:23.

2 1Chron.9:32. It is true that this text relates to the order of things after the return from Babylon; yet we learn from verse 22, that this order was originally ordained by David and Samuel. See verses 1-32.

3 Compare these two cases; Ex.16:23; 1Chron.9:32.

4 See chapters ii and iii.

5 Josh.6.

6 See Dr. A. Clarke's commentary on Josh.6:15.

7 Josh.10:12-14.

8 1Sam.21:1-6; Matt.12:3,4; Mark 2:25,26; Luke 6:3,4.

9 Lev.24:5-9; 1Chron.9:32.

10 1Sam.21:5,6; Matt.12:4.

11 See the tenth chapter of this work.

12 1Chron.23:31; 2Chron.2:4; 8:13; 31:3; Neh.10:31, 33; Eze.45:17.

13 See chapter vii. of this work.

14 1Chron.9:32.

15 Cotton Mather says: "There is a psalm in the Bible whereof the title is, 'A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath day.' Now 'tis a clause in that psalm, 'O Lord, how great are thy works! thy thoughts are very deep.' Ps.92:5. That clause intimates what we should make the subject of our meditations on the Sabbath day. Our thoughts are to be on God's works." - Discourse on the Lord's Day, p 30, A.D. 1703. And Hengstenberg says: "This psalm is according to the heading, 'A Song for the Sabbath day.' The proper positive employment of the Sabbath appears here to be a thankful contemplation of the works of God, a devotional absorption in them which could only exist when ordinary occupations are laid aside." - The Lord's Day, pp. 36,37.

16 2Kings 4:23.

17 Isa.66:23; Eze.46:1; Amos 8:5.

18 Ex.16:29.

19 2Kings 11:5-9; 2Chron.23 4-8.

20 Amos 8:4-6.

21 2Kings 16:18.

22 Isa.56.1-8.

23 For the coming of this salvation see Heb.9:28; 1Pet.1:9.

24 Ex.12:48,49; Isa.14:1; Eph.2:12.

25 See chapter vii.

26 Deut.28:64; Luke 21:24.

27 Isa.58:13,14.

28 Matt.8:11; Heb.11:8-16; Rev.21.

29 On this text Dr. A. Clarke comments thus: "From this and the following verses we find the ruin of the Jews attributed to the breach of the Sabbath: as this led to a neglect of sacrifice, the ordinances of religion, and all public worship; so it necessarily brought with it all immorality. The breach of the Sabbath was that which let in upon them all the waters of God's wrath."

30 For an inspired commentary on this language, see Neh.13:15-18.

31 This language strongly implies that the violation of the Sabbath had ever been general with the Hebrews. See Jer.7:23-28.

32 Jer.17:20-27

33 Eze.22:7,8,26; 23:38,39.

34 Eze.20:23,24; Deut.32:16-35.

35 Eze.23:38,39.

36 2Chron.36:16-20.

37 Eze., chapters 40-43.

38 Eze.43:7-11.

39 Eze.44:24; 45:17; 46:1,3,4,12.

40 Eze.46:1.

41 Neh.9:13,14.

42 Neh.9:38; 10:1-31.

43 Neh.10:31.

44 A few words relative to the time of beginning the Sabbath are here demanded. 1. The reckoning of the first week of time necessarily determines that of all succeeding weeks. The first division of the first day was night; and each day of the first week began with evening; the evening and the morning, an expression equivalent to the night and the day, constituted the day of twenty-four hours. Gen.1. Hence, the first Sabbath began and ended with evening. 2. That the night is in the Scriptures reckoned a part of the day of twenty-four hours, is proved by many texts. Ex.12:41,42; 1Sam.26:7,8; Luke 2:8-11; Mark 14:30; Luke 22:34, and many other testimonies. 3. The 2300 days, symbolizing 2300 years are each constituted like the days of the first week of time. Dan.8:14. The margin, which gives the literal Hebrew, calls each of these days an "evening morning." 4. The statute defining the great day of atonement is

absolutely decisive that the day begins with evening, and that the night is a part of the day. Lev.23:32. "It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath" 5. That evening is at sunset is abundantly proved by the following scriptures: Deut.16:6; Lev.22:6,7; Deut.23:2; 24:13,15; Josh.8:29; 10:26,27; Judges 14:18; 2Sam.3:35; 2Chron.18:34; Matt.8:16; Mark 1:32; Luke 4:40. But does not Neh.13:19. conflict with this testimony, and indicate that the Sabbath did not begin until after dark? I think not. The text does not say, "When it began to be dark at Jerusalem before the Sabbath," but it says, "When the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark." If it be remembered that the gates of Jerusalem were placed under wide and high walls, it will not be found difficult to harmonize this text with the many here adduced, which prove that the day begins with sunset.

Calmet, in his Bible Dictionary, article, Sabbath, thus states the ancient Jewish method of beginning the Sabbath: "About half an hour before the sunset all work is quitted and the Sabbath is supposed to be begun." He speaks thus of the close of the Sabbath; "When night comes, and they can discern in the heaven three stars of moderate magnitude, then the Sabbath is ended, and they may return to their ordinary employments."

45 Neh.13:15-22.

CHAPTER 9

THE SABBATH FROM NEHEMIAH TO CHRIST

Great change in the Jewish people respecting idolatry and Sabbath-breaking after their return from Babylon - Decree of Antiochus Epiphanes against the Sabbath - Massacre of a thousand Sabbath-keepers in the wilderness - Similar massacre at Jerusalem - Decree of the Jewish elders relative to resisting attacks upon the Sabbath - Other martyrdoms - Victories of Judas Maccabeus - How Pompey captured Jerusalem - Teaching of the Jewish doctors respecting the Sabbath - State of the Sabbatic institution at the first advent of the Saviour.

The period of almost five centuries intervenes between the time of Nehemia and the commencement of the ministry of the Redeemer. During this time an extraordinary change came over the Jewish people. Previously, they had been to an alarming extent idolaters, and outbreaking violators of the Sabbath. But after their return from Babylon they were never guilty of idolatry to any extent, the chastisement of that captivity effecting a cure of this evil.¹ In like manner did they change their conduct relative to the Sabbath; and during this period they loaded the Sabbatic institution with the most burdensome and rigorous ordinances. A brief survey of this period must suffice. Under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the king of Syria, B.C. 170, the Jews were greatly oppressed.

"King Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom, that all should be one people, and every one should leave his laws: so all the heathen agreed according to the commandment of the king. Yea, many also of the Israelites consented to his religion, and sacrificed unto idols, and profaned the Sabbath."²

The greater part of the Hebrews remained faithfull to God, and, as a consequence, were obliged to flee for their lives. Thus the historian continues:

"Then many that sought after justice and judgment went down into the wilderness, to dwell there: both they, and their children, and their wives, and their cattle; because afflictions increased sore upon them. Now when it was told the king's servants, and the host that was at Jerusalem, in the city of David, that certain men, who had broken the king's commandment, were gone down into the secret places in the wilderness, they pursued after them a great number, and having overtaken them, they camped against them, and made war against them on the Sabbath day. And they said unto them, Let that which ye have done hitherto suffice; come forth, and do according to the commandment of the king, and ye shall live. But they said, We will not come forth, neither will we do the king's commandment, to profane the Sabbath day. So then they gave them the battle with all speed. Howbeit they answered them not, neither cast they a stone at them, nor stopped the places where they lay hid. But said, Let us die all in our innocency: heaven and earth shall testify for us, that ye put us to death wrongfully. So they rose up against them in battle on the Sabbath, and they slew them, with their wives and children, and their cattle, to the number of a thousand people."³

In Jerusalem itself a like massacre took place. King Antiochus sent Appollonius with an army of twenty-two thousand,

"Who, coming to Jerusalem, and pretending peace, did forbear till the holy day of the Sabbath, when taking the Jews keeping holy day, he commanded his men to arm themselves. And so he slew all them that were gone to the celebrating of the Sabbath, and running through the city with weapons, slew great multitudes."⁴

In view of these dreadful acts of slaughter, Mattathias, "an honorable and great man," the father of Judas Maccabeus, with his friends decreed thus:

"Whosoever shall come to make battle with us on the Sabbath day we will fight against him; neither will we die all, as our brethren that were murdered in the secret places."⁵

Yet were some martyred after this for observing the Sabbath. Thus we read:

"And others, that had run together into caves near by, to keep the Sabbath day secretly, being discovered to Philip, were all burnt together, because they made a conscience to help themselves for the honor of the most sacred day."⁶

After this, Judas Maccabeus did great exploits in defense of the Hebrews, and in resisting the dreadful oppression of the Syrian government. Of one of these battles we read:

"When he had given them this watchword, The help of God, himself leading the first band, he joined battle with Nicanor. And by the help of the Almighty they slew above nine thousand of their enemies, and wounded and maimed the most part of Nicanor's host, and so put all to flight; and took their money that came to buy them, and pursued them far; but lacking time, they returned: for it was the day before the Sabbath, and therefore they would no longer pursue them. So when they had gathered their armor together, and spoiled their enemies, they occupied themselves about the Sabbath, yielding exceeding praise and thanks to the Lord, who had preserved them unto that day, which was the beginning of mercy distilling upon them. And after the Sabbath, when they had given part of the spoils to the maimed, and the widows, and orphans, the residue they divided among themselves and their servants."⁷

After this the Hebrews being attacked upon the Sabbath by their enemies, defeated them with much slaughter.⁸

About B.C. 63, Jerusalem was besieged and taken by Pompey, the general of the Romans. To do this, it was necessary to fill an immense ditch, and to raise against the city a bank on which to place the engines of assault. Thus Josephus relates the event:

"And had it not been our practice, from the days of our forefathers, to rest on the seventh day, this bank could never have been perfected, by reason of the opposition the Jews would have made; for though our law gives us leave then to defend ourselves against those that begin to fight with us, and assault us, yet does it not permit us to meddle with our enemies while they do anything else. Which thing when the Romans understood, on those days which we call Sabbaths, they threw nothing at the Jews, nor came to any pitched battle with

them, but raised up their earthen banks, and brought their engines into such forwardness, that they might do execution the next days." ⁹

From this it is seen that Pompey carefully refrained from any attack upon the Jews on each Sabbath during the siege, but spent that day in filling the ditch and raising the bank, that he might attack them on the day following each Sabbath, that is, upon Sunday. Josephus further relates that the priests were not at all hindered from their sacred ministrations by the stones thrown among them from the engines of Pompey, even "if any melancholy accident happened;" and that when the city was taken and the enemy fell upon them, and cut the throats of those that were in the temples, yet did not the priests run away or desist from the offering of the accustomed sacrifices.

These quotations from Jewish history are sufficient to indicate the extraordinary change that came over that people concerning the Sabbath, after the Babylonish captivity. A brief view of the teaching of the Jewish doctors respecting the Sabbath at the time when our Lord began his ministry will conclude this chapter:

"They enumerated about forty primary works, which they said were forbidden to be done on the Sabbath. Under each of these were numerous secondary works, which they said were also forbidden. . . . Among the primary works which were forbidden, were ploughing, sowing, reaping, winnowing, cleaning, grinding, etc. Under the head of grinding, was included the breaking or dividing of things which were before united. . . . Another of their traditions was, that, as threshing on the Sabbath was forbidden, the bruising of things, which was a species of threshing, was also forbidden. Of course, it was violation of the Sabbath to walk on green grass, for that would bruise or thresh it. So, as a man might not hunt on the Sabbath, he might not catch a flea; for that was a species of hunting. As a man might not carry a burden on the Sabbath, he might not carry water to a thirsty animal, for that was a species of burden; but he might pour water into a trough, and lead the animal to it. . . . Yet should a sheep fall into a pit, they would readily lift him out, and bear him to a place of safety. . . . They said a man might minister to the sick for purpose of relieving their distress, but not for the purpose of healing their diseases. He might put a covering on a diseased eye, or anoint it with eye-salve for the purpose of easing the pain, but not to cure the eye."¹⁰

Such was the remarkable change in the conduct of the Jewish people towards the Sabbath; and such was the teaching of their doctors respecting it. The most merciful institution of God for mankind had become a source of distress; that which God ordained as a delight and a source of refreshment had become a yoke of bondage; the Sabbath, made for man in paradise, was now a most oppressive and burdensome institution. It was time that God should interfere. Next upon the scene of action appears the Lord of the Sabbath.

1 Speaking of the Babylonish captivity, in his note on Eze.23:48, Dr. Clarke says: "From that time to the present day the Jews never relapsed into idolatry."

2 1 Mac.1:41-43.

3 1 Mac.2:20-38; Josephus' Antiquities, b. xii. chap. vi.

4 2Mac.5:25,26.

5 1Mac.2:41.

6 2Mac.6:11.

7 2Mac.8:23-28.

8 1Mac.9:43-49; Josephus Antiquities, b. xiii. chap. i.; 2Mac.15.

9 Antiquities of the Jews, b. xiv. chap. iv. Here we call attention to one of those historical frauds by which Sunday is shown to be the Sabbath. Dr. Justin Edwards states this case thus: "Pompey, the Roman general, knowing this, when besieging Jerusalem, would not attack them on the Sabbath; but spent the day in constructing his works, and preparing to attack them on Monday, and in a manner that they could not withstand, and so he took the city." - Sabbath Manual, p. 216. That is to say, the next day after the Sabbath was Monday, and of course Sunday was the Sabbath! Yet Dr. E. well knew that in Pompey's time, 63 years before Christ, Saturday was the only weekly Sabbath, and that Sunday and not Monday was the day of attack.

10 Sabbath Manual of the American Tract Society, pp. 214, 215.

CHAPTER 10

THE SABBATH DURING THE LAST OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS

Mission of the Saviour - His qualifications as a judge of Sabbatic observance - State of the institution at his advent - The Saviour at Nazareth - At Capernaum - His discourse in the corn - field - Case of the man with a withered arm - The Saviour among his relatives - Case of the impotent man - Of the man born blind - Of the woman bound by Satan - Of the man who had the dropsy - Object of our Lord's teaching and miracles relative to the Sabbath - Unfairness of many anti Sabbatarians - Examination of Matt.24:20 - The Sabbath not abrogated at the crucifixion - Fourth commandment after that event - Sabbath not changed at the resurrection of Christ - Examination of John 20:26 - Of Acts 2:1,2 - Redemption furnishes no argument for the change of the Sabbath - Examination of Ps. 118:22 - 24 - The Sabbath neither abolished nor changed as late as the close of the Seventy weeks.

In the fullness of time God sent forth his Son to be the Saviour of the world. He who fulfilled this mission of infinite benevolence was both the Son of God and the Son of man. He was with the Father before the world was, and by him God created all things.¹ The Sabbath being ordained at the close of that great work as a memorial to keep it in lasting remembrance, the Son of God, by whom all things were created, could not be otherwise than a perfect judge of its true design, and of its proper observance. The sixty-nine weeks of Daniel's prophecy being accomplished, the Redeemer began to preach, saying, "The time is fulfilled."² The ministry of the Saviour was at a time when the Sabbath of the Lord had become utterly perverted from its gracious design, by the teaching of the Jewish doctors. As we have seen in the previous chapter, it was to the people no longer a source of refreshment and delight, but a cause of suffering and distress. It had been loaded down with traditions by the doctors of the law until its merciful and beneficent design was utterly hidden beneath the rubbish of men's inventions. It being impracticable for Satan, after the Babylonish captivity, to cause the Jewish people, even by bloody edicts, to relinquish the Sabbath and openly to profane it as before that time, he turned their doctors so to pervert it, that its real character should be utterly changed and its observance entirely unlike that which would please God. We shall find that the Saviour never missed an opportunity to correct their false notions respecting the Sabbath; and that he selected, with evident design, the Sabbath as the day on which to perform many of his merciful works. It will be found that no small share of his teaching through his whole ministry was devoted to a determination of what was lawful on the Sabbath, a singular fact for those to explain who think that he designed its abrogation. At the opening of our Lord's ministry, we read thus:

"And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee; and there went out a fame of him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all. And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read."³

Such was the manner of the Saviour relative to the Sabbath. It is evident that in this he designed to show his regard for that day; for it was not necessary thus to do in order to gain a

congregation, as vast multitudes were ever ready to throng his steps. His testimony being rejected, our Lord left Nazareth for Capernaum. Thus the sacred historian says:

"But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way, and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath days. And they were astonished at his doctrine; for his word was with power. And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil; and he cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth; art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not. And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out. And the fame of him went out into every place of the country round about. And he arose out of the synagogue, and entered into Simon's house. And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever; and they besought him for her. And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her; and immediately she rose and ministered unto them."⁴

These miracles are the first which stand upon record as performed by the Saviour upon the Sabbath. But the strictness of Jewish views relative to the Sabbath is seen in that they waited till sunset, that is, till the Sabbath was passed,⁵ before they brought the sick to be healed. Thus it is added:

"And at even when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him."⁶

The next mention of the Sabbath is of peculiar interest:

"At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, Behold thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shew-bread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you that in this place is one greater than the temple. But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day."⁷

The parallel text in Mark has an important addition to the conclusion as stated by Matthew:

"And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."⁸

The following points should be noted in examining this text:

1. That the question at issue did not relate to the act of passing through the corn on the Sabbath; for the Pharisees themselves were in the company; and hence it may be concluded that the Saviour and those with him were either going to, or returning from, the synagogue.
2. That the question raised by the Pharisees was this: Whether the disciples, in satisfying their hunger from the corn through which they were passing, were not violating the law of the Sabbath.
3. That he to whom this question was proposed was in the highest degree competent to answer it; for he was with the Father when the Sabbath was made.⁹
4. That the Saviour was pleased to appeal to scriptural precedents for the decision of this question, rather than to assert his own independent judgment.
5. That the first case cited by the Saviour was peculiarly appropriate. David, fleeing for his life, entered the house of God upon the Sabbath,¹⁰ and ate the shew-bread to satisfy his hunger. The disciples, to relieve their hunger, simply ate of the corn through which they were passing upon the Sabbath. If David did right, though eating in his necessity of that which belonged only to the priests, how little of blame could be attached to the disciples who had not even violated a precept of the ceremonial law? Thus much for the disciples' satisfying their hunger as they did upon the Sabbath. Our Lord's next example is designed to show what labor upon the Sabbath is not a violation of its sacredness.
6. And hence the case of the priests is cited. The same God who had said in the fourth commandment, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all THY work," had commanded that the priests upon the Sabbath should offer certain sacrifices in his temple.¹¹ Herein was no contradiction; for the labor performed by the priests upon the Sabbath was simply the maintenance of the appointed worship of God in his temple, and was not doing what the commandment calls "THY WORK." Labor of this kind, therefore, the Saviour being judge, was not, and never had been, a violation of the Sabbath.
7. But it is highly probable that the Saviour, in this reference to the priests, had his mind not merely upon the sacrifices which they offered upon the Sabbath, but upon the fact that they were required to prepare new shew-bread every Sabbath; when the old was to be removed from the table before the Lord and eaten by them.¹² This view of the matter would connect the case of the priests with that of David, and both would bear with wonderful distinctness upon the act of the disciples. Then our Lord's argument could be appreciated when he adds: "But I say unto you, That in this place is one greater than the temple." So that if the shew-bread was to be prepared each Sabbath for the use of those who ministered in the temple, and those who did this were guiltless, how free from guilt also must be the disciples who, in following HIM that was greater than the temple, but who had not where to lay his head, had eaten of the standing corn upon the Sabbath to relieve their hunger?
8. But our Lord next lays down a principle worthy of the most serious attention. Thus he adds: "But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." The Most High had ordained certain labor to be performed upon the Sabbath, in order that sacrifices might be offered to himself. But Christ affirms upon the authority of the Scriptures,¹³ that there is something far more acceptable to God than sacrifices, and that this is acts of mercy. If God held those guiltless who offered sacrifices

upon the Sabbath, how much less would he condemn those who extend mercy and relief to the distressed and suffering, upon that day.

9. Nor does the Saviour even leave the subject here; for he adds: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." If the Sabbath was made, certain acts were necessary in order to give existence to it. What were those acts? (1) God rested upon the seventh day. This made the seventh day the rest-day or Sabbath of the Lord. (2) He blessed the day; thus it became his holy day. (3) He sanctified it, or set it apart to a holy use; thus its observance became a part of man's duty toward God. There must be a time when these acts were performed. And on this point there is really no room for controversy. They were not performed at Sinai, nor in the wilderness of Sin, but in paradise. And this is strikingly confirmed by the language here used by the Saviour: "The Sabbath was made for THE man, not THE man for the Sabbath;"¹⁴ thus citing our minds to the man Adam that was made of the dust of the ground, and affirming that the Sabbath was made for him; a conclusive testimony that the Sabbath originated in paradise. This fact is happily illustrated by a statement of the apostle Paul: "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man."¹⁵ It will not be denied that this language has direct reference to the creation of Adam and Eve. If then we turn back to the beginning, we shall find Adam made of the dust of the ground, Eve taken from his side, and the Sabbath made of the seventh day.¹⁶ Thus the Saviour, to complete the solution of the question raised by the Pharisees, traces the Sabbath back to the beginning, as he does the institution of marriage when the same class proposed for his decision the lawfulness of divorce.¹⁷ His careful statement of the design of the Sabbath and of marriage, tracing each to the beginning, in the one case striking down their perversion of the Sabbath, in the other, that of marriage, is the most powerful testimony in behalf of the sacredness of each institution. The argument in the one case stands thus: In the beginning God created one man and one woman, designing that they TWO should be one flesh. The marriage relation therefore was designed to unite simply two persons, and this union should be sacred and indissoluble. Such was the bearing of his argument upon the question of divorce. In relation to the Sabbath, his argument is this: God made the Sabbath for the man that he made of the dust of the ground; and being thus made for an unfallen race, it can only be a merciful and beneficent institution. He who made the Sabbath for man before the fall saw what man needed, and knew how to supply that want. It was given to him for rest, refreshment, and delight; a character that it sustained after the fall,¹⁸ but which the Jews had wholly lost sight of.¹⁹ And thus our Lord lays open his whole heart concerning the Sabbath. He carefully determines what works are not a violation of the Sabbath; and this he does by Old-Testament examples, that it may be evident that he is introducing no change in the institution; he sets aside their rigorous and burdensome traditions concerning the Sabbath, by tracing it back to its merciful origin in paradise; and having thus disencumbered the Sabbath of Pharisaic rigor, he leaves it upon its paradisiacal foundation, enforced by all the authority and sacredness of that law which he came not to destroy, but to magnify and make honorable.²⁰

10. Having thus divested the Sabbath of all Pharisaic additions, our Lord concludes with this remarkable declaration: "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." (1) It was not a disparagement to the Sabbath, but an honor, that God's only Son should claim to be its Lord. (2) Nor was it derogatory to the character of the Redeemer to be the Lord of the Sabbath; with all the high honors pertaining to his messiahship he is ALSO Lord of the Sabbath. Or, if we take the expression in Matthew, he is "Lord EVEN of the Sabbath day," it implies that it is not a small honor to possess such a title. (3) This title implies that the Messiah should be the protector, and not the destroyer, of the Sabbath. And hence that he was the rightful being to

decide the proper nature of Sabbatic observance. With these memorable words ends our Lord's first discourse concerning the Sabbath.

From this time the Pharisees watched the Saviour to find an accusation against him of violating the Sabbath. The next example will show the malignity of their hearts, their utter perversion of the Sabbath, the urgent need of an authoritative correction of their false teachings respecting it, and the Saviour's unanswerable defense:

"And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: and behold there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore, it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. Then the Pharisees went out and held a council against him, how they might destroy him."²¹

What was the act that caused this madness of the Pharisees? On the part of the Saviour, it was a word; on the part of the man, it was the act of stretching out his arm. Did the law of the Sabbath forbid either of these things? No one can affirm such a thing. But the Saviour had publicly transgressed that tradition of the Pharisees that forbade the doing of anything whatever toward the healing of the sick upon the Sabbath. And how necessary that such a wicked tradition should be swept away, if the Sabbath itself was to be preserved for man. But the Pharisees were filled with such madness that they went out of the synagogue and consulted how they might destroy the Saviour. Yet Jesus only acted in behalf of the Sabbath in setting aside those traditions by which they had perverted it.

After this, our Lord returned into his own country, and thus we read of him:

"And when the Sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue; and many hearing him were astonished, saying, From whence hath this man these things? and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?"²²

Not far from this time we find the Saviour at Jerusalem, and the following miracle was performed upon the Sabbath:

"And a certain man was there which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been there now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool; but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed and walked; and on the same day was the Sabbath. The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the Sabbath day: It is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed. He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? . . . The man departed and told the Jews that it was Jesus, which had made him whole. And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had

done these things on the Sabbath day. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."²³

Our Lord here stands charged with two crimes: 1. He had broken the Sabbath. 2. He had made himself equal with God. The first accusation is based on these particulars: (1) By his word he had healed the impotent man. But this violated no law of God; it only set at naught that tradition which forbade anything to be done for curing diseases upon the Sabbath. (2) He had directed the man to carry his bed. But this as a burden was a mere trifle,²⁴ like a cloak or mat, and was designed to show the reality of his cure, and thus to honor the Lord of the Sabbath who had healed him. Moreover, it was not such a burden as the Scriptures forbid upon the Sabbath.²⁵ (3) Jesus justified what he had done by comparing his present act of healing to that work which his Father had done HITHERTO, i.e., from the beginning of the creation. Ever since the Sabbath was sanctified in paradise, the Father, by his providence, had continued to mankind, even upon the Sabbath, all the merciful acts by which the human race has been preserved. This work of the Father was of precisely the same nature as that which Jesus had now done. These acts did not argue that the Father had hitherto lightly esteemed the Sabbath, for he had most solemnly enjoined its observance in the law and in the prophets;²⁶ and as our Lord had most expressly recognized their authority,²⁷ there was no ground to accuse him of disregarding the Sabbath, when he had only followed the example of the Father from the beginning. The Saviour's answer to these two charges will remove all difficulty:

"Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." ²⁸

This answer involves two points: 1. That he was following his Father's perfect example, who had ever laid open to him all his works; and hence as he was doing that only which had ever been the pleasure of the Father to do, he was not engaged in the overthrow of the Sabbath. 2. And by the meek humility of this answer - "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do" - he showed the groundlessness of their charge of self-exaltation. Thus, in nothing was there left a chance to answer him again.

Several months after this, the same case of healing was under discussion:

"Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the Sabbath-day circumcise a man. If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day?"²⁹

This Scripture contains our Lord's second answer relative to healing the impotent man upon the Sabbath. In his first answer he rested his defense upon the fact that what he had done was precisely the same as that which his Father had done hitherto, that is, from the beginning of the world; which implies that the Sabbath had existed from the same point, else the example of the Father during this time would not be relevant. In this, his second answer, a similar point is involved relative to the origin of the Sabbath. His defense this time rests upon the fact that his act of healing no more violated the Sabbath than did the act of circumcising upon the Sabbath. But if circumcision, which was ordained in the time of Abraham, was older than the Sabbath - as it certainly was if the Sabbath originated in the wilderness of Sin - there would

be an impropriety in the allusion; for circumcision would be entitled to the priority as the more ancient institution. It would be strictly proper to speak of the more recent institution as involving no violation of an older one; but it would be otherwise to speak of an ancient institution as involving no violation of one more recent. The language therefore implies that the Sabbath was older than circumcision; in other words, more ancient than the days of Abraham. These two answers of the Saviour are certainly in harmony with the unanimous testimony of the sacred writers, that the Sabbath originated with the sanctification of the rest-day of the Lord in Eden.

What had the Saviour done to justify the hatred of the Jewish people toward him? He had healed upon the Sabbath, with one word, a man who had been helpless thirty-eighty years. Was not this act in strict accordance with the Sabbatic institution? Our Lord has settled this point in the affirmative by weighty and unanswerable arguments,³⁰ not in this case alone, but in others already noticed, and also in those which remain to be noticed. Had he left the man in his wretchedness because it was the Sabbath, when a word would have healed him, he would have dishonored the Sabbath, and thrown reproach upon its Author. We shall find the Lord of the Sabbath still further at work in its behalf in rescuing it from the hands of those who had so utterly perverted its design; a work quite unnecessary, had he designed to nail the institution to his cross.

The next incident to be noticed is the case of the man that was born blind. Jesus seeing him said:

"I must work the works of him that sent me whilst it is day; the night cometh when no man can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world. When he had thus spoken he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go wash in the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, Sent). He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing. . . . And it was the Sabbath day when Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes."³¹

Here is the record of another of our Lord's merciful acts upon the Sabbath day. He saw a man blind from his birth; moved with compassion toward him, he moistened clay and anointed his eyes, and sent him to the pool to wash; and when he had washed he received sight. The act was alike worthy of the Sabbath and of its Lord: and it pertains only to the opponents of the Sabbath now, as it pertained only to the enemies of its Lord then, to see in this even the slightest violation of the Sabbath.

After this we read as follows:

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

eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him."³²

This time a daughter of Abraham, that is, a pious woman,³³ who had been bound by Satan eighteen years, was loosed from that bond upon the Sabbath day. Jesus silenced the clamor of his enemies by an appeal to their own course of action in loosing the ox and leading him to water upon the Sabbath. With this answer our Lord made ashamed all his adversaries, and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him. The last of these glorious acts with which Jesus honored the Sabbath is thus narrated:

"And it came to pass as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the the Sabbath day, that they watched him. And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? And they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go; and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day? And they could not answer him again to these things."³⁴

It is evident that the Pharisees and lawyers durst not answer the question, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? If they said, "Yes," they condemned their own tradition. If they said, "No," they were unable to sustain their answer by fair argument. Hence they remained silent. And when Jesus had healed the man, he asked a second question equally embarrassing: Which of you shall have an ox fall into a pit and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath? They could not answer him again to these things. It is apparent that our Lord's argument with the Pharisees from time to time relative to the Sabbath had satisfied them at last that silence relative to their traditions was wiser than speech. In his public teaching the Saviour declared that the weightier matters of the law were judgment, MERCY, and faith;³⁵ and his long-continued and powerful effort in behalf of the Sabbath, was to vindicate it as a MERCIFUL institution, and to rid it of Pharisaic traditions, by which it was perverted from its original purpose. Those who oppose the Sabbath are here guilty of unfairness in two particulars: 1. They represent these Pharasaic rigors as actually belonging to the Sabbatic institution. By this means they turn the minds of men against the Sabbath. 2. And having done this they represent the effort of the Saviour to set aside those traditions as directed to the overthrow of the Sabbath itself.

And now we come to the Saviour's memorable discourse upon the mount of Olives, on the very eve of his crucifixion, in which for the last time he mentions the Sabbath:

"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand), then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the house-top not come down to take anything out of his house; neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day; for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be."³⁶

In this language our Lord brings to view the dreadful calamities of the Jewish people, and the destruction of their city and temple as predicted by the Daniel the prophet;³⁷ and his watchful care over his people as their Lord leads him to point out their means of escape.

1. He gives them a token by which they should know when this terrible overthrow was immediately impending. It was "the abomination of desolation" standing "in the holy place;" or, as expressed by Luke, the token was "Jerusalem compassed with armies."³⁸ The fulfillment of this sign is recorded by the historian Josephus. After stating that Cestius, the Roman commander, at the commencement of the contest between the Jews and the Romans, encompassed the city of Jerusalem with an army, he adds:

"Who, had he but continued the siege a little longer, had certainly taken the city; but it was, I suppose, owing to the aversion God had already at the city and the sanctuary, that he was hindered from putting an end to the war that very day. It then happened that Cestius was not conscious either how the besieged despaired of success, nor how courageous the people were for him; and so he recalled his soldiers from the place, and by despairing of any expectation of taking it, without having received any disgrace, he retired from the city, without any reason in the world."³⁹

2. This sign being seen, the disciples were to know that the desolation of Jerusalem was nigh. "Then," says Christ, "let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Josephus records the fulfillment of this injunction:

"After this calamity had befallen Cestius, many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city, as from a ship when it was going to sink."⁴⁰

Eusebius also relates its fulfillment:

"The whole body, however, of the church at Jerusalem, having been commanded by a divine revelation, given to men of approved piety there before the war, removed from the city, and dwelt at a certain town beyond the Jordan, called Pella. Here, those that believed in Christ, having removed from Jerusalem, as if holy men had entirely abandoned the royal city itself, and the whole land of Judea; the divine justice for their crimes against Christ and his apostles, finally overtook them, totally destroying the whole generation of these evil-doers from the earth."⁴¹

3. So imminent was the danger when this sign should be seen that not a moment was to be lost. He that was upon the housetop could not even come down to take a single article from his house. The man that was in the field was forbidden to return to the house for his clothes. Not a moment was to be lost; they must flee as they were, and flee for life. And pitiable indeed was the case of those who could not flee.

4. In view of the fact that the disciples must flee the moment that the promised token should appear, our Lord directed them to pray for two things: 1. That their flight should not be in the winter. 2. That it should not be upon the Sabbath day. Their pitiable situation should they be compelled to flee to the mountains in the depth of winter, without time to even take their clothes, sufficiently attest the importance of the first of these petitions, and the tender care of Jesus as the Lord of his people. The second of these petitions will be found equally expressive of his care as Lord of the Sabbath.

5. But it is replied that this last petition has reference only to the fact that the Jews would then be keeping the Sabbath strictly, and as a consequence the city gates would be closed that day, and those be punished with death who should attempt to flee; and hence this petition indicates nothing in proof of Christ's regard for the Sabbath. An assertion so often and so confidently uttered should be well founded in truth; yet a brief examination will show that such is not the case. 1. The Saviour's language has reference to the whole land of Judea, and not to Jerusalem only: "Let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." The closing of the city gates could not therefore affect the flight of but a part of the disciples. 2. Josephus states the remarkable fact that when Cestius was marching upon Jerusalem in fulfillment of the Saviour's token and had reached Lydda, not many miles from Jerusalem, "he found the city empty of its men; for the whole multitude were gone up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles."⁴² The law of Moses required the presence of every male in Israel at this feast in Jerusalem;⁴³ and thus, in the providence of God, the disciples had no Jewish enemies left in the country to hinder their flight. 3. The Jewish nation being thus assembled at Jerusalem did most openly violate the Sabbath a few days prior to the flight of the disciples; a singular commentary on their supposed strictness in keeping it at that time.⁴⁴ Thus Josephus says of the march of Cestius upon Jerusalem that,

"He pitched his camp at a certain place called Gabao, fifty furlongs distant from Jerusalem. But as for the Jews, when they saw the war approaching to their metropolis, they left the feast, and betook themselves to their arms; and taking courage greatly from their multitude, went in a sudden and disorderly manner to the fight, with a great noise, and without any consideration had of the rest of the seventh day, although the Sabbath was the day to which they had the greatest regard; but that rage which made them forget the religious observation [of the Sabbath] made them too hard for their enemies in the fight; with such violence therefore did they fall upon the Romans, as to break into their ranks, and to march through the midst of them, making a great slaughter as they went,"⁴⁵ etc.

Thus it is seen that on the eve of the disciples' flight the rage of the Jews toward their enemies made them utterly disregard the Sabbath! 4. But after Cestius encompassed the city with his army, thus giving the Saviour's signal, he suddenly withdrew it, as Josephus says, "without any reason in the world." This was the moment of flight for the disciples, and mark how the providence of God opened the way for those in Jerusalem:

"But when the robbers perceived this unexpected retreat of his, they resumed their courage, and ran after the hinder parts of his army, and destroyed a considerable number of both their horsemen and footmen: and now Cestius lay all night at the camp which was at Scopus, and as he went off farther next day, he thereby invited the enemy to follow him, who still fell upon the hindmost and destroyed them."⁴⁶

This sally of the excited multitude in pursuit of the Romans was at the very moment when the disciples were commanded to flee, and could not but afford them the needed facility of escape. Had the flight of Cestius happened upon the Sabbath, undoubtedly the Jews would have pursued him upon that day, as under less exciting circumstances they had a few days before gone out several miles to attack him upon the Sabbath. It is seen, therefore, that whether in city or country, the disciples were not in danger of being attacked by their enemies, even had their flight been upon the Sabbath day.

6. There is therefore but one view that can be taken relative to the meaning of these words of our Lord, and that is that he thus spake, out of sacred regard for the Sabbath. For in his tender care for his people he had given them a precept that would require them to violate the Sabbath, should the moment for flight happen upon that day. For the command to flee was imperative the instant the promised signal should be seen, and the distance to Pella, where they found a place of refuge, was at least sixty miles. This prayer which the Saviour left with the disciples would cause them to remember the Sabbath whenever they should come before God. It was therefore impossible that the apostolic church should forget the day of sacred rest. Such a prayer, that they might not at a future time be compelled to violate the Sabbath, was a sure and certain means of perpetuating its sacred observance for the coming forty years, until the final destruction of Jerusalem, and was never forgotten by that early church, as we shall hereafter see.⁴⁷ The Saviour, who had taken unwearied pains during his whole ministry to show that the Sabbath was a merciful institution and to set aside those traditions by which it had been perverted from its true design, did, in this his last discourse, most tenderly commend the Sabbath to his people, uniting in the same petition their own safety and the sacredness of the rest-day of the Lord.⁴⁸

A few days after this discourse, the Lord of the Sabbath was nailed to the cross as the great sacrifice for the sins of men.⁴⁹ The Messiah was thus cut off in the midst of the seventieth week; and by his death he caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease.⁵⁰

Paul thus describes the abrogation of the typical system at the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus:

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. . . . Let no man thereof judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."⁵¹

The object of this action is declared to be the handwriting of ordinances. The manner of its abrogation is thus stated: 1. Blotted out; 2. Nailed to the cross; 3. Taken out of the way. Its nature is shown in these words: "Against us" and "contrary to us." The things contained in it were meats, drinks, holy days [Gr. *eorhtes* a feast day], new moons and sabbaths.⁵² The whole is declared a shadow of good things to come; and the body which casts this shadow is of Christ. That law which was proclaimed by the voice of God and written by his own finger upon the tables of stone, and deposited beneath the mercy-seat, was altogether unlike that system of carnal ordinances that was written by Moses in a book, and placed in the side of the ark.⁵³ It would be absurd to speak of the tables of STONE as NAILED to the cross; or to speak of BLOTTING out what was ENGRAVED in STONE. It would be to represent the Son of God as pouring out his blood to blot out what the finger of his Father had written. It would be to confound all the immutable principles of morality, to represent the ten commandments as "contrary" to man's moral nature. It would be to make Christ the minister of sin, to represent him as dying to utterly destroy the moral law. Nor does that man keep truth on his side who represents the ten commandments as among the things contained in Paul's enumeration of what was abolished. Nor is there any excuse for those who would destroy the ten commandments with this statement of Paul; for he shows, last of all, that what was thus abrogated was a shadow of good things to come - an absurdity if applied to the moral law.

The feasts, new moons, and sabbaths, of the ceremonial law, which Paul declared to be abolished in consequence of the abrogation of that code, have been particularly noticed

already.⁵⁴ That the Sabbath of the Lord is not included in their number, the following facts evince:

1. The Sabbath of the Lord was made before sin entered our world. It is not therefore one of those things that shadow redemption from sin.⁵⁵
2. Being made FOR man before the fall it is not one of those things that are AGAINST him and CONTRARY to him.⁵⁶
3. When the ceremonial sabbaths were ordained they were carefully distinguished from the Sabbath of the Lord.⁵⁷
4. The Sabbath of the Lord does not owe its existence to the handwriting of ordinances, but is found in the very bosom of that law which Jesus came not to destroy. The abrogation of the ceremonial law could not therefore abolish the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.⁵⁸
5. The effort of our Lord through his whole ministry to redeem the Sabbath from the thralldom of the Jewish doctors, and to vindicate it a merciful institution, is utterly inconsistent with the idea that he nailed it to his cross, as one of those things against man and contrary to him.
6. Our Lord's petition respecting the flight of the disciples from Judea, recognizes the sacredness of the Sabbath many years after the crucifixion of the Saviour.
7. The perpetuity of the Sabbath in the new earth is not easily reconciled with the idea that it was blotted out and nailed to our Lord's cross as one of those things that were contrary to man.⁵⁹
8. Because the authority of the fourth commandment is expressly recognized after the the Saviour's crucifixion.⁶⁰
9. And finally, because the royal law which is unabolished embodies the ten commandments, and consequently embraces and enforces the Sabbath of the Lord.⁶¹

When the Saviour died upon the cross the whole typical system which had pointed forward to that event as the commencement of its antitype, expired with him. The Saviour being dead, Joseph of Arimathea went in unto Pilate and begged the body of Jesus, and with the assistance of Nicodemus, buried it in his own new tomb.⁶²

"And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."⁶³

This text is worthy of special attention. 1. Because it is an express recognition of the fourth commandment after the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus. 2. Because it is the most remarkable case of Sabbatic observance in the whole Bible. The Lord of the Sabbath was dead; preparation being made for his embalming, when the Sabbath drew on it was suspended, and they rested, says the sacred historian, according to the commandment. 3. Because it shows that the Sabbath day according to the commandment is the day before the first day of the

week; thus identifying the seventh day in the commandment with the seventh day of the New-Testament week. 4. Because it is a direct testimony that the knowledge of the true seventh day was preserved as late as the crucifixion; for they observed the day enjoined in the commandment; and that was the day on which the Most High had rested from the work of creation.

In the course of the day following this Sabbath, that is, upon the first day of the week, it was ascertained that Jesus was risen from the dead. It appears that this event must have taken place upon that day, though it is not thus stated in express terms. At this point of time it is supposed by many that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week; and that the sacredness of the seventh day was then transferred to the first day of the week, which henceforth was the Christian Sabbath, enforced by all the authority of the fourth commandment. To judge of the truthfulness of these positions, let us read with care each mention of the first day found in the four evangelists. Thus writes Matthew:

"In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher."

Thus also Mark writes:

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun. . . . Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

Luke uses the following language:

"And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

John bears the following testimony:

"The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher. . . . Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in their midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." ⁶⁴

In these texts the foundation of the "Christian Sabbath" must be sought - if indeed such an institution actually exists - for there are no other records of the first day which relate to the time when it is supposed to have become sacred. These texts are supposed to prove that at the resurrection of the Saviour, the first day absorbed the sacredness of the seventh, elevating itself from the rank of a secular to that of a sacred day, and abasing the Sabbath of the Lord to the rank of "the six working days."⁶⁵ Yet the following facts must be regarded as very extraordinary indeed. if this supposed change of the Sabbath here took place:

1. That these texts should contain no mention of this change of the Sabbath.
2. That they should carefully discriminate between the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and the first day of the week.

3. That they should apply no sacred title to that day; particularly that they should omit the title of Christian Sabbath.
4. That they should not mention the fact that Christ rested upon that day; an act essential to its becoming his Sabbath.⁶⁶
5. That they do not relate the act of taking the blessing of God from the seventh day, and placing it upon the first; and indeed that they do not mention any act whatever of blessing and hallowing the day.
6. That they omit to mention anything that Christ did TO the first day; and that they even neglect to inform us that Christ so much as took up the first day of the week into his lips!
7. That they give no precept in support of first-day observance, nor do they contain a hint of the manner in which the first day of the week can be enforced by the authority of the fourth commandment.

Should it be asserted, however, from the words of John, that the disciples were on this occasion convened for the purpose of honoring the day of the resurrection, and that Jesus sanctioned this act by meeting with them, thus accomplishing the change of the Sabbath, it is sufficient to cite in reply the words of mark in which the same interview is narrated:

"Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen."⁶⁷

This testimony of Mark shows that the inference so often drawn from the words of John is utterly unfounded. 1. The disciples were assembled for the purpose of eating supper. 2. Jesus came into their midst and upbraided them for their unbelief respecting his resurrection.

The Scriptures declare that "with God all things are possible;" yet this statement is limited by the declaration that God cannot lie.⁶⁸ Does the change of the Sabbath pertain to those things that are possible with God, or is excluded by that important limitation, God cannot lie? The Law-giver is the God of truth, and his law is the truth.⁶⁹ Whether it would still remain the truth if changed to something else, and whether the Law-giver would still continue to be the God of truth after he had thus changed it, remains to be seen. The fourth commandment, which is affirmed to have been changed, is thus expressed:

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. . . . 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."

If now we insert "first day" in place of the seventh, we shall bring the matter to a test:

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. . . .

For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the first day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

This changes the truth of God into a lie;⁷⁰ for it is false that God rested upon the first day of the week and blessed and hallowed it. Nor is it possible to change the rest-day of the Creator

from that day on which he rested to one of the six days on which he did not rest.⁷¹ To change a part of the commandment, and to leave the rest unchanged, will not therefore answer, as the truth which is left is still sufficient to expose the falsehood which is inserted. A more radical change is needed, like the following:

"Remember the Christian Sabbath, to keep it holy. The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord Jesus Christ. For on that day he arose from the dead; wherefore he blessed the first day of the week, and hallowed it."

After such a change, no part of the original Sabbatic institution remains. Not only is the rest-day of the Lord left out, but even the reasons on which the fourth commandment is based are of necessity omitted also. But does such an edition of the fourth commandment as this exist? Not in the Bible, certainly. Is it true that such titles as these are applied to the first day? Never, in the Holy Scriptures. Did the Law-giver bless and hallow that day? Most assuredly not. He did not even take the name of it into his lips. Such a change of the fourth commandment on the part of the God of truth is impossible; for it not merely affirms that which is false and denies that which is true, but it turns the truth of God itself into a lie. It is simply the act of setting up a rival to the Sabbath of the Lord, which, having neither sacredness nor authority of its own, has contrived to absorb that of the Bible Sabbath itself. Such is the FOUNDATION of the first-day Sabbath. The texts which are employed in rearing the institution upon this foundation will be noticed in their proper order and place. Several of these texts properly pertain to this chapter:

"And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you."⁷²

It is not asserted that on this occasion our Lord hallowed the first day of the week; for that act is affirmed to date from the resurrection itself on the authority of the texts already quoted. But the sacredness of the first day being assumed as the foundation, this text furnishes the first stone for the superstructure; the first pillar in the first-day temple. The argument drawn from it may be thus stated: Jesus selected this day as the one in which to manifest himself to his disciples; and by this act strongly attested his regard for the day. But it is no small defect in this argument that his next meeting with them was on a fishing occasion,⁷³ and his last and most important manifestation, when he ascended into Heaven, was upon Thursday.⁷⁴ The act of the Saviour in meeting with his disciples must therefore be yielded as insufficient of itself to show that any day is sacred; for it would otherwise prove the sacredness of several of the working days. But a still more serious defect in this argument is found in the fact that this meeting of Jesus with his disciples does not appear to have been upon the first day of the week. It was "after eight days" from the previous meeting of Jesus and the disciples, which, coming at the very close of the resurrection day, could not but have extended into the second day of the week.⁷⁵ "After eight days" from this meeting, if made to signify only one week, necessarily carries us to the second day of the week. But a different expression is used by the Spirit of inspiration when simply one week is intended. "After seven days" is the chosen term of the Holy Spirit when designating just one week.⁷⁶ "After eight days" most naturally implies the ninth or tenth day;⁷⁷ but allowing it to mean the eighth day, it fails to prove that this appearance of the Saviour upon the first day of the week. To sum the argument: The meeting first meeting of Jesus with his disciples in the evening at the close of the first day of the week was mainly if not wholly upon the second day of the week;⁷⁸ the second meeting could not have been earlier in the week than the second or third day, and the day seems to have been selected simply because that Thomas was present; the third meeting was upon a fishing

occasion; and the fourth, was upon Thursday, when he ascended into Heaven. The argument for first-day sacredness drawn from this text is eminently fitted to the foundation of that sacredness already examined; and the institution of the first-day Sabbath itself, unless formed of more substantial frame-work than enters into its foundation, is at best only a castle in the air.

The text which next enters into the fabric of first-day sacredness is the following:

"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting."⁷⁹

This text is supposed to contribute an important pillar for the first-day temple. On this wise it is furnished: The disciples were convened on this occasion to celebrate the first-day Sabbath, and the Holy Spirit was poured out at that time in honor of that day. To this deduction there are, however, the most serious objections. 1. That there is no evidence that a first-day Sabbath was then in existence. 2. That there is no intimation that the disciples came together on this occasion for its celebration. 3. Nor that the Holy Spirit was then poured out in honor of the first day of the week. 4. That from the ascension of Jesus until the day of the Spirit's outpouring, the disciple has continued in prayer and supplication, so that their being convened on this day was nothing materially different from what had been the case for the past ten or more days.⁸⁰ 5. That had the sacred writer designed to show that a certain day of the week was honored by the events narrated, he would doubtless have stated that fact, and named that day. 6. That Luke was so far from naming the day of the week that it is even now a disputed point; eminent first-day authors⁸¹ even asserting that the day of Pentecost that year came upon the seventh day. 7. That the one great event which the Holy Spirit designed to mark was the antitype of the feast of Pentecost; the day of the week on which that should occur being wholly immaterial. How widely, therefore, do those err who reverse this order, making the day of the week, which the Holy Spirit has not even named, but which they assume to be the first day, the thing of chief importance, and passing in silence over that fact which the Holy Spirit has so carefully noted, that this event took place upon day of Pentecost. The conclusion to which these facts lead is inevitable; viz., that the pillar furnished from this text for the first-day temple is like the foundation of that edifice, simply a thing of the imagination, and quite worthy of a place beside the pillar furnished from the record of our Lord's second appearance to his disciples.

A third pillar for the first-day edifice is the following: Redemption is greater than creation; therefore the day of Christ's resurrection should be observed instead of the day of the Creator's rest. But this proposition is open to the fatal objection that the Bible says nothing of the kind.⁸² Who then knows that it is true? When the Creator gave existence to our world, did he not foresee the fall of man? And, foreseeing that fall, did he not entertain the purpose of redeeming man? And does it not follow that the purpose of redemption was entertained in that of creation? Who then can affirm that redemption is greater than the creation?

But as the Scriptures do not decide this point, let it be assumed that redemption is the greater. Who knows that a day should be set apart for its commemoration? The Bible says nothing on the point. But granting that a day should be set apart for this purpose, what day should have the preference? Is it said, That day on which redemption was finished? It is not true that redemption is finished; the resurrection of the saints and redemption of our earth from the curse are included in that work.⁸³ But granting that redemption should be commemorated before it is finished, by setting apart a day in its honor, the question again arises, What day

shall it be? The Bible is silent in reply. If the most memorable day in the history of redemption should be selected, undoubtedly the day of the crucifixion, on which the price of human redemption was paid, must have the preference. Which is the more memorable day, that on which the infinite Law-giver gave up his only and well-beloved Son to die and ignominious death for a race of rebels who had broken his law, or that day on which he restored that beloved Son to life? The latter event, though of thrilling interest, is the most natural thing in the world; the crucifixion of the Son of God for sinful men may be safely pronounced the most wonderful event in the annals of eternity. The crucifixion day is therefore beyond all comparison the more memorable day. And that redemption itself is asserted of the crucifixion rather than of the resurrection is an undoubted fact. Thus it is written:

"In whom we have redemption through his blood." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree;" "Thou was slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood."⁸⁴

If, therefore, any day should be observed in memory of redemption, unquestionably the day of the crucifixion should have the preference. But it is needless to pursue this point further. Whether the day of the crucifixion or the day of the resurrection should be preferred is quite immaterial. The Holy Spirit has said nothing in behalf of either of these days, but it has taken care that the event in each case should have its own appropriate memorial. Would you commemorate the crucifixion of the Redeemer? You need not change the Sabbath to the crucifixion day. It would be a presumptuous sin in you to do this. Here is the divinely appointed memorial of the crucifixion:

"The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."⁸⁵

It is the death of the Redeemer, therefore, and not the day of his death that the Holy Spirit has thought worthy of commemoration. Would you also commemorate the resurrection of the Redeemer? You need not change the Sabbath of the Bible for that purpose. The great Law-giver has never authorized such an act. But an appropriate memorial of that event has been ordained:

"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in the newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."⁸⁶

To be buried in the watery grave as our Lord was buried in the tomb, and to be raised from the water to walk in newness of life, as our Lord was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, is the divinely authorized memorial of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. And let it be observed, it is not the day of the resurrection, but the resurrection itself, that was thought worthy of commemoration. The events which lie at the foundation of redemption are the

death, burial, and resurrection, of the Redeemer. Each of these has its appropriate memorial; while the the days on which they severally occurred have no importance attached to them. It was the death of the redeemer, and not the day of his death, that was worthy of commemoration; and hence the Lord's supper was appointed for that purpose. It was the resurrection of the Saviour, and not the day of the resurrection, that was worthy of commemoration; and hence burial in baptism was ordained as its memorial. It is the change of this memorial to sprinkling that has furnished s plausible a plea for first-day observance in memory of the resurrection.

To celebrated the work of redemption by resting from labor on the first day of the week after six days of toil, it should be true that our Lord accomplished the work of human redemption in the six days prior to that of his resurrection, and that he rested on that day from the work, blessing it, and setting it apart for that reason. Yet not one of these particulars is true. Our Lord's whole life was devoted to this work. He rested temporarily from it indeed over the Sabbath following his crucifixion, but resumed the work on the morning of the first day of the week, which he has never since relinquished, and never will, until its perfect accomplishment in the resurrection of the saints and the redemption of the purchased possession. Redemption, therefore, furnishes no plea for a change of the Sabbath; its own memorials being quite sufficient, without destroying that of the great Creator. And thus the third pillar in the temple of first-day sacredness, like the other parts of that structure which have been already examined, is found to be a thing of the imagination only.

A fourth pillar in this temple is taken from an ancient prophecy in which it is claimed that the Christian Sabbath was foretold:

"The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."⁸⁷

This text is considered one of the strongest testimonies in support of the Christian Sabbath. Yet it is necessary to assume the very points that this text is supposed to prove. 1. It is assumed that the Saviour became the head of the corner by his resurrection. 2. That the day of his resurrection was made the Christian Sabbath in commemoration of that event. 3. And that this day thus ordained should be celebrated by abstinence from labor, and attendance upon divine worship.

To these extraordinary assumptions it is proper to reply: 1. There is no proof that Jesus became the head of the corner on the day of his resurrection. The Scriptures do not mark the day when this event took place. His being made head of the corner has reference to his becoming the chief corner stone of that spiritual temple composed of his people; in other words, it has reference to his becoming head of that living body, the saints of the Most High. It does not appear that he assumed this position until his ascension on high, where he became the chief corner stone in Zion above, elect and precious.⁸⁸ And hence there is no evidence that the first day of the week is even referred to in this text. 2. Nor is there the slightest evidence that that day or any other day was set apart as the Christian Sabbath in memory of Christ's resurrection. 3. Nor can there well be found a more extraordinary assumption than that this text enjoins the Sabbatic observance of the first day of the week!

This scripture has manifest reference to the Saviour's act of becoming the head of the New-Testament church; and consequently it pertains to the opening of the gospel dispensation. The day in which the people of God rejoice, in view of this relation to the Redeemer, can therefore be understood of no one day of the week; for they are commanded to "rejoice

EVERMORE;"⁸⁹ but of the whole period of the gospel dispensation. Our Lord uses the word day in the same manner when he says:

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad."⁹⁰

To assert the existence of what is termed the Christian Sabbath on the ground that text is the prediction of such an institution, is to furnish a fourth pillar for the first-day temple quite as substantial as those already tested.

The seventieth week of Daniel's prophecy extends three and a half years beyond the death of the Redeemer, to the commencement of the great work for the Gentiles. This period of seven years through which we have been passing is the most eventful period in the history of the Sabbath. It embraces the whole history of the Lord of the Sabbath as connected with that institution: His miracles and teaching, by which it is affirmed that he weakened its authority; his death, at which many affirm that he abrogated it; and his resurrection, at which a still larger number declare that he changed it to the first day of the week. We have had the most ample evidence, however, that each of these positions is false; and that the opening of the great work for the Gentiles witnessed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment neither weakened, abrogated, nor changed.

1 Gal.4:4,5; John 1:1-10; 17:5,24; Heb.1.

2 Dan.9:25; Mark 1:14,15.

3 Luke 4:14-16.

4 Luke 4:30-39; Mark 1:21-31; Matt.8:5-15.

5 See, on this point, the conclusion of chapter viii.

6 Mark 1:32-34; Luke 4:40.

7 Matt.12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5.

8 Mark 2:27,28.

9 Comp. John 1:1-3; Gen.1:1,26; 2:1-2.

10 See chap. viii.

11 Num.28:9,10.

12 Lev.24:5-9; 1Chron.9:32.

13 Hosea 6:6.

14 Thus the Greek Testament: Kai elegen autois. To sabbaton dia ton anthropon egebeto, ech o anthropos dia to sabbaton.

15 1Cor.11:9

16 Gen.2:1-3,7,21-23.

17 Matt.19:3-9.

18 Ex.16:23; 23:12; Isa.58:13,14.

19 See conclusion of chap. ix.

20 Matt.5:17-19; Isa.42:21.

21 Matt.12:9-14; Mark 3:1-6; Luke 6:6-11.

22 Mark 6:1-6.

23 John 5:1-18.

24 Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament on this text; family Testament of the American Tract Society on the same; Nevins' Biblical Antiquities, pp. 62, 63.

25 Compare Jer.17:21-27 with Nehemiah 13:15-20.

26 Gen.2:1-3; Ex.20:8-11; Isa.56; 58:13,14; Eze.20.

27 Gal.4:4; Matt.5:17-19; 7:12; 19:17; Luke 16:17.

28 John 5:19.

29 John 7:21-23.

30 Grotius well says: "If he healed any on the Sabbath he made it appear, not only from the law, but also from their received opinions, that such works were not forbidden on the Sabbath." - The Truth of the Christian Religion, b. v. sect. 7.

31 John 9:1-16.

32 Luke 13:10-17.

33 1Pet.3:6.

34 Luke 14:1-6.

35 Matt.23:23.

36 Matt.24:15-21.

37 Dan.9,26,27.

38 Luke 21:20.

39 Jewish Wars, b. ii, chap. xix.

40 Id. b. ii, chap. xx.

41 Eccl. Hist. b. iii, chap. v.

42 Jewish Wars, b. ii, chap. xix.

43 Deut.16:16.

44 Thus remarks Mr. Crozier in the Advent Harbinger for Dec. 6, 1851: "The reference to the Sabbath in Matt.24:20, only shows that the Jews who rejected Christ would be keeping the

Sabbath at the destruction of Jerusalem, and would, in consequence, add to the dangers of the disciples' flight by punishing them perhaps with death for fleeing on that day." And Mr. Marsh, forgetting that Christ forbade his disciples to take anything with them in their flight, uses the following language: "If the disciples should attempt to flee from Jerusalem on that day and carry their things, the Jews would embarrass their flight and perhaps put them to death. The Jews would be keeping the Sabbath, because they rejected Christ and his gospel." Advent Harbinger, Jan. 24, 1852. These quotations betray the bitterness of their authors. In honorable distinction from these anti-Sabbatarians, the following is quoted from Mr. William Miller, himself an observer of the first day of the week:

" 'Neither on the Sabbath day.' Because it was to be kept as a day of rest, and no servile work was to be done on that day, nor would it be right for them to travel on that day. Christ has in this place sanctioned the Sabbath, and clearly shows us our duty to let no trivial circumstance cause us to break the law of the Sabbath. Yet how many who profess to believe in Christ, at this present day, make it a point to visit, travel, and feast, on this day? What a false-hearted profession must that person make who can thus treat with contempt the moral law of God, and despise the precepts of the Lord Jesus! We may here learn our obligation to remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." - Exposition of Matt.24, p. 18.

45 Jewish Wars, b. ii, chap. xix.

46 Id. b. ii, chap. xix.

47 See chap. xvi.

48 President Edward says: "A further argument for the perpetuity of the Sabbath we have in Matt.24:20: 'Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' Christ is here speaking of the flight of the apostles and other Christians out of Jerusalem and Judea, just before their final destruction, as is manifest by the whole context, and especially by the 16th verse: 'Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.' But this final destruction of Jerusalem was after the dissolution of the Jewish constitution, and after the Christian dispensation was fully set up. Yet it is plainly implied in these words of our Lord, that even then Christians were bound to a strict observation of the Sabbath." - Works of President Edwards, vol. iv, pp. 621, 622, New York, 1849.

49 Matt.27, Isa.53.

50 Dan.9:24-27.

51 Col.2:14-17.

52 For and extended view of these Jewish festivals see chapter vii.

53 Deut.10:4,5, compared with 31:24-26. Thus Morer contrasts the phrase "in the ark," which is used with reference to the two tables, with the expression "in the side of the ark," as used respecting the book of the law, and says of the latter: "In the side of the ark, or more critically, in the outside of the ark; or in a chest by itself on the right side of the ark, saith the Targum of Jonathan." - Morer's Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 211, London, 1701.

54 See chap. vii.

55 See chap. ii.

56 Mark 2:27.

57 Lev.23:37,38.

58 Gen.2:1-3; Ex.20; Matt.5:17,19.

59 Isa.66:22,23. See also the close of chap. xix of this work.

60 Luke 23:34-56.

61 James 2:8-12; Matt.5:17-19; Rom.3:19,31.

62 Heb.9; 10; Luke 23:46-53; John 19:38-42.

63 Luke 23:54-56.

64 Matt.28:1; Mark 16:1,2,9; Luke 23:56; 24:1; John 20:1,19.

65 Ezek.46:1.

66 See the origin of the ancient Sabbath in Gen.2:1-3.

67 Mark 16:14. That this interview was certainly the same with that in John 20:19, will be seen from a careful examination of Luke 24.

68 Matt.19:26; Titus 1:2.

69 Isa. 65:16; Ps.119:142,151.

70 Rom.1:25.

71 It is just as easy to change the crucifixion-day from that day of the week on which Christ was crucified, to one of the six days on which he was not, as to change the rest-day of the Creator from that day of the week on which he rested, to one of the six days on which he wrought in the work of creation.

72 John 20:26.

73 John 21.

74 Acts 1:3. Forty days from the day of the resurrection would expire on Thursday.

75 When the resurrection day was "far spent," the Saviour and two of the disciples drew near to Emmaus, a village seven and half miles from Jerusalem. They constrained him to go in with them to tarry for the night. While they were eating supper they discovered that it was Jesus, when he vanished from their sight. Then they arose and returned to Jerusalem; and after their arrival, the first meeting of Jesus with the eleven took place. It could not therefore have lacked but little of sunset, which closed the day, if not actually upon the second day, when Jesus came into their midst. Luke 24. In the latter case, the expression, "the same day at evening being the first day of the week," would find an exact parallel in the meaning, in the expression, "in the ninth day of the month at even," which actually signifies the evening with which the tenth day of the seventh day of the seventh month commences. Lev.23:32.

76 Those who were to come before God from Sabbath to Sabbath to minister in his temple, were said to come "after seven days." 1Chron.9:25; 2Kings 11:5.

77 "After six days," instead of being the sixth day, was about eight days after. Mark 17:1; Mark 9:2; Luke 9:28.

78 That sunset marks the close of the day, see the close of chapter viii.

79 Acts 2:1,2.

80 Luke 24:49-53; Acts 1.

81 Horatio B. Hacket, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, in Newton Theological Institution, thus remarks: "It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signalized by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday." - Commentary of the Original Text of the Acts, pp. 50, 51.

82 In 1633, William Prynne, a prisoner in the tower of London, composed a work in defense of first-day observance, entitled, "Dissertation on the Lord's Day Sabbath." He thus acknowledges the futility of the argument under consideration: "No scripture . . . prefers or advanceth the work of redemption . . . before the work of creation; both these works being very great and glorious in themselves; wherefore I cannot believe the work of redemption, or Christ's resurrection alone, to be more excellent and glorious than the work of creation, without sufficient texts and Scripture grounds to prove it; but may deny it as a presumptuous fancy or unsound assertion, till satisfactory proved, as well as peremptorily averred without proof." - Page 59. This is the judgment of a candid advocate of the first day as a Christian festival. On Acts 20:7, he will be allowed to testify again.

83 Luke 21:28; Rom.8:23; Eph.1:13,14; 4:30.

84 Eph.1:7; Gal.3:13; Rev.5:9

85 1Cor.11:23-26.

86 Rom.6:3-5; Col.2:12.

87 Ps.118:22-24.

88 Eph.1:20-23; 2:20,21; 1Pet.2:4-7.

89 1Thess.5:16.

90 John 8:56.

CHAPTER 11.

THE SABBATH DURING THE MINISTRY OF THE APOSTLES

The knowledge of God preserved in the family of Abraham - The call of the Gentiles - The new covenant puts the law of God into the heart of each Christian - The new covenant has a temple in Heaven; and an ark containing the great original of that law which was in the ark upon earth - And before that ark a priest whose offering can take away sin - The Old and New Testaments compared - The human family in all ages amenable to the law of God - The good olive tree shows the intimate relation between the church of the New Testament and the Hebrew church - The apostolic church observed the Sabbath - Examination of Acts 13 - The assembly of the apostles at Jerusalem - Sabbatarian origin of the church at Philippi - Of the church of the Thessalonians - Of the church of Corinth - The churches in Judea and in many cases among the Gentiles began with Sabbath-keepers - Examination of 1Cor.16:1,2 - Self-contradiction of Dr. Edwards - Paul at Troas - Examination of Rom.14:1-6 - Flight of the disciples from Judea - The Sabbath of the Bible at the close of the first century.

We have now traced the Sabbath through the period of its especial connection with the family of Abraham. The termination of the seventy weeks brings us to the call of the Gentiles, and to their admission to equal privileges with the Hebrew race. We have seen that with God there was no injustice in conferring especial blessings upon the Hebrews, and at the same time leaving the Gentiles to their own chosen ways.¹ Twice had he given the human family, as a while, the most ample means of grace that their age of the world admitted, and each time did it result in the almost total apostasy of mankind. Then God selected as his heritage the family of Abraham, his friend; and by means of that family preserved in the earth the knowledge of his law, his Sabbath, and himself, until the coming of the great Messiah. During his ministry, the Messiah solemnly affirmed the perpetuity of his Father's law, enjoining obedience, even to its least commandment;² at his death he broke down that middle wall of partition³ by which the Hebrews had so long been preserved a separate people in the earth; and when about to ascend into Heaven commanded his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; teaching them to observe all things which he had commanded them.⁴ With the expiration of the seventieth week, the apostles enter upon the execution of this great commission to the Gentiles.⁵ Several facts of deep interest should here be noticed:

1. The new covenant or testament dates from the death of the Redeemer. In accordance with the prediction of Jeremiah, it began with the Hebrews alone, and was confined exclusively to them until the expiration of the seventieth week. Then the Gentiles were admitted to a full participation with the Hebrews in its blessings, being no longer aliens and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints.⁶ God entered into covenant this time with his people as individuals and not as a nation. The promises of this covenant embrace two points of great interest: (1) That God will put his law into the hearts of his people. (2) That he will forgive their sins. These promises being made six hundred years before the birth of Christ, there can be no question relative to what was meant by the law of God. It was the law of God then in existence that should be put into the heart of each new-covenant saint. The new covenant, then, is based upon the perpetuity of the law of God; it does not abrogate that law, but takes

away sin, the transgression of the law, from the heart, and puts the law of God in its place.⁷ The perpetuity of each precept of the moral law lies, therefore, at the very foundation of the new covenant.

2. As the first covenant had a sanctuary, and within that sanctuary an ark containing the law of God in ten commandments,⁸ and had also a priesthood to minister before that ark, to make atonement for the sins of men,⁹ even thus is it with the new covenant. Instead of the tabernacle erected by Moses as the pattern of the true, the new covenant has the greater and more perfect tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man - the temple of God in Heaven.¹⁰ As the great central point in the earthly sanctuary was the ark containing that law which man had broken, even thus it is with the heavenly sanctuary. "The temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament."¹¹ Our Lord Jesus Christ as a great High Priest presents his own blood before the ark of God's testament in the temple in Heaven. Respecting this object before which he ministers, let the following points be noted:

1. The ark in the heavenly temple is not empty; it contains the testament of God; and hence it is the great center of the sanctuary above, as the ark of God's testament was the center of the sanctuary of earth.¹²

2. The death of the Redeemer for the sins of men, and his work as High Priest before the ark in Heaven, have direct reference to the fact that within that ark is the law which mankind have broken.

3. As the atonement and priesthood of Christ have reference to the law within that ark before which he ministers, it follows that this law existed and was transgressed before the Saviour came down to die for men.

4. And hence, the law contained in the ark above is not a law which originated in the New Testament; for it necessarily existed long anterior to it.

5. If, therefore, God has revealed this law to mankind, that revelation must be sought in the Old Testament. For while the New Testament makes many references to that law which caused the Saviour to lay down his life for sinful men and even quotes from it it never publishes a second edition, but cites us to the Old Testament for the original code.¹³

6. It follows, therefore, that this law is revealed, and that this revelation is to be found in the Old Testament.

7. In that volume will be found, (1) the descent of the Holy One upon Mount Sinai; (2) The proclamation of his law in ten commandments; (3) The ten commandments written by the finger of God upon two table of stone; (4) These tables place beneath the mercy-seat in the ark of the earthly sanctuary.¹⁴

8. That this remarkable Old-Testament law which was shut up in the ark of the earthly sanctuary was identical with that in the ark in Heaven, may be thus shown: (1) The mercy-seat which was placed over the ten commandments was the place from which pardon was expected, the great central point in the work of atonement;¹⁵ (2) The law beneath the mercy-seat was that which made the work of atonement necessary; (3) There was no atonement that could take away sins; it was only a shadowy or typical atonement; (4) But there was actual sin, and hence a real law which man had broken; (5) There must therefore be an atonement that can take away sins; and that real atonement

must pertain to that law which was broken, and respecting which an atonement had been shadowed forth.¹⁶ (6) The ten commandments are thus set forth in the Old Testament as that law which demanded an atonement; while the fact is ever kept in view that those sacrifices there provided could not avail to take away sins.¹⁷ (7) But the death of Jesus as the antitype of those sacrifices, was designed to accomplish precisely what they shadowed forth, but which they could not effect, viz., to make atonement for the transgression of that law which was placed in the ark beneath the mercy-seat.¹⁸

We are thus brought to the conclusion that the law of God contained in the ark in Heaven is identical with that law which was contained in the ark upon the earth; and that both are identical with that law which the new covenant puts in the heart of each believer.¹⁹ The Old Testament, therefore, gives us the law of God and pronounces it perfect; it also provides a typical atonement, but pronounces it inadequate to take away sins.²⁰ Hence what was needed was not a new edition of the law of God; for that which was given already was perfect; but a real atonement to take away the guilt of the transgressor. So the New Testament responds precisely to this want, providing a real atonement in the death and intercession of the Redeemer, but giving no new edition of the law of God,²¹ though it fails not to cite us to the perfect code given long before. But although the New Testament does not give a new edition of the law of God, it does show that the Christian dispensation has the great original of that law in the sanctuary in Heaven.

9. We have seen that the new covenant places the law of God in the heart of each believer, and that the original of that law is preserved in the temple in Heaven. That all mankind are amenable to the law of God, and that they ever have been, is clearly shown by Paul's epistle to the Romans. In the first chapter, he traces the origin of idolatry to the willful apostasy of the Gentiles, which took place soon after the flood. In the second chapter, he shows that although God gave them up to their own ways, and as a consequence left them without his written law, yet they were not left in utter darkness; for they had by nature the work of the law written in their hearts; and dim as was this light, their salvation would be secured by living up to it, or their ruin accomplished by sinning against it. In the third chapter, he shows what advantage the family of Abraham had in being taken as the heritage of God, while all other nations were left to their own ways. It was that the oracles of God, the written law, was given them in addition to that work of the law written in the heart, which they had by nature in common with the Gentiles. He then shows that they were no better than the Gentiles, because that both classes were transgressors of the law. This he proves by quotations from the Old Testament. Then he shows that the law of God has jurisdiction over all mankind:

"Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God."²²

He then shows that the law cannot save the guilty, but must condemn them, and that justly. Next, he reveals the great fact that redemption through the death of Jesus is the only means by which God can justify those who seek pardon, and at the same time remain just himself. And finally he exclaims:

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."²³

It follows, herefore, that the law of God is unabolished; that the sentence of condemnation which it pronounces upon the guilty is as extensive as is the offer of pardon through the

gospel; that its work exists in the hearts of men by nature; from which we may conclude that man in his uprightness possessed it in perfection, as is further proved by the fact that the new covenant, after delivering men from the condemnation of the law of God, puts that law perfectly into their hearts. From all of which it follows that the law of God is the great standard by which sin is shown,²⁴ and hence the rule of life, by which all mankind, both Jews and Gentiles, should walk.

That the church in the present dispensation is really a continuation of the ancient Hebrew church, is shown by the illustration of the good olive tree. That ancient church was God's olive tree, and that olive tree has never been destroyed.²⁵ Because of unbelief, some of its branches were broken off; but the proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles does not create a new olive tree; it only grafts into the good olive tree such of the Gentiles as believe; giving them a place among the original branches, that with them they may partake of its root and fatness. This olive tree must date from the call of Abraham after the apostasy of the Gentiles; its trunk representing the patriarchs, beginning with the father of the faithful;²⁶ its branches, the Hebrew people. The ingrafting of the wild olive into the place of those branches which were broken off, represents the admission of the Gentiles to equal privileges with the Hebrews after the expiration of the seventy weeks. The Old-Testament church, the original olive tree, was a kingdom of priests and an holy nation; the New-Testament church, the olive tree after the ingrafting of the Gentiles, is described in the same terms.²⁷

When God gave up the Gentiles to apostasy before the call of Abraham, he confounded their language, that they should not understand one another, and thus scattered them abroad upon the face of the earth. Standing over against this is the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost, preparatory to the call of the Gentiles, and their ingrafting into the good olive tree.²⁸

We have followed the Sabbath to the call of the Gentiles, and the opening events of the gospel dispensation. We find the law of God, of which the Sabbath is a part, to be that which made our Lord's death as an atoning sacrifice necessary; and that the great original is in the ark above, before which our Lord ministers as high priest; while a copy of that law is by the new covenant written within the heart of each believer. It is seen, therefore, that the law of God is more intimately connected with the people of God since the death of the Redeemer than before that event.

That the apostolic church did sacredly regard the Sabbath, as well as all the other precepts of the moral law, admits of no doubt. The fact is proved, not merely because the early Christians were not accused of its violation by their most inveterate enemies; nor wholly by the fact that they held sin to be the transgression of the law, and that the law was the great standard by which sin is shown, and that by which sin becomes exceeding sinful.²⁹ These points are certainly very decisive evidence that the apostolic church did keep the fourth commandment. The testimony of James relative to the ten commandments, that he who violates one of them becomes guilty of all, is yet another strong evidence that the primitive church did sacredly regard the whole law of God.³⁰ But besides these facts we have a peculiar guaranty that the Sabbath of the Lord was not forgotten by the apostolic church. The prayer which our Lord taught his disciples, that their flight from Judea should not be upon the Sabbath was, as we have seen, designed to impress its sacredness deeply upon their minds, and could not but have secured that result.³¹ In the history of the primitive church we have several important references to the Sabbath. The first of these is as follows:

"But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down."³²

By invitation of the rulers of the synagogue, Paul delivered an extended address, proving that Jesus was the Christ. In the course of these remarks he used the following language:

"For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him."³³

When Paul's discourse was concluded, we read:

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath."³⁴ Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God. And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God."³⁵

These texts show, 1. That by the term Sabbath in the book of Acts is meant that day on which the Jewish people assembled in the synagogue to listen to the voices of the prophets. 2. That as this discourse was fourteen years after the resurrection of Christ, and the record of it by Luke was some thirty years after that event, it follows that the alleged change of the Sabbath at the resurrection of Christ had not, even after many years, come to the knowledge of either Luke or Paul. 3. That here was a remarkable opportunity to mention the change of the Sabbath, had it been true that the Sabbath had been changed in honor of Christ's resurrection. For when Paul was asked to preach the same words the next Sabbath, he might have answered that the following day was now the proper day for divine worship. And Luke, in placing this incident upon record, could not well avoid the mention of this new day, had it been true that another day had become the Sabbath of the Lord. 4. That as this second meeting pertained almost wholly to Gentiles, it cannot be said in this case that Paul preached upon the Sabbath out of regard to the Jews. On the contrary, the narrative strongly indicates Paul's regard for the Sabbath as the proper day for divine worship. 5. Nor can it be denied that the Sabbath was well understood by the Gentiles in this city, and that they had some degree of regard for it, a fact which will be corroborated by other texts.

Several years after these things, the apostles assembled at Jerusalem to consider the question of circumcision."³⁶ "Certain men which came down from Judea," finding the Gentiles uncircumcised, had "taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." Had they found the Gentiles neglecting the Sabbath, unquestionably this would have first called out their rebuke. It is indeed worthy of notice that no dispute at this time existed in the church relative to the observance of the Sabbath; for none was brought before this apostolic assembly. Yet had it been true that the change of the Sabbath was then advocated, or that Paul had taught the Gentiles to neglect the Sabbath, without doubt those who brought up the question of circumcision would have urged that of the Sabbath with even greater earnestness. That the law of Moses, the observance of which was under discussion in this assembly, is not the ten commandments, is evident from several decisive facts. 1. Because that Peter calls the code under consideration a yoke which neither their fathers nor themselves were able to bear. But James expressly calls that royal law, which, on his own showing, embodies the ten commandments, a law of liberty. 2. Because that this assembly did decide against the authority of the law of Moses; and yet James, who was a member of this body, did some years afterward solemnly enjoin obedience to the commandments, affirming that he who violated one was guilty of all.³⁷ 3. Because the chief feature in the law of Moses as here presented was circumcision.³⁸ But circumcision was not in

the ten commandments; and were it true that the law of Moses includes these commandments, circumcision would not in that case be a chief feature of that law. 4. Finally, because that the precepts still declared obligatory are not properly either of the ten commandments. These were, first, the prohibition of meats offered to idols; second, of blood; third, of things strangled; and fourth, of fornication.³⁹ Each of these precepts may be often found in the books of Moses,⁴⁰ and the first and last ones come under the second and seventh commandments respectively; but neither of these cover but a part of that which is forbidden in either commandment. It is evident, therefore, that the authority of the ten commandments was not under consideration in this assembly, and that the decision of that assembly had no relation to those precepts. For otherwise the apostles released the Gentiles from all obligation to eight of the ten commandments, and from the greater prohibitions contained in the other two.

It is evident that those greatly err who represent the Gentiles as released from the obligation of the Sabbath by this assembly. The question did not come before the apostles on this occasion; a strong proof that the Gentiles had not been taught to neglect the Sabbath, as they had to omit circumcision, which was the occasion of its being brought before the apostles at Jerusalem. Yet the Sabbath was referred to in this very assembly as an existing institution, and that, too, in connection with the Gentile Christians. Thus when James pronounced sentence upon the question, he used the following language:

"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day."⁴¹

This last fact is given by James as a reason for the course proposed toward the brethren among the Gentiles. "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day." From this it is apparent that the ancient custom of divine worship upon the Sabbath was not only preserved by the Jewish people and carried with them into every city of the Gentiles, but that the Gentile Christians did attend these meetings. Otherwise the reason assigned by James would lose all its force, as having no application to this case. That they did attend them strongly attests the Sabbath as the day of divine worship with the Gentile churches.

That the ancient Sabbath of the Lord had neither been abrogated nor changed prior to this meeting of the apostles, is strongly attested by the nature of the dispute here adjusted. And the close of their assembly beheld the Bible Sabbath still sacredly enthroned within the citadel of the fourth commandment. After this, in a vision of the night, Paul was called to visit Macedonia. In obedience to this call he came to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia. Thus Luke records the visit:

"And we were in that city abiding certain days. And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us; whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul."⁴²

This does not appear to have been a gathering of Jews, but of Gentiles, who, like Cornelius, were worshipers of the true God. Thus it is seen that the church of the Philippians originated with a pious assembly of Sabbath-keeping Gentiles. And it is likely that Lydia and those

employed by her in business, who were evidently observers of the Sabbath, were the means of introducing the gospel into their own city of Thyatira.

"Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews. And Paul, as his manner was,⁴³ went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. . . . And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few."⁴⁴

Such was the origin of the Thessalonian church. That it was an assembly of Sabbath-keepers at its beginning admits of no doubt. For besides the few Jews who received the gospel through the labors of Paul, there was a great multitude of devout Greeks; that is, of Gentiles who had united themselves with the Jews in the worship of God upon the Sabbath. We have a strong proof of the fact that they continued to observe the Sabbath after their reception of the gospel in the following words of Paul addressed to them as a church of Christ:

"For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus."⁴⁵

The churches in Judea, as we have seen, were observers of the Sabbath of the Lord. The first Thessalonian converts, before they received the gospel, were Sabbath-keepers, and when they became a Christian church they adopted the churches in Judea as their proper examples. And this church was adopted as an example of the churches of Macedonia and Achaia. In this number were included the churches of Philippi and of Corinth. Thus writes Paul:

"And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost; so that ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia. For from you sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to Godward is spread abroad."⁴⁶

After these things, Paul came to Corinth. Here, he first found Aquila and Priscilla.

"And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them and wrought; for by their occupation they were tent makers. And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."⁴⁷

At this place also Paul found Gentiles as well as Jews in attendance upon the worship of God on the Sabbath. The first members of the church at Corinth were therefore observers of the Sabbath at the time when they received the gospel; and, as we have seen, they adopted as their pattern the Sabbath-keeping church of Thessalonica, who in turn patterned after the churches in Judea.

The first churches were founded in the land of Judea. All their members had from childhood been familiar with the law of God, and well understood the precept, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." Besides this precept, all these churches had a peculiar memento of the Sabbath. They knew from our Lord himself that the time was coming when they must all suddenly flee from that land. And in view of this fact, they were to pray that the moment of their sudden flight might not be upon the Sabbath; a prayer which was designed, as we have seen, to preserve the sacredness of the Sabbath. That the churches in Judea were composed of Sabbath-keeping members, admits therefore of no doubt.

Of the churches founded outside the land of Judea, whose origin is given in the book of Acts, nearly all began with Jewish converts. These were Sabbath-keepers when they received the gospel. Among these, the Gentile converts were engrafted. And it is worthy of notice that in a large number of cases, those Gentiles are termed "devout Greeks," "religious proselytes," persons that "worshipped God," that feared God and that "prayed to God alway."⁴⁸ These Gentiles, at the time of their conversion to the gospel, were, as we have seen, worshipers of God upon the Sabbath with the Jewish people. When James had proposed the kind of letter that should be addressed by the apostles to the Gentile converts, he assigned a reason for its adoption, the force of which can now be appreciated: "For Moses," said he, "of old time hath in EVERY CITY them that preach him, being read in the synagogue every Sabbath day." The Sabbatarian character of the apostolic churches is thus clearly shown.

In a letter addressed to the Corinthians, about five years after they had received the gospel, Paul is supposed to contribute a fifth pillar to the first-day temple. Thus he wrote them:

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."⁴⁹

From this text it is argued in behalf of the first-day Sabbath, 1. That this was a public collection. 2. That hence the first day of the week was the day of public worship in the churches of Corinth and Galatia. 3. And therefore that the Sabbath had been changed to that day. Thus the change of the Sabbath is inferred from the public assemblies for divine worship on the first day at Corinth and Galatia; and the existence of these assemblies on that day is inferred from the words of Paul, "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store."

What, then, do these words ordain? But one answer can be returned: They ordain precisely the reverse of a public collection. Each one should lay by himself on each first day of the week according as God had prospered him, that when Paul should arrive, they might have their bounty ready. Mr. J. W. Morton, late Presbyterian missionary to Haiti, bears the following testimony:

"The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him;' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, 'With one's self, i.e., at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, 'apud se,' with one's self; at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, 'chez soi,' at his own house; at home. The German of Luther, 'bei sich selbst,' by himself; at home. The Dutch, 'by hemselfen,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, 'appresso di se,' in his own presence; at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, 'en su casa,' in his own house. The Portugese of Ferreira, 'para isso,' with himself. The Swedish, 'noer sig self,' near himself."⁵⁰

Dr. Bloomfield thus comments on the original: "par eanto, 'by him.' French, chez lui, 'at home.'"⁵¹

The Douay Bible reads: "Let every one of you put apart with himself." Mr. Sawyer thus translates: "Let each one of you lay aside by himself." Theodore Beza's Latin version has it:

"Apud se," i.e., at home. The Syriac reads thus: "Let everyone of you lay aside and preserve at home."

It is true that an eminent first-day writer, Justin Edwards, D.D., in a labored effort to prove the change of the Sabbath, brings forward this text to show that Sunday was the day of religious worship with the early church. Thus he says:

"This laying by in store was NOT laying by AT HOME; for that would not prevent gatherings when he should come."⁵²

Such is his language as a theologian upon whom has fallen the difficult task of proving the change of the Sabbath by the authority of the Scriptures. But in his Notes on the New Testament, in which he feels at liberty to speak the truth, he thus squarely contradicts his own language already quoted. Thus he comments on this text:

"Lay by him in store; AT HOME. That there be no gatherings; that their gifts might be ready when the apostle should come."⁵³

Thus even Dr. Edwards confesses that the idea of a public collection is not found in this scripture. On the contrary, it appears that each individual, in obedience to this precept, would, at the opening of each new week, be found AT HOME laying aside something for the cause of God, according as his worldly affairs would warrant. The change of the Sabbath, as proved by this text, rests wholly upon an idea which Dr. Edwards confesses is not found in it. We have seen that the church at Corinth was a Sabbath-keeping church. It is evident that the change of the Sabbath could never have been suggested to them by this text.

This is the only scripture in which Paul even mentions the first day of the week. It was written nearly thirty years after the alleged change of the Sabbath. Yet Paul omits all titles of sacredness, simply designating it as first day of the week; a name to which it was entitled as one of "the six working days."⁵⁴ It is also worthy of notice that this is the only precept in the Bible in which the first day is even named; and that this precept says nothing relative to the sacredness of the day to which it pertains; even the duty which it enjoins being more appropriate to a secular than to a sacred day.

Soon after writing his first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul visited Troas. In the record of this visit occurs the last instance in which the first day of the week is mentioned in the New Testament:

"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days;⁵⁵ where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep; and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted. And we went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos, there

intending to take in Paul; for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot."⁵⁶

This scripture is supposed to furnish a sixth pillar for the first-day temple. The argument may be concisely stated thus: this testimony shows that the first day of the week was appropriated by the apostolic church to meetings for the breaking of bread in honor of Christ's resurrection upon that day; from which it is reasonable to conclude that this day had become the Christian Sabbath.

If this proposition could be established as an undoubted truth, the change of the Sabbath would not follow as a necessary conclusion; it would even then amount only to a plausible conjecture. The following facts will aid us in judging of the truthfulness of this argument for the change of the Sabbath.

1. That this is the only instance of a religious meeting upon the first day of the week recorded in the New Testament.
2. That no stress can be laid upon the expression, "when the disciples came together," as proving that meetings for the purpose of breaking bread were held on each first day of the week; for there is nothing in the original answering to the word "when," the whole phrase being translated from three words, the perfect passive participle *sunegmenon*, "being assembled," and *ton matheton*, "the disciples;" the sacred writer simply stating the gathering of the disciples on this occasion.⁵⁷
3. That the ordinance of breaking bread was not appointed to commemorate the resurrection of Christ, but to keep in memory his death upon the cross.⁵⁸ The act of breaking bread therefore upon the first day of the week, is not a commemoration of Christ's resurrection.
4. That as the breaking of bread commemorates our Lord's crucifixion, and was instituted on the evening with which the crucifixion day began, on which occasion Jesus himself and all the apostles were present,⁵⁹ it is evident that the day of the crucifixion presents greater claims to the celebration of this ordinance than does the day of the resurrection.
5. But as our Lord designated no day for this ordinance, and as the apostolic church at Jerusalem are recorded to have celebrated it daily,⁶⁰ it is evidently presumption to argue the change of the Sabbath from a single instance of its celebration upon the first day of the week.
6. That this instance of breaking bread upon first-day, was with evident reference to the immediate and final departure of Paul.
7. For it is a remarkable fact that this, the only instance of a religious meeting on the first day recorded in the New Testament, was a night meeting. This is proved by the fact that many lights were burning in that assembly, and that Paul preached till midnight.
8. And from this fact follows the important consequence that this first-day meeting was upon Saturday night.⁶¹ For the days of the week being reckoned from evening to evening, and evening being at sunset,⁶² it is seen that the first day of the week begins Saturday night at sunset, and ends at sunset on Sunday. A night meeting, therefore, upon the first day of the week could be only upon Saturday night.
9. Paul therefore preached until midnight of Saturday night - for the disciples held a night meeting at the close of the Sabbath, because he was to leave in the morning - then being

interrupted by the fall of the young man, he went down and healed him, then went up and attended to the breaking of bread; and at break of day, on Sunday morning, he departed.

10. Thus are we furnished with conclusive evidence that Paul and his companions resumed their journey toward Jerusalem on the morning of the first day of the week; they taking ship to Assos, and he being pleased to go on foot. This fact is an incidental proof of Paul's regard for the Sabbath, in that he waited till it was past before resuming his journey; and it is a positive proof that he knew nothing of what in modern times is called the Christian Sabbath.

11. This narrative was written by Luke at least thirty years after the alleged change of the Sabbath. It is worthy of note that Luke omits all titles of sacredness, simply designating the day in question as the first day of the week. This is in admirable keeping with the fact that in his gospel, when recording the very event which is said to have changed the Sabbath, he not only omits the slightest hint of that fact, but designates the day itself by its secular title of first day of the week, and at the same time designates the previous day as the Sabbath according to the commandment.⁶³

The same year that Paul visited Troas, he wrote as follows to the church at Rome:

"Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth thanks."⁶⁴

These words have often been quoted to show that the observance of the fourth commandment is now a matter of indifference; each individual being at liberty to act his pleasure in the matter. So extraordinary a doctrine should be thoroughly tested before being adopted. For as it pleased God to ordain the Sabbath before the fall of man, and to give it a place in his code of ten commandments, thus making it a part of that law to which the great atonement relates; and as the Lord Jesus, during his ministry, spent much time in explaining its merciful design, and took care to provide against its desecration at the flight of his people from the land of Judea, which was ten years in the future when these words were written by Paul; and as the fourth commandment itself is expressly recognized after the crucifixion of Christ; if, under these circumstances, we could suppose it to be consistent with truth that the Most High should abrogate the Sabbath, we certainly should expect that aggregation to be stated in explicit language. Yet neither the Sabbath nor the fourth commandment are here named. That they are not referred to in this language of Paul, the following reasons will show:

1. Such a view would make the observance of one of the ten commandments a matter of indifference; whereas James shows that to violate one of them is to transgress the whole.⁶⁵

2. It directly contradicts what Paul had previously written in this epistle; for in treating of the law of ten commandments, he styles it holy, spiritual, just, and good; and states that sin-the transgression of the law-by the commandment becomes "EXCEEDING SINFUL."⁶⁶

3. Because that Paul in the same epistle affirms the perpetuity of that law which caused our Lord to lay down his life for sinful men,⁶⁷ which we have seen before was the ten commandments.
4. Because that Paul in this case not only did not name the Sabbath and the fourth commandment, but certainly was not treating of the moral law.
5. Because that the topic under consideration which leads him to speak as he does of the days in question was that of eating all kinds of food, or of refraining from certain things.
6. Because that the fourth commandment did not stand associated with precepts of such a kind, but with moral laws exclusively.⁶⁸
7. Because that in the ceremonial law, associated with the precepts concerning meats, was a large number of festivals, entirely distinct from the sabbath of the Lord.⁶⁹
8. Because that the church of Rome, which began probably with those Jews that were present from Rome on the day of Pentecost, had many Jewish members in its communion, as may be gathered from the epistle itself;⁷⁰ and would therefore be deeply interested in the decision of this question relative to the ceremonial law; the Jewish members feeling conscientious in observing its distinctions, the Gentile members feeling no such scruples: hence the admirable counsel of Paul exactly meeting the case of both classes.
9. Nor can the expression, "every day," be claimed as decisive proof that the Sabbath of the Lord is included. At the very time when the Sabbath was formally committed to the Hebrews, just such expressions were used, although only the six working days were intended. Thus it was said: "The people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day;" and the narrative says, "They gathered it every morning." Yet when some of them went out to gather on the Sabbath, God says, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?"⁷¹ The Sabbath being a great truth, plainly stated and many times repeated, it is manifest that Paul, in the expression, "every day," speaks of the six working days, among which a distinction had existed precisely coeval with that respecting meats; and that he manifestly excepts that day which from the beginning God had reserved unto himself. Just as when Paul quotes and applies to Jesus the words of David, "All things are put under him," he adds: "It is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him."⁷²
10. And lastly, in the words of John, "I was in the Spirit on the Lords day,"⁷³ written many years after this epistle of Paul, we have an absolute proof that in the gospel dispensation one day is still claimed be the Most High as his own.⁷⁴

About ten years after this epistle was written, occurred the memorable flight of all the people of God that were in the land of Judea. It was not in the winter; for it occurred just after the feast of tabernacles, some time in October. And it was not upon the Sabbath; for Josephus, who speaks of the sudden withdrawal of the Roman army after it had, by encompassing the city, given the very signal for flight which our Lord promised his people, tells us that the Jews rushed out of the city in pursuit of the retreating Romans, which was at the very time when our Lord's injunction of instant flight became imperative upon the disciples. The historian does not intimate that the Jews thus pursued the Romans upon the Sabbath, although he carefully notes the fact that a few days previous to this event they did, in their rage, utterly forget the Sabbath and rush out to fight the Romans upon that day. These providential circumstances in the flight of the disciples being made dependent upon their asking such interposition at the hand of God, it is evident that the disciples did not forget the prayer which

the Saviour taught them relative to this event; and that, as a consequence, the Sabbath of the Lord was not forgotten by them. And thus the Lord Jesus in his tender care for his people and in his watchful care in behalf of the Sabbath, showed that he was alike the Lord of his people and the Lord of the Sabbath.⁷⁵

Twenty-six years after the destruction of Jerusalem, the book of Revelation was committed to the beloved disciple. It bears the following deeply interesting date as to place and time:

"I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in THE ISLE that is called PATMOS, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. I was in the Spirit ON THE LORD'S DAY, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last; and, What thou seest, write in a book."⁷⁶

This book is dated in the isle of Patmos, and upon the Lord's day. The place, the day, and the individual, have each a real existence, and not merely a symbolical or mystical one. Thus John, almost at the close of the first century, and long after those texts were written which are now adduced to prove that no distinction in days exists, shows that the Lord's day has as real an existence, as has the isle of Patmos, or as had the beloved disciple himself.

What day, then, is intended by this designation?

Several answers have been returned to this question. 1. It is the gospel dispensation. 2. It is the day of Judgment. 3. It is the first day of the week. 4. It is the Sabbath of the Lord. The first answer cannot be the true one; for it not only renders the day a mystical term, but it involves the absurdity of representing John as writing to Christians sixty-five years after the death of Christ, that the vision which he had just had, was seen by him in the gospel dispensation; as though it were possible for them to be ignorant of the fact that if he had a vision at all he must have it in the existing dispensation.

Nor can the second answer be admitted as the truth. For while it is true that John might have a vision CONCERNING the day of Judgment, it is impossible that he should have a vision ON that day when it was yet future. If it be no more than an absurdity to represent John as dating his vision in the isle of Patmos, on the gospel dispensation, it becomes a positive untruth, if he is made to say that he was in vision at Patmos on the day of Judgment.

The third answer, that the Lord's day is the first day of the week, is now almost universally received as the truth. The text under examination is brought forward with an air of triumph as completing the temple of first-day sacredness, and proving beyond all doubt that that day is indeed the Christian Sabbath. Yet as we have examined this temple with peculiar carefulness, we have discovered that the foundation on which it rests is a thing of the imagination only; and that the pillars by which it is supported exist only in the minds of those who worship at its shrine. It remains to be seen whether the dome which is supposed to be furnished by this text is more real than the pillars on which it rests.

That the first day of the week has no claim to the title of Lord's day, the following facts will show:

1. That, as this text does not define the term Lord's day, we must look elsewhere in the Bible for the evidence that shows the first day to be entitled to such a designation.

2. That Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, the other sacred writers who mention the day, use no other designation for it than first day of the week, a name to which it was entitled as one of the six working days. Yet three of these writers mention it at the very time when it is said to have become the Lord's day; and two of them mention it also some thirty years after that event.

3. That while it is claimed that the Spirit of inspiration, by simply leading John to use the term Lord's day, though he did in no wise connect the first day of the week therewith, did design to fix this as the proper title of the first day of the week, it is a remarkable fact that after John returned from the isle of Patmos he wrote his gospel;⁷⁷ and in that gospel he twice mentioned the first day of the week; yet in each of these instances where it is certain that first-day is intended, no other designation is used than plain first day of the week. This is a most convincing proof that John did not regard the first day of the week as entitled to this name, or any other, expressive of sacredness.

4. What still further decides the point against the first day of the week is the fact that neither the Father nor the Son have ever claimed the first day in any higher sense than they have each of the six days given to man for labor.

5. And what completes the chain of evidence against the claim of first day to this title is the fact that the testimony adduced by first-day advocates to prove that it has been adopted by the Most High in place of that day which he once claimed as his, having been examined, is found to have no such meaning or intent. In setting aside the third answer, also, as not being in accordance with truth, the first day of the week may be properly dismissed with it, as having no claim to our regard as a scriptural institution.⁷⁸

That the Lord's day is the Bible Sabbath, admits of clear and certain proof. The argument stands thus: When God gave to man six days of the week for labor, he did expressly reserve unto himself the seventh, on which he placed his blessing in memory of his own act of resting upon that day, and thence forward, through the Bible, has ever claimed it as his holy day. As he has never put away this sacred day and chosen another, the Sabbath of the Lord is still his holy day. These facts may be traced in the following scriptures. At the close of the Creator's rest, it is said:

"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."⁷⁹

After the children of Israel had reached the wilderness of Sin, Moses said to them on the sixth day:

"To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."⁸⁰

In giving the ten commandments, the Law-giver thus stated his claim to this day:

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. . . . 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."⁸¹

He gives to man the six days on which himself had labored; he reserves as his own that day upon which he had rested from all his work. About eight hundred years after this, God spoke by Isaiah as follows:

"If thou turn away thy foot from THE SABBATH, from doing thy pleasure on MY HOLY DAY, . . . then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth."⁸²

This testimony is perfectly explicit; the Lord's day is the ancient Sabbath of the Bible. The Lord Jesus puts forth the following claim:

"The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."⁸³

Thus, whether it be the Father or the Son whose title is involved, the only day that can be called "the Lord's day" is the Sabbath of the great Creator.⁸⁴ And here, at the close of the Bible history of the Sabbath, two facts of deep interest are presented:

1. That John expressly recognizes the existence of the Lord's day at the very close of the first century.
2. That it pleased the Lord of the Sabbath to place a signal honor upon his own day in that he selected it as the one on which to give that revelation to John, which himself alone had been worthy to receive from the Father.

1 See chap. iii.

2 Matt.5:17-19.

3 Eph.2:13-16; Col.2:14-17.

4 Matt.28:19,20; Mark 16:15.

5 Dan.9:24-27; Acts 9; 10; 11; 26:12-17; Rom.11:13.

6 1Cor.11:25; Jer.31:31-34; Heb.8:8,12; Dan.9:27; Eph.2:11-22.

7 Matt.5:17-19; 1John 3:4,5; Rom.4:15.

8 Heb.9:1-7; Ex.25:1-21; Deut.10:4,5; 1Kings 8:9.

9 Heb., chaps. 7-10; Lev.16.

10 Heb.8:1-5; 9:23,24.

11 Rev.11:19.

12 Ex.25:21,22.

13 Rom.3:19-31; 5:8-21; 8:3,4; 13:8-10; Gal.3:13,14; Eph.6:2,3; James 2:8-12; 1John3:4,5.

14 Ex.19; 20; 24:12; 31:18; Deut.10.

15 Lev.16.

16 Rom.3:19-31; 1John3:4,5;

17 Ps.40:6-8; Heb.10.

18 Heb.9; 10.

19 Jer.31:33; Rom.8:3,4; 2Cor.3:3.

20 Ps.19:7; James 1:25; Ps.40.

21 Rom.5.

22 Rom.3:19.

23 Rom.3:31.

24 Rom.3:20; 1John3:4,5; 2:1,2.

25 Jer.11:16; Rom.11:17-24.

26 Rom.4:16-18; Gal.3:7-9.

27 Ex.19:5,6; 1Pet.2:9,10.

28 Gen.11:1-9; Acts 2:1-11.

29 Rom.7:12,13.

30 James 2:8-12.

31 See chapter x.

32 Acts 13:14.

33 Verse 27.

34 Dr. Bloomfield has the following note on this text: "The words, eis to metaxn sabb., are by many commentators supposed to mean 'on some intermediate week-day.' But that is refuted by verse 44, and the sense expressed in our common version is, no doubt, the true one. It is adopted by the best recent commentators, and confirmed by the ancient versions." Greek Testament with English notes, vol. i. p. 521. And Prof. Hacket has a similar note. - Commentary on Acts, p. 233.

35 Verses 42-44.

36 Acts 15.

37 Acts 15:10,28,29; James 2:8-12.

38 Verses 1,5.

39 Verse 29; 21:25.

40 Ex.34:15,16; Num.25:2; Lev.17:13,14; Gen.9:4; Lev.3:17; Gen.34; Lev.19:29.

41 Acts 15:19-21.

42 Acts 16:12-14.

43 Paul's manner is exemplified by the following texts, in all of which it would appear that the meetings in question were upon the Sabbath. Acts 13:5; 14:1; 17:10,17; 18:19; 19:8.

44 Acts 17:1-4.

45 1Thess.2:14.

46 1Thess.1:7,8.

47 Acts 18:3,4.

48 Acts 10:2,4,7, 30-35; 13:43; 14:1; 16:13-15; 17:4,10-12.

49 1Cor.16:1,2.

50 Vindication of the True Sabbath, Battle Creek ed., pp. 51, 52.

51 Greek Testament with English Notes, vol. ii. p. 173.

52 Sabbath Manual of the American Tract Society, p. 116.

53 Family Testament of the American Tract Society,

54 Eze.46:1.

55 Prof. Hacket remarks on the length of this voyage: "The passage on the apostle's first journey to Europe occupied two days only; see chapter 16:11. Adverse winds or calms would be liable, at any season of the year, to occasion this variation." - Commentary on Acts, p. 329. This shows how little ground there is to claim that Paul broke the Sabbath on this voyage. There was ample time to reach Troas before the Sabbath when he started from Philippi, had not providential causes hindered.

56 Acts 20:6-13.

57 Thus Prof. Whiting renders the phrase: "The disciples being assembled." And Sawyer has it: "We being assembled."

58 1Cor.11:23-26.

59 Matt.26.

60 Acts 2:42-46.

61 This fact has been acknowledged by many first-day commentators. Thus Prof. Hacket comments upon this text: "The Jews reckoned the day from evening to morning, and on that principle the evening of the first day of the week would be our Saturday evening. It Luke reckoned so here, as many commentators suppose, the apostle then waited for the expiration of the Jewish Sabbath, and held his last religious service with the brethren at Troas, at the beginning of the Christian Sabbath, i.e., on Saturday evening, and consequently resumed his journey on Sunday morning." - Commentary on Acts, pp.329,330. But he endeavors to shield the first-day Sabbath from this fatal admission by suggesting that Luke probably reckoned time according to the pagan method, rather than by that which is ordained in the Scriptures! Kitto, in noting the fact that this was an evening meeting, speaks thus: "It has from this last circumstance been inferred that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning [Jahn's Bibl. Antiq., sect. 398], which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection." - Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, article, Lord's day. And Prynne, whose testimony relative to redemption as an argument for the change of the Sabbath has been already quoted, thus states this point: "Because the text saith there were many lights in

the upper room where they were gathered together, and that Paul preached from the time of their coming together till midnight, . . . this meeting of the disciples at Troas, and Paul's preaching to them, began at evening. The sole doubt will be what evening this was. . . . For my own part I conceive clearly that it was upon Saturday night, as we falsely call it, and not the coming Sunday night. . . . Because St. Luke records that it was upon the first day of the week when this meeting was . . . therefore it must needs be on the Saturday, not on our Sunday evening, since the Sunday evening in St. Luke's and the Scripture account was no part of the first, but of the second day; the day ever beginning and ending at evening." Prynne notices the objection drawn from the phrase, "ready to depart on the morrow," as indicating that this departure was not on the same day of the week with his night meeting. The substance of his answer is this: If the fact be kept in mind that the days of the week are reckoned from evening to evening, the following texts, in which in the night, the morning is spoken of as the morrow, will show at once that another day of the week is not necessarily intended by the phrase in question. 1Sam.19:11; Esth.2:14; Zeph.3:3; Acts 23:31,32. - Diss. on Lord's Day Sab., pp.36-41, 1633.

62 See the conclusion of chap. viii.

63 Luke 23:56; 24:1.

64 Rom.14:1-6.

65 James 2:8-12.

66 Rom.7:12,13; 1John 3:4,5.

67 Rom.3.

68 Ex.20.

69 Lev.23. These are particularly enumerated in Col.2, as we have already noticed in chapter vii, and in the concluding part of chapter x.

70 Acts 2:1-11; Rom.2:17; 4:1; 7:1.

71 Ex.16:4,21,27,28.

72 1Cor.15:27; Ps.8.

73 Rev.1:10.

74 To show that Paul regarded Sabbatic observance as dangerous, Gal.4:10, is often quoted; notwithstanding the same individuals claim that Rom.14 proves that it is a matter of perfect indifference; they not seeing that this is to make Paul contradict himself. But if the connection be read from verse 8 to verse 11, it will be seen that the Galatians before their conversion were not Jews, but heathen: and that these days, months, times, and years, were not those of the Levitical law, but those which they had regarded with superstitious reverence while heathen. Observe the stress which Paul lays upon the word "again," in verse 9. And how many that profess the religion of Christ at the present day superstitiously regard certain days as "lucky" or "unlucky days;" though such notions are derived only from heathen distinctions.

75 See chapter x.

76 Rev.1:9-11.

77 Dr. Bloomfield, though himself of a different opinion, speaks thus of the views of others concerning the date of John's gospel: "It has been the general sentiment, both of ancient and modern inquirers, that it was published about the close of the first century." - Greek Testament with English Notes, vol. i. p. 328. Morer says that John "penned his gospel two years later than the Apocalypse, and after his return from Patmos, as St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and Eusebius, affirm." - Dialogues on the Lord's Day, pp. 53, 54. The Paragraph Bible of the London Religious Tract Society, in its preface to the book of John, speaks thus: "According to the general testimony of ancient writers, John wrote his gospel at Ephesus, about the year 97." In support of the same view, see also Religious Encyclopedia, Barnes' Notes (gospel), Bible Dictionary, Cottage Bible, Domestic Bible, Mine Explored, Union Bible Dictionary, Comprehensive Bible, Dr. Hales, Horne, Nevins, Olshausen, &c.

78 The Encyclopedia Britannica, in its article concerning the Sabbath, undertakes to prove that the "religious observation of the first day of the week is of apostolical appointment." After citing and commenting upon all the passages that could be urged in proof of the point, it makes the following candid acknowledgment: "Still, however, it must be owned that these passages are not sufficient to prove the apostolical institution of the Lord's day, or even the actual observation of it." The absence of all scriptural testimony relative to the change of the Sabbath, is accounted for by certain advocates of that theory, not by the frank admission that it never was changed by the Lord, but by quoting John 21:25, assuming the change of the Sabbath as an undoubted truth, but that it was left out of the Bible lest it should make that book too large! They think, therefore, that we should go the Ecclesiastical history to learn this part of our duty; not seeing that, as the fourth commandment still stands in the Bible unrepealed and unchanged, to acknowledge that that change must be sustained wholly outside of the Bible, is to acknowledge that first-day observance is a tradition which makes void the commandment of God. The following chapters will, however, patiently examine the argument for first-day observance drawn from ecclesiastical history.

79 Gen.2:3.

80 Ex.16:23.

81 Ex.20:8-11.

82 Isa.58:13,14.

83 Mark 2:27,28.

84 An able opponent of Sabbatic observance thus speaks relative to the term Lord's day of Rev.1:10: "If a current day was intended, the only day bearing this definition, in either the Old or New Testament, is Saturday, the seventh day of the week."- W. B. Taylor, in the Obligation of the Sabbath, p. 296.

PART II - SECULAR HISTORY

CHAPTER 12

EARLY APOSTASY IN THE CHURCH

General purity of the apostolic churches - Early decline of their piety - False teachers arose in the church immediately after the apostles - The great Romish apostasy began before the death of Paul - An evil thing not rendered good by beginning in the apostolic age - How to decide between truth and error - Age cannot change the fables of men into the truth of God - Historical testimony concerning the early development of the great apostasy - Such an age no standard by which to correct the Bible - Testimony of Bower relative to the traditions of this age - Testimony of Dowling - Dr. Cumming's opinion of the authority of the fathers - Testimony of Adam Clarke - The church of Rome has corrupted the writings of the fathers - Nature of tradition illustrated - The two rules of faith which divide Christendom - The first-day Sabbath can only be sustained by adopting the rule of the Romanists.

The book of Acts is an inspired history of the church. During the period which is embraced in its record, the apostles and their fellow-laborers were upon the stage of action, and under their watchcare the churches of Christ preserved, to a great extent, their purity of life and doctrine. These apostolic churches are thus set forth as the proper examples for all coming time. This book fitly connects the narratives of the four evangelists with the apostolic epistles, and thus joins together the whole New Testament. But when we leave the period embraced in this inspired history, and the churches which were founded and governed by inspired men, we enter upon altogether different times. There is, unfortunately, great truth in the severe language of Gibbon:

"The theologian may indulge the pleasing task of describing religion as she descended from Heaven, arrayed in her native purity. A more melancholy duty is imposed on the historian. He must discover the inevitable mixture of error and corruption, which she contracted in a long residence upon earth, among a weak and degenerate race of beings."¹

What says the book of Acts respecting the time immediately following the labors of Paul? In addressing the elders of the Ephesian church, Paul said:

"For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."²

It follows from this testimony that we are not authorized to receive the teaching of any man simply because he lived immediately after the apostolic age, or even in the days of the apostles themselves. Grievous wolves were to enter the midst of the people of God, and of their own selves were men to arise, speaking perverse things. If it be asked how these are to be distinguished from the true servants of God, this is the proper answer: Those who spoke and acted in accordance with the teachings of the apostles were men of God; those who taught

otherwise were of that class who should speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them.

What say the apostolic epistles relative to this apostasy? To the Thessalonians, it is written:

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."³

To Timothy, in like manner, it is said:

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."⁴

These texts are most explicit in predicting a great apostasy in the church, and in stating the fact that that apostasy had already commenced. The Romish church, the eldest in apostasy, prides itself upon its apostolic character. In the language of Paul to the Thessalonians, already quoted, that great Anti-Christian body may indeed find its claim to an origin in apostolic times vindicated, but its apostolic character most emphatically denied. And herein is found a striking illustration of the fact that an evil thing is not rendered good by the accidental circumstances of its originating in the days of the apostles. Everything, at its commencement, is either right or wrong. If right, it may be known by its agreement with the divine standard. If wrong at its origin, it can never cease to be such. Satan's great falsehood which involved our race in ruin has not yet become the truth, although six thousand years have elapsed since it was uttered. Think of this, ye who worship at the shrine of venerable error. When the fables of men obtained the place of the truth of God, he was thereby dishonored. How, then, can he accept obedience to them as any part of that pure devotion which he requires at our hands? They that worship God must worship him in Spirit and in truth. How many ages must pass over the fables of men before they become changed into divine truth? That these predictions of the New Testament respecting the great apostasy in the church were fully realized, the pages of ecclesiastical history present ample proof. Mr. Dowling, in his *History of Romanism*, bears the following testimony:

"There is scarcely anything which strikes the mind of the careful student of ancient ecclesiastical history with greater surprise than the comparatively early period at which many of the corruptions of Christianity, which are embodied in the Romish system, took their rise; yet it is not to be supposed that when the first originators of many of these unscriptural notions and practices planted those germs of corruption, they anticipated or even imagined they would ever grow into such a vast and hideous system of superstition and error, as is that of popery. . . . Each of the great corruptions of the latter ages took its rise in a manner which it would be harsh to say was deserving of strong reprehension. . . . The worship of images, the invocation of saints, and the superstition of relics, were but expansions of the natural feelings of veneration and affection

cherished toward the memory of those who had suffered and died for the truth."⁵

Robinson, author of the "History of Baptism," bears the following testimony:

"Toward the latter end of the second century most of the churches assumed a new form, the first simplicity disappeared; and insensibly, as the old disciples retired to their graves, their children along with new converts, both Jews and Gentiles, came forward and new modeled the cause."⁶

The working of the mystery of iniquity in the first centuries of the Christian church is thus described by a recent writer:

"During these centuries the chief corruptions of popery were either introduced in principle, or the seeds of them so effectually sown as naturally to produce those baneful fruits which appeared so plentifully at a later period. In Justin Martyr's time, within fifty years of the apostolic age, the cup was mixed with water, and a portion of the elements sent to the absent. The bread, which at first was sent only to the sick, was, in the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, carried home by the people and locked up as a divine treasure for their private use. At this time, too, the ordinance of the supper was given to infants of the tenderest age, and was styled the sacrifice of the body of Christ. The custom of praying for the dead, Tertullian states, was common in the second century, and became the universal practice of the following ages; so that it came in the fourth century to be reckoned a kind of heresy to deny the efficacy of it. By this time the invocation of saints, the superstitious use of images, of the sign of the cross, and of consecrated oil, were become established practices, and pretended miracles were confidently adduced in proof of their supposed efficacy. Thus did that mystery of iniquity, which was already working in the time of the apostles, speedily after their departure, spread its corruptions among the professors of Christianity."⁷

Neander speaks thus of the early introduction of image worship:

"And yet, perhaps, religious images made their way from domestic life into the churches, as early as the end of the third century; and the walls of the churches were painted in the same way."⁸

The early apostasy of the professed church is a fact which rests upon the authority or inspiration, not less than upon that of ecclesiastical history. "The mystery of iniquity," said Paul, "doth already work." We are constrained to marvel that so large a portion of the people of God were so soon removed from the grace of God unto another gospel.

What shall be said of those who go to this period of church history, and even to later times, to correct their Bibles? Paul said that men would rise in the very midst of the elders of the apostolic church, who would speak perverse things, and that men would turn away their ears from the truth, and would be turned unto fables. Are the traditions of this period of sufficient importance to make void God's word? The learned historian of the popes, Archibald Bower, uses the following emphatic language:

"To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. . . . False and lying traditions are

of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them."⁹

Mr. Dowling bears a similar testimony:

" `The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!' Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant how early a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. He learns from the New Testament itself that there were errors in the time of the apostles, and that their pens were frequently employed in combating those errors. Hence, if a doctrine be propounded for his acceptance, he asks, Is it to be found in the inspired word? Was it taught by the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles? . . . More than this, we will add, that though Cyprian, or Jerome, or Augustine, or even the fathers of an earlier age, Tertullian, Ignatius, or Irenaeus, could be plainly shown to teach the unscriptural doctrines and dogmas of Popery, which, however, is by no means admitted, still the consistent Protestant would simply ask, Is the doctrine to be found in the Bible? Was it taught by Christ and his apostles? . . . He who receives a single doctrine upon the mere authority of tradition, let him be called by what name he will, by so doing steps down from the Protestant rock, passes over the line which separates Protestantism from Popery, and can give no valid reason why he should not receive all the earlier doctrines and ceremonies or Romanism upon the same authority."¹⁰

Dr. Cumming of London thus speaks of the authority of the fathers of the early church:

"Some of these were distinguished for their genius, some for their eloquence, a few for their piety, and too many for their fanaticism and superstition. It is recorded by Dr. Delahogue (who was Professor in the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth), on the authority of Eusebius, that the fathers who were really most fitted to be the luminaries of the age in which they lived, were too busy in preparing their flocks for martyrdom to commit anything to writing; and, therefore, by the admission of this Roman Catholic divine, we have not the full and fair exponent of the views of all the fathers of the earlier centuries, but only of those who were most ambitious of literary distinction, and least attentive to their charges. . . . The most devoted and pious of the fathers were busy teaching their flocks; the more vain and ambitious occupied their time in preparing treatises. If all the fathers who signalized the age had committed their sentiments to writing, we might have had a fair representation of the theology of the church of the fathers; but as only a few have done so (many even of their writings being mutilated or lost), and these not the most devoted and spiritually minded, I contend that it is as unjust to judge of the theology of the early centuries by the writings of the few fathers who are its only surviving representatives, as it would be to judge of the theology of the nineteenth century by the sermons of Mr. Newman, the speeches of Dr. Candlish, or the various productions of the late Edward Irving."¹¹

Dr. Adam Clarke bears the following decisive testimony on the same subject:

"But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority; nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine, their authority is, with me, nothing. The word of God alone contains

my creed. On a number of points I can go to the Greek and Latin fathers of the church to know what they believed; and what the people of their respective communions believed; but after all this, I must return to God's word to know what he would have me to believe."¹²

In his life, he uses the following strong language:

"We should take heed how we quote the fathers in proof of the doctrines of the gospel; because he who knows them best, knows that on many of those subjects they blow hot and cold."¹³

The following testimonies will in part explain the unreliable nature of the fathers. Thus Ephraim Pagitt testifies:

"The church of Rome having been conscious of their errors and corruptions, both in faith and manners, have sundry times pretended reformations; yet their great pride and infinite profit, arising from purgatory, pardons, and such like, hath hindered all such reformations. Therefore, to maintain their greatness, errors, and new articles of faith, 1. They have corrupted many of the ancient fathers, and reprinting them, make them speak as they would have them. . . . 2. They have written many books in the names of these ancient writers, and forged many decrees, canons, and councils, to bear false witness to them."¹⁴

And Wm. Reeves testifies to the same fact:

"The church of Rome has had all the opportunities of time, place and power, to establish the kingdom of darkness; and that in coining, clipping, and washing, the primitive records to their own good liking, they have not been wanting to themselves, is notoriously evident."¹⁵

The traditions of the early church are considered by many quite as reliable as the language of the Holy Scriptures. A single instance taken from the Bible will illustrate the character of tradition, and show the amount of reliance that can be placed upon it:

"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved, following (which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?); Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"¹⁶

Here is the account of a tradition which actually originated in the very bosom of the apostolic church, which nevertheless handed down to the following generations an entire mistake. Observe how carefully the word of God corrects this error.

Two rules of faith really embrace the whole Christian world. One of these is the word of God alone; the other is the word of God and the traditions of the church. Here they are:

I. THE RULE OF THE MAN OF GOD, THE BIBLE ALONE.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."¹⁷

II. THE RULE OF THE ROMANIST, THE BIBLE AND TRADITION.

"If we would have the whole rule of Christian faith and practice, we must not be content with those scriptures which Timothy knew from his infancy, that is, with the Old Testament alone; nor yet with the New Testament, without taking along with it the traditions of the apostles and the interpretation of the church, to which the apostles delivered both the book and the true meaning of it."¹⁸

It is certain that the first-day Sabbath cannot be sustained by the first of these rules; for the word of God says nothing respecting such an institution. The second of these rules is necessarily adopted by all those who advocate the sacredness of the first day of the week. For the writings of the fathers and the traditions of the church furnish all the testimony which can be adduced in support of that day. To adopt the first rule is to condemn the first-day Sabbath as a human institution. To adopt the second is virtually to acknowledge that the Romanists are right; for it is by this rule that they are able to sustain their unscriptural dogmas. Mr. W. B. Taylor, an able anti-Sabbatarian writer, states this point with great clearness:

"The triumph of the consistent Roman Catholic over all observers of Sunday, calling themselves Protestants, is indeed complete and unanswerable. . . . It should present a subject of very grave reflection to Christians of the reformed and evangelical denominations, to find that no single argument or suggestion can be offered in favor of Sunday observance that will not apply with equal force and to its fullest extent in sustaining the various other 'holy days' appointed by 'the church.'"¹⁹

Listen to the argument of a Roman Catholic:

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy: you [Protestants] without any precept of Scripture, change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of Scripture, where it is said 'that the first day of the week.'²⁰ Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath days in which those meetings were kept? Or where is it ordained they should be always observed? Or which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate or abolish the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God."²¹

Whoever therefore enters the lists in behalf of the first-day Sabbath, must of necessity do this - though perhaps not aware of the fact - under the banner of the Church of Rome.

1 Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. xv.

2 Acts 20:29, 30.

3 2Thess.2:3,4,7,8.

4 2Tim.4:2-4; 2Pet.2; Jude 4; 1John2:18

5 Book ii. chap. i. sect. 1.

6 Eccl. Researches, chap. vi. p. 51, ed. 1792.

7 The Modern Sabbath Examined, pp. 123, 124.

8 Rose's Neander, p. 184.

9 Hist. of the Popes, vol. i. p. 1, Phila. ed., 1847.

10 History of Romanism, book ii. chap. i. sects. 3, 4.

11 Lectures on Romanism, p. 203.

12 Commentary on Prov.8.

13 Autobiography of Adam Clarke, LL.D., p. 134.

14 Christianography, part ii. p. 59, London, 1636.

15 Translation of the Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, vol. ii. p. 375.

16 John 21:20-23.

17 2Tim.3:16,17.

18 Note of the Douay Bible on 2Tim.3:16,17.

19 Obligation of the Sabbath, pp. 254,255.

20 Acts 20:7; 1Cor.16:2; Rev.1:10.

21 A Treatise of Thirty Controversies.

CHAPTER 13

THE SUNDAY-LORD'S DAY NOT TRACEABLE TO THE APOSTLES

General statement respecting the Ante-Nicene fathers-The change of the Sabbath never mentioned by one of these fathers-Examination of the historical argument for Sunday as the Lord's day - This argument compared with the like argument for the Catholic festival of the Passover.

¹The Ante-Nicene fathers are those Christian writers who flourished after the time of the apostles, and before the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. Those who govern their lives by the volume of Inspiration do not recognize any authority in these fathers to change any precept of that book, nor any authority in them to add any new precepts to it. But those whose rule of life is the Bible as modified by tradition, regard the early fathers of the church as nearly or quite equal in authority with the inspired writers. They declare that the fathers conversed with the apostles; or if they did not do this, they conversed with some who had seen some of the apostles; or at least they lived within a few generations of the apostles, and so learned by tradition, which involved only a few transitions from father to son, what was the true doctrine of the apostles.

Thus with perfect assurance they supply the lack of inspired testimony in behalf of the so-called Christian Sabbath by plentiful quotations from the early fathers. What if there be no mention of the change of the Sabbath in the New Testament? And what if there be no commandment for resting from labor on the first day of the week? Or, what if there be no method revealed in the Bible by which the first day of the week can be enforced by the fourth commandment? They supply these serious omissions in the Scriptures by testimonies which they say were written by men who lived during the first three hundred years after the apostles.

On such authority as this the multitude dare to change the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But next to the deception under which men fall when they are made to believe that the Bible may be corrected by the fathers, is the deception practiced upon them as to what the fathers actually teach. It is asserted that the fathers bear explicit testimony to the change of the Sabbath by Christ as a historical fact, and that they knew that this was so because they had conversed with the apostles, or with some who had conversed with them. It is also asserted that the fathers called the first day of the week the Christian Sabbath, and that they refrained from labor on that day as an act of obedience to the fourth commandment.

Now it is a most remarkable fact that every one of these assertions is false. The people who trust in the fathers as their authority for departing from God's commandment are miserably deceived as to what the fathers teach.

1. The fathers are so far from testifying that the apostles told them Christ changed the Sabbath, that not even one of them ever alludes to the idea of such a change.

2. No one of them ever calls the first day the Christian Sabbath, nor indeed ever calls it a Sabbath of any kind.
3. They never represent it as a day on which ordinary labor was sinful; nor do they represent the observance of Sunday as a act of obedience to the fourth commandment.
4. The modern doctrine of the change of the Sabbath was therefore absolutely unknown in the first centuries of the Christian church.²

But though no statement asserting the change of the Sabbath can be produced from the writings of the fathers of the first three hundred years, it is claimed that their testimony furnishes decisive proof that the first day of the week is the Lord's day of Rev.1:10. The biblical argument that the Lord's day is the seventh day and no other, because that day alone is in the Holy Scriptures claimed by the Father and the Son as belonging in a peculiar sense to each, is given in chapter eleven, and is absolutely decisive. But this is set aside without answer, and the claim of the first day to this honorable distinction is substantiated out of the fathers as follows:

The term Lord's day as a name for the first day of the week can be traced back through the first three centuries, from the fathers who lived toward their close, to the ones next preceding who mention the first day, and so backward by successive steps till we come to one who lived in John's time, and was his disciple; and this disciple of John calls the first day of the week the Lord's day. It follows therefore that John must have intended the first day of the week by the term Lord's day, but did not define his meaning because it was familiarly known by that name in his time. Thus by history we prove the first day of the week to be the Lord's day of Rev.1:10; and then by Rev.1:10, we prove the first day of the week to be the sacred day of this dispensation; for the spirit of inspiration by which John wrote would not have called the first day by this name if it were only a human institution, and if the seventh day was still by divine appointment the Lord's holy day.

This is a concise statement of the strongest argument for first-day sacredness which can be drawn from ecclesiastical history. It is the argument by which first-day writers prove Sunday to be the day called by John the Lord's day. This argument rests upon the statement that Lord's day as a name for Sunday can be traced back to the disciples of John, and that it is the name by which that day was familiarly known in John's time.

But this entire statement is false. The truth is, no writer of the first century, and no one of the second, prior to A.D. 194, who is known to speak of the first day of the week, ever calls it the Lord's day! Yet the first day is seven times mentioned by the sacred writers before John's vision upon Patmos on the Lord's day, and is twice mentioned by John in his gospel which he wrote after his return from that island, and is mentioned some sixteen times by ecclesiastical writers of the second century prior to A.D. 194, and never in a single instance is it called the Lord's day! We give all the instances of its mention in the Bible. Moses, in the beginning, by divine inspiration, gave to the day its name, and though the resurrection of Christ is said to have made it the Lord's day, yet every sacred writer who mentions the day after that event still adheres to the plain name of first day of the week. Here are all the instances in which the inspired writers mention the day:

Moses, B.C. 1490. "The evening and the morning were the first day." Gen.1:5.

Matthew, A.D. 41. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." Matt.28:1.

Paul, A.D. 57. "Upon the first day of the week." 1Cor.16:2.

Luke, A.D. 60. "Now upon the first day of the week." Luke 24:1.

Luke, A.D. 63. "And upon the first day of the week." Acts 20:7.

Mark, A.D. 64. "And very early in the morning, the first day of the week."
Mark 16:2.

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week."
Verse 9.

After the resurrection of Christ, and before John's vision, A.D. 96, the day is six times mentioned by inspired men, and every time as plain first day of the week. It certainly was not familiarly known as Lord's day before the time of John's vision. To speak the exact truth, it was not called by that name at all, nor by any other name equivalent to that, nor is there any record of its being set apart by divine authority as such.

But in the year 96, John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev.1:10. Now it is evident that this must be a day which the Lord had set apart for himself, and which he claimed as his. This was all true in the case of the seventh day, but was not in any respect true in that of the first day. He could not therefore call the first day by this name, for it was not such. But if the Spirit of God designed at this point to create a new institution and to call a certain day the Lord's day which before had never been claimed by him as such, it was necessary that he should specify that new day. He did not define the term, which proves that he was not giving a sacred name to some new institution, but was speaking of a well-known, divinely appointed day. But after John's return from Patmos, he wrote his gospel,³ and in that gospel he twice had occasion to mention the first day of the week. Let us see whether he adheres to the manner of the other sacred writers, or whether, when we know he means the first day, he gives to it a sacred name.

John, A.D. 97. "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early." John 20:1.

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week." Verse 19.

These texts complete the Bible record of the first day of the week. They furnish conclusive evidence that John did not receive new light in vision at Patmos, bidding him call the first day of the week the Lord's day, and when taken with all the instances preceding, they constitute a complete demonstration that the first day was not familiarly known as the Lord's day in John's time, nor indeed known at all by that name then.

Let us now see whether Lord's day as a title for the first day can be traced back to John by means of the writings of the fathers.

The following is a concise statement of the testimony by which the fathers are made to prove that John used the term Lord's day as a name for the first day of the week. A chain of seven successive witnesses, commencing with one who was the disciple of John, and extending forward through several generations, is made to connect and identify the Lord's day of John with the Sunday-Lord's day of a later age. Thus, Ignatius, the disciple of John, is made to speak familiarly of the first day as the Lord's day. This is directly connecting the fathers and

the apostles. Then the epistle of Pliny, A.D. 104, in connection with the Acts of the Martyrs, is adduced to prove that the martyrs in his time and forward were tested as to their observance of Sunday, the question being, "Have you kept the Lord's day?" Next, Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, is made to speak of Sunday as the Lord's day. After this, Theophilus of Antioch, A.D. 168, is brought forward to bear a powerful testimony to the Sunday-Lord's day. Then Dionysius of Corinth, A.D. 170, is made to speak to the same effect. Next Melito of Sardis, A.D. 177, is produced to confirm what the others have said. And finally, Irenaeus, A.D. 178, who had been the disciple of Polycarp, who had been the disciple of John the apostle, is brought forward to bear a decisive testimony in behalf of Sunday as the Lord's day and the Christian Sabbath.

These are the first seven witnesses who are cited to prove Sunday the Lord's day. They bring us nearly to the close of the second century. They constitute the chain of testimony by which the Lord's day of the apostle John is identified with the Sunday-Lord's day of later times.

First-day writers present these witnesses as proving positively that Sunday is the Lord's day of the Scriptures, and the Christian church accepts this testimony in the absence of that of the inspired writers. But the folly of the people, and the wickedness of those who lead them, may be set forth in one sentence:-the first, second, third, fourth, and seventh, of these testimonies are inexcusable frauds, while the fifth and sixth have no decisive bearing upon the case.

1. Ignatius, the first of these witnesses, it is said, must have known Sunday to be the Lord's day, for he calls it such, and he had conversed with the apostle John. But in the entire writings of this father the term Lord's day does not once occur, nor is there in them all a single mention of the first day of the week! The reader will find a critical examination of the epistles of Ignatius in chapter fourteen of this history.

2. It is a pure fabrication that the martyrs in Pliny's time, about A.D. 104, and thence onward, were tested by the question whether they had kept the Sunday-Lord's day. No question at all resembling this is to be found in the words of the martyrs till we come to the fourth century, and then the reference is not at all to the first day of the week. This is fully shown in chapter fifteen.

3. the Bible Dictionary of the American Tract Society, page 379, brings forward the third of these Sunday-Lord's day witnesses in the person of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140. It makes him call Sunday the Lord's day by quoting him as follows:

"Justin Martyr observes that `on the Lord's day all Christians in the city or country meet together, because that is the day of our Lord's resurrection.'"

But Justin never gave to Sunday the title of Lord's day, nor indeed any other sacred title. Here are his words correctly quoted:

"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," etc.⁴

Justin speaks of the day called Sunday. But that he may be made to help establish its title to the name of Lord's day, his words are deliberately changed. Thus the third witness to Sunday as the Lord's day, like the first and the second, is made such by fraud. But the fourth fraud is even worse than the three which precede.

4. The fourth testimony to the Sunday-Lord's day is furnished in Dr. Justin Edwards' Sabbath Manual, p.114:

"Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about A.D. 162, says: 'Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the Lord's day, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead.' "

Dr. Edwards does not pretend to give the place in Theophilus where these words are to be found.

Having carefully and minutely examined every paragraph of the writings of Theophilus several times over, I state emphatically that nothing of the kind is to be found in that writer. He never uses the term Lord's day, and he does not even speak of the first day of the week. These words which are so well adapted to create the impression that the Sunday-Lord's day is of apostolic institution, are put into his mouth by the falsehood of some one.

Here are four frauds, constituting the first four instances of the alleged use of Lord's day as a name for Sunday. Yet it is by means of these very frauds that the Sunday-Lord's day of later ages is identified with the Lord's day of the Bible. Somebody invented these frauds. The use to which they are put plainly indicates the purpose for which they were framed. The title of Lord's day must be proved to pertain to Sunday by apostolic authority. For this purpose these frauds were a necessity. The case of the Sunday-Lord's day may be fitly illustrated by that of the long line of popes. Their apostolic authority as head of the Catholic church depends on their being able to identify the apostle Peter as the first of their line, and to prove that his authority was transmitted to them. There is no difficulty in tracing back their line to the early ages, though the earliest Roman bishops were modest, unassuming men, wholly unlike the popes of after times. But when they come to make Peter the head of their line, and to identify his authority and theirs, they can do it only by fraudulent testimonials. And such is the case with first-day observance. It may be traced back as a festival to the time of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, but the day had then no sacred name, and at that time claimed no apostolic authority. But these must be secured at any cost, and so its title of Lord's day is by a series of fraudulent testimonials traced to the apostle John, as in like manner the authority of the popes is traced to the apostle Peter.

5. The fifth witness of this series is Dionysius of Corinth, A.D. 170. Unlike the four which have been already examined, Dionysius actually uses the term Lord's day, though he says nothing identifying it with the first day of the week. His words are these:

"To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle; in reading which we shall always have our minds stored with admonition, as we shall, also, from that written to us before by Clement."⁵

The epistle of Dionysus to Soter, bishop of Rome, from which this sentence is taken, has perished. Eusebius, who wrote in the fourth century, has preserved to us this sentence, but we have no knowledge of its connection. First-day writers quote Dionysus as the fifth of their witnesses that Sunday is the Lord's day. They say that Sunday was so familiarly known as Lord's day in the time of Dionysius, that he calls it by that name without even stopping to tell what day he meant.

But it is not honest to present Dionysius as a witness to the Sunday-Lord's day, for he makes no application of the term. But it is said he certainly meant Sunday because that was the familiar name of the day in his time, even as is indicated by the fact that he did not define the

term. And how is it known that Lord's day was the familiar name of Sunday in the time of Dionysius? The four witnesses already examined furnish all the evidence in proof of this, for there is no writer this side of Dionysius who calls Sunday the Lord's day until almost the entire period of a generation has elapsed. So Dionysius constitutes the fifth witness of the series by virtue of the fact that the first four witnesses prove that in his time, Lord's day was the common name for first day of the week. But the first four testify to nothing of the kind until the words are by fraud put into their mouths! Dionysius is a witness for the Sunday-Lord's day because that four fraudulent testimonials from the generations preceding him fix this as the meaning of his words!

And the name Lord's day must have been a very common one for first day of the week because Dionysius does not define the term! And yet those who say this know that this one sentence of his epistle remains, while the connection, which doubtless fixed his meaning, has perished.

But Dionysius does not merely use the term Lord's day. He uses a stronger term than this - "the Lord's holy day." Even for a long period after Dionysius, no writer gives to Sunday so sacred a title as "the Lord's holy day." Yet this is the very title given to the Sabbath in the Holy Scriptures, and it is a well-ascertained fact that at this very time it was extensively observed, especially in Greece, the country of Dionysius, and that, too, as an act of obedience to the fourth commandment.⁶

6. The sixth witness in this remarkable series is Melito of Sardis, A.D. 177. The first four, who never use the term Lord's day, are by direct fraud made to call Sunday by that name; the fifth, who speaks of the Lord's holy day, is claimed on the strength of these frauds to have meant by it Sunday; while the sixth is not certainly proved to have spoken of any day! Melito wrote several books now lost, the titles of which have been preserved to us by Eusebius.⁷ One of these, as given in the English version of Eusebius, is "On the Lord's Day." Of course, first-day writers claim that this was a treatise concerning Sunday, though down to this point no writer calls Sunday by this name. But it is an important fact that the word day formed no part of the title of Melito's book. It was a discourse on something pertaining to the Lord - *d peri tes kuriakes logos* - but the essential word *emeras*, day, is wanting. It may have been a treatise on the life of Christ, for Ignatius thus uses these words in connection: *kuriaken xoen*, Lord's life. Like the sentence from Dionysius, it would not even seem to help the claim of Sunday to the title of Lord's day were it not for the series of frauds in which it stands.

7. The seventh witness summoned to prove that Lord's day was the apostolic title of Sunday, is Irenaeus. Dr. Justin Edwards professes to quote him as follows:⁸

"Hence Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A.D. 167 (it should be A.D. 178), says that the Lord's day was the Christian Sabbath. His words are, 'On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God.' "

This witness is brought forward in a manner to give the utmost weight and authority to his words. He was the disciple of that eminent Christian martyr, Polycarp, and Polycarp was the companion of the apostles. What Irenaeus says is therefore in the estimation of many as worthy of our confidence as though we could read it in the writings of the apostles. Does not Irenaeus call Sunday the Christian Sabbath and the Lord's day? Did he not learn these things from Polycarp? And did not Polycarp get them from the fountain head? What need have we of further witness that Lord's day is the apostolic name for Sunday? What if the six earlier

witnesses have failed us? Here is one that says all that can be asked, and he had his doctrine from a man who had his from the apostles!

Why then does not this establish the authority of Sunday as the Lord's day? The first reason is that neither Irenaeus nor any other man can add to or change one precept of the word of God, on any pretense whatever. We are never authorized to depart from the words of the inspired writers on the testimony of men who conversed with the apostles, or rather who conversed with some who had conversed with them. But the second reason is that every word of this pretended testimony of Irenaeus is a fraud! Nor is there a single instance in which the term Lord's day is to be found in any of his works, nor in any fragment of his works preserved in other authors!⁹ And this completes the seven witnesses by whom the Lord's day of the Catholic church is traced back to and identified with the Lord's day of the Bible! It is not till A.D. 194, sixteen years after the latest of these witnesses, that we meet the first instance in which Sunday is called the Lord's day. In other words, Sunday is not called the Lord's day till ninety-eight years after John was upon Patmos, and one hundred and sixty-three years after the resurrection of Christ!

But is not this owing to the fact that the records of that period have perished? By no means; for the day is six times mentioned by the inspired writers between the resurrection of Christ, A.D. 31, and John's vision upon Patmos, A.D. 96; namely, by Matthew, A.D. 41; by Paul, A.D. 57; by Luke, A.D. 60, and A.D. 63; and by Mark, A.D. 64; and always as first day of the week. John, after his return from Patmos, A.D. 97, twice mentions the day, still calling it first day of the week.

After John's time, the day is next mentioned in the so-called epistle of Barnabas, written probably as early as A.D. 140, and is there called "the eighth day." Next it is mentioned by Justin Martyr in his Apology, A.D. 140, once as "the day on which we all hold our common assembly;" once as "the first day on which God . . . made the world;" once as "the same day (on which Christ) rose from the dead;" once as "the day after that of Saturn;" and three times as "Sunday," or "the day of the sun." Next the day is mentioned by Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, A.D. 155, in which he twice calls it the "eighth day;" once "the first of all the days;" once as "the first" "of all the days of the (weekly) cycle;" and twice as "the first day after the Sabbath." Next it is once mentioned by Irenaeus, A.D. 178, who calls it simply the first day of the week." And next it is mentioned once by Bardesanes, who calls it simply "the first of the week." The variety of names by which the day is mentioned during this time is remarkable; but it is never called Lord's day, nor ever called by any sacred name.

Though Sunday is mentioned in so many different ways during the second century, it is not till we come almost to the close of that century that we find the first instance in which it is called Lord's day. Clement, of Alexandria, A.D. 194, uses this title with reference to "the eighth day." If he speaks of a natural day, he no doubt means Sunday. It is not certain, however, that he speaks of a natural day, for his explanation gives to the term an entirely different sense. Here are his words:

"And the Lord's day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the Republic, in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth they are to set out and arrive in four days.' By the meadow is to be understood the fixed sphere, as being a mild and genial spot, and the locality of the pious; and by the seven days, each motion of the seven planets, and the whole practical art which speeds to the end of rest. But after the wandering orbs, the journey leads to Heaven, that is, to the eighth motion

and day. And he says that souls are gone on the fourth day, pointing out the passage through the four elements. But the seventh day is recognized as sacred, not by the Hebrews only, but also by the Greeks; according to which the whole world of all animals and plants revolve."¹⁰

Clement was originally a heathen philosopher, and these strange mysticisms which he here puts forth upon the words of Plato are only modifications of his former heathen notions. Though Clement says that Plato speaks of the Lord's day, it is certain that he does not understand him to speak of literal days nor of a literal meadow. On the contrary, he interprets the meadow to represent "the fixed sphere, as being a mild and genial spot, and the locality of the pious;" which must refer to their future inheritance. The seven days are not so many literal days, but they represent "each motion of the seven planets, and the whole practical art which speeds to the end of rest." This seems to represent the present period of labor which is to end in the rest of the saints. For he adds: "But after the wandering orbs (represented by Plato's seven days) the journey leads to Heaven, that is, to the eighth motion and day." The seven days, therefore, do here represent the period of the Christian's pilgrimage, and the eighth day of which Clement here speaks is not Sunday, but Heaven itself! Here is the first instance of Lord's day as a name for the eighth day, but this eighth day is a mystical one, and means Heaven!

But Clement uses the term Lord's day once more, and this time clearly, as representing, not a literal day, but the whole period of our regenerate life. For he speaks of it in treating of fasting, and he sets forth fasting as consisting in abstinence from sinful pleasures, not only in deeds, to use his distinction, as forbidden by the law, but in thoughts, as forbidden by the gospel. Such fasting pertains to the entire life of the Christian. And thus Clement sets forth what is involved in observing this duty in the gospel sense:

"He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself."¹¹

From this statement we learn, not merely his idea of fasting, but also that of celebrating the Lord's day, and glorifying the resurrection of Christ. This, according to Clement, does not consist in paying special honors to Sunday, but in abandoning an evil disposition, and in assuming that of the Gnostic, a Christian sect to which he belonged. Now it is plain that this kind of Lord's-day observance pertains to no one day of the week, but embraces the entire life of the Christian. Clement's Lord's day was not a literal, but a mystical, day, embracing, according to this, his second use of the term, the entire regenerate life of the Christian; and according to his first use of the term, embracing also the future life in Heaven. And this view is confirmed by Clement's statement of the contrast between the Gnostic sect to which he belonged and other Christians. He says of their worship that it was "NOT ON SPECIAL DAYS, as some others, but doing this continually in our whole life." And he speaks further of the worship of the Gnostic that it was "not in a specified place, or selected temple, or at certain festivals, and on appointed days, but during his whole life."¹²

It is certainly a very remarkable fact that the first writer who speaks of the Lord's day as the eighth day uses the term, not with reference to a literal, but a mystical, day. It is not Sunday, but the Christian's life, or Heaven itself! This doctrine of a perpetual Lord's day, we shall find alluded to in Tertullian, and expressly stated in Origen, who are the next two writers that use the term Lord's day. But Clement's mystical or perpetual Lord's day shows that he had no idea

that John, by Lord's day, meant Sunday; for in that case, he must have recognized that as the true Lord's day, and the Gnostics' special day of worship.

Tertullian, A.D. 200, is the next writer who uses the term Lord's day. He defines his meaning, and fixes the name upon the day of Christ's resurrection. Kitto¹³ says this is "the earliest authentic instance" in which the name is thus applied, and we have proved this true by actual examination of every writer, unless the reader can discover some reference to Sunday in Clement's mystical eighth day. Tertullian's words are these:

"We, however (just as we have received), only on the Lord's day of the resurrection (solo die dominico resurrectionis) ought to guard, not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude; deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil. Similarly, too, in the period of Pentecost; which period we distinguish by the same solemnity of exultation."¹⁴

Twice more does Tertullian use the term Lord's day, and once more does he define it, this time calling it the "eighth day." And in each of these two cases does he place the day which he calls Lord's day in the same rank with the Catholic festival of Pentecost, even as he does in the instance already quoted. As the second instance of Tertullian's use of Lord's day, we quote a portion of the rebuke which he addressed to his brethren for mingling with the heathen in their festivals. He says:

"Oh! better fidelity of the nations to their own sects, which claims no solemnity of the Christians for itself! Not the Lord's day, not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians. We are not apprehensive lest we seem to be heathens! If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the heathens each festive day occurs but once annually; you have a festive day every eighth day."¹⁵

The festival which Tertullian here represents as coming every eighth day was no doubt the one which he has just called the Lord's day. Though he elsewhere¹⁶ speaks of the Sunday festival as observed at least by some portion of the heathen, he here speaks of the Lord's day as unknown to those heathen of whom he now writes. This strongly indicates that the Sunday festival had but recently begun to be called by the name of Lord's day. But he once more speaks of the Lord's day:

"As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birth-day honors. We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday (the Pentecost). We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground. At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign [of the cross].

"If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom as their strengthener, and faith as their observer. That reason will support tradition, and custom, and faith, you will either yourself perceive, or learn from some one who has."¹⁷

This completes the instances in which Tertullian uses the term Lord's day, except a mere allusion to it in his discourse on Fasting. It is very remarkable that in each of the three cases, he puts it on a level with the festival of Whitsunday, or Pentecost. He also associates it directly with "offerings for the dead" and with the use of "the sign of the cross." When asked for authority from the Bible for these things, he does not answer, "We have the authority of John for the Lord's day, though we have nothing but tradition for the sign of the cross and offerings for the dead." On the contrary, he said there was no Scripture injunction for any of them. If it be asked, How could the title of Lord's day be given to Sunday except by tradition derived from the apostles? the answer will be properly returned, What was the origin of offerings for the dead? And how did the sign of the cross come into use among Christians? The title of Lord's day as a name for Sunday is no nearer apostolic than is the sign of the cross, and offerings for the dead; for it can be traced no nearer to apostolic times than can these most palpable errors of the great apostasy.

Clement taught a perpetual Lord's day; Tertullian held a similar view, asserting that Christians should celebrate a perpetual Sabbath, not by abstinence from labor, but from sin.¹⁸ Tertullian's method of Sunday observance will be noticed hereafter.

Origen, A.D. 231, is the third of the ancient writers who call "the eighth day" the Lord's day. He was the disciple of Clement, the first writer who makes this application. It is not strange, therefore, that he should teach Clement's doctrine of a perpetual Lord's day, nor that he should state it even more distinctly than did Clement himself. Origen, having represented Paul as teaching that all days are alike, continues thus:

"If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as for example the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words, and deeds, serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day."¹⁹

This was written some forty years after Clement had propounded his doctrine of the Lord's day. The imperfect Christian might honor a Lord's day which stood in the same rank with the Preparation, the Passover, and the Pentecost. But the perfect Christian observed the true Lord's day, which embraced all the days of his regenerate life. Origen uses the term Lord's day for two different days. 1. For a natural day, which in his judgment stood in the same rank with the Preparation day, the Passover, and the Pentecost. 2. For a mystical day, as did Clement, which is the entire period of the Christian's life. The mystical day, in his estimation, was the true Lord's day. It therefore follows that he did not believe Sunday to be the Lord's day by apostolic appointment. But, after Origen's time, Lord's day becomes a common name for the so-called eighth day. Yet these three men, Clement, Tertullian, and Origen, who first make this application, not only do not claim that this name was given to the day by the apostles, but do plainly indicate that they had no such idea. Offerings for the dead and the use of the sign of the cross are found as near to apostolic times as is the use of Lord's day as a name for Sunday. The three have a common origin, as shown by Tertullian's own words. Origen's views of the Sabbath, and of the Sunday festival, will be noticed hereafter.

Such is the case with the claim of Sunday to the title of Lord's day. The first instance of its use, if Clement be supposed to refer to Sunday, is not till almost one century after John was in vision upon Patmos. Those who first call it by that name had no idea that it was such by divine or apostolic appointment, as they plainly show. In marked contrast with this is the

Catholic festival of the Passover. Though never commanded in the New Testament, it can be traced back to men who say that they had it from the apostles!

Thus the churches of Asia Minor had the festival from Polycarp who, as Eusebius states the claim of Polycarp, had "observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles with whom he associated."²⁰ Socrates says of them that they maintain that this observance "was delivered to them by the apostle John."²¹ Anatolius says of these Asiatic Christians that they received "the rule from an unimpeachable authority, to wit, the evangelist John."²²

Nor was this all. The western churches also, with the church of Rome at their head, were strenuous observers of the Passover festival. They also traced the festival to the apostles. Thus Socrates says of them: "The Romans and those in the western parts assure us that their usage originated with the apostles Peter and Paul."²³ But he says these parties cannot prove this by written testimony. Sozomen says of the Romans, with respect to the Passover festival, that they "have never deviated from their original usage in this particular; the custom having been handed down to them by the holy apostles Peter and Paul."²⁴

If the Sunday-Lord's day could be traced to a man who claimed to have celebrated it with John and other of the apostles, how confidently would this be cited as proving positively that it is an apostolic institution! And yet this can be done in the case of the Passover festival! Nevertheless, a single fact in the case of this very festival is sufficient to teach us the folly of trusting in tradition. Polycarp claimed that John and other of the apostles taught him to observe the festival on the fourteenth day of the first month, whatever day of the week it might be; while the elders of the Roman church asserted that Peter and Paul taught them that it must be observed on the Sunday following Good Friday!²⁵

The Lord's day of the Catholic church can be traced no nearer to John than A.D. 194, or perhaps in strict truth to A.D. 200, and those who then use the name show plainly that they did not believe it to be the Lord's day by apostolic appointment. To hide these fatal facts by seeming to trace the title back to Ignatius the disciple of John, and thus to identify Sunday with the Lord's day of that apostle, a series of remarkable frauds has been committed which we have had occasion to examine. But even could the Sunday-Lord's day be traced to Ignatius, the disciple of John, it would then come no nearer being an apostolic institution than does the Catholic festival of the Passover, which can be traced to Polycarp, another of John's disciples, who claimed to have received it from John himself!

1 The writer has prepared a small work entitled, "The complete Testimony of the Fathers of the first Three Centuries concerning the Sabbath and First Day," in which, with the single exception of Origen, some of whose works were not at that time accessible, every passage in the fathers which gives their views of the Sabbath and first-day is presented. This pamphlet can be had of the publishers of the present work for fifteen cents. To save space in this History, a general statement of the doctrine of the fathers is here made with brief quotations of their words. But in "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers" every passage is given in their own words, and to this little work the reader is referred.

2 Those who dispute these statements are invited to present the words of the fathers which modify or disprove them. The reader who may not have access to the writing of the fathers is referred to the pamphlet already mentioned in which their complete testimony is given.

- 3 See the testimony on page 189 of this work.
- 4 Justin Martyr's First Apology, chap. lxvii.
- 5 Eusebius's Eccl. Hist., book iv. chap. xxiii.
- 6 See chap. xviii. of this History.
- 7 See his Ecclesiastical History, book iv. chap. xxvi.
- 8 Sabbath Manual, p. 114.
- 9 See chap. xvi. of this work; and also Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 44-52.
- 10 The Miscellanies of Clement, book v. chap. xiv.
- 11 The Miscellanies of Clement, book vii. chap. xii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 61.
- 12 The Miscellanies, book vii. chap. vii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 62.
- 13 Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, original edition, article Lord's Day.
- 14 Tertullian on Prayer, chap. xxiii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 67.
- 15 On Idolatry, chap. xiv.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 66.
- 16 Ad Nationes, book i. chap. xiii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 70.
- 17 De Corona, sects. 3 and 4; Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 68, 69.
- 18 An Answer to the Jews, chap. iv.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 73.
- 19 Against Celcus, book 8. chap. xxii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 87.
- 20 Eusebius's Eccl. Hist., book v. chap. xxiv.
- 21 Socrates's Eccl. Hist., book v. chap. xxii.
- 22 Anatolius, Tenth Fragment.
- 23 Socrates's Eccl. Hist., book v. chap. xxii.
- 24 Sozomen's Eccl. Hist., book vii. chap. xviii.; see also Mosheim, book i. cent. 2, part ii. chap. iv. sect. 9.
- 25 Socrates's Eccl. Hist., book v. chap. xxii.; McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. iii. p. 13; Bingham's Antiquities, p. 1149.

CHAPTER 14

THE FIRST WITNESSES FOR SUNDAY

Origin of Sunday observance the subject of present inquiry - Contradictory statements of Mosheim and Neander - The question between them stated, and the true data for deciding that question - The New Testament furnishes no support for Mosheim's statement - Epistle of Barnabas a forgery - The testimony of Pliny determines nothing in the case - the epistle of Ignatius probably spurious, and certainly interpolated so far as it is made to sustain Sunday - Decision of the question.

The first day of the week is now almost universally observed as the Christian Sabbath. The origin of this institution is still before us as the subject of inquiry. This is presented by two eminent church historians; but so directly do they contradict each other, that it is a question of curious interest to determine which of them states the truth. Thus Mosheim writes respecting the first century:

"All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers."¹

Now let us read what Neander, the most distinguished of church historians, says of this apostolic authority for Sunday observance:

"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 laboring on Sunday as a sin."²

How shall we determine which of these historians is in the right? Neither of them lived in the apostolic age of the church. Mosheim was a writer of the eighteenth century, and Neander, of the nineteenth. Of necessity therefore they must learn the facts in the case from the writings of that period which have come down to us. These contain all the testimony which can have any claim to be admitted in deciding this case. These are, first, the inspired writings of the New Testament; second, the reputed productions of such writers of that age as are supposed to mention the first day, viz., the epistle of Barnabas; the letter of Pliny, governor of Bythinia, to the emperor Trajan; and the epistle of Ignatius. These are all the writings prior to the middle of the second century - and this is late enough to amply cover the ground of Mosheim's statement - which can be introduced as even referring to the first day of the week.

The questions to be decided by this testimony are these: Did the apostles set apart Sunday for divine worship (as Mosheim affirms)? or does the evidence in the case show that the festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance (as is affirmed by Neander)?

It is certain that the New Testament contains no appointment of Sunday for the solemn celebration of public worship. And it is equally true that there is no example of the church of Jerusalem on which to found such observance. The New Testament therefore furnishes no support³ for the statement of Mosheim.

The three epistles which have come down to us purporting to have been written in the apostolic age, or immediately subsequent to that age, next come under examination. These are all that remain to us of a period more extended than that embraced in the statement of Mosheim. He speaks of the first century only; but we summon all the writers of that century, and of the following one prior to the time of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, who are even supposed to mention the first day of the week. Thus the reader is furnished with all the data in the case. The epistle of Barnabas speaks as follows in behalf of first-day observance:

"Lastly he saith unto them, Your new-moons and your sabbaths I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it; the sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep, are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made; when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world; for which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus arose from the dead, and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into Heaven."⁴

It might be reasonably concluded that Mosheim would place great reliance upon this testimony as coming from an apostle, and as being somewhat better suited to sustain the sacredness of Sunday than anything previously examined by us. Yet he frankly acknowledges that this epistle is spurious. Thus he says:

"The epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew, who, most probably, lived in this century, and whose mean abilities and superstitious attachment to Jewish fables, show, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions, that he must have been a very different person from the true Barnabas, who was St. Paul's companion."⁵

In another work, Mosheim says of this epistle:

"As to what is suggested by some, of its having been written by that Barnabas who was the friend and companion of St. Paul, the futility of such a notion is easily to be made apparent from the letter itself; several of the opinions and interpretations of Scripture which it contains, having in them so little of either truth, dignity or force, as to render it impossible that they could ever have proceeded from the pen of a man divinely instructed."⁶

Neander speaks thus of this epistle:

"It is impossible that we should acknowledge this epistle to belong to that Barnabas who was worthy to be the companion of the apostolic labors of St. Paul."⁷

Prof. Stuart bears a similar testimony:

"That a man by the name of Barnabas wrote this epistle I doubt not; that the chosen associate of Paul wrote it, I with many others must doubt."⁸

Dr. Killen, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of Ireland, uses the following language:

"The tract known as the Epistle of Barnabas was probably composed in A.D. 135. It is the production apparently of a convert from Judaism who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretation of Scripture."⁹

Prof. Hackett bears the following testimony:

"The letter still extant, which was known as that of Barnabas even in the second century, cannot be defended as genuine."¹⁰

Mr. Milner speaks of the reputed epistle of Barnabas as follows:-

"It is a great injury to him to apprehend the epistle, which goes by his name, to be his."¹¹

Kitto speaks of this production as,

"The so-called epistle of Barnabas, probably a forgery of the second century."¹²

Says the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, speaking of the Barnabas of the New Testament:

"He could not be the author of a work so full of forced allegories, extravagant and unwarrantable explications of Scripture, together with stories concerning beasts, and such like conceits, as make up the first part of this epistle."¹³

Eusebius, the earliest of church historians, places this epistle in the catalogue of spurious books. Thus he says:

"Among the spurious must be numbered both the books called, 'The Acts of Paul,' and that called, 'Pastor,' and 'The Revelation of Peter.' Besides these the books called 'The Epistle of Barnabas,' and what are called, 'The Institutions of the Apostles.'"¹⁴

Sir Wm. Domville speaks as follows:

"But the epistle was not written by Barnabas; it was not merely unworthy of him, - it would be a disgrace to him, and what is of much more consequence, it would be a disgrace to the Christian religion, as being the production of one of the authorized teachers of that religion in the times of the apostles, which circumstance would seriously damage the evidence of its divine origin. Not being the epistle of Barnabas, the document is, as regards the Sabbath question, nothing more than the testimony of some unknown writer to the practice of Sunday observance by some Christians of some unknown community, at some uncertain period of the Christian era, with no sufficient ground for believing that period to have been the first century."¹⁵

Coleman bears the following testimony:

"The epistle of Barnabas, bearing the honored name of the companion of Paul in his missionary labors, is evidently spurious. It abounds in fabulous narratives, mystic, allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, and fanciful conceits, and is generally agreed by the learned to be of no authority."¹⁶

As a specimen of the unreasonable and absurd things contained in this epistle, the following passage is quoted:

"Neither shalt thou eat of the hyena: that is, again, be not an adulterer; nor a corrupter of others; neither be like to such. And wherefore so? Because that creature every year changes its kind, and is sometimes male, and sometimes female."¹⁷

Thus first-day historians being allowed to decide the case, we are authorized to treat this epistle as a forgery. And whoever will read its ninth chapter - for it will not bear quoting - will acknowledge the justice of this conclusion. This epistle is the only writing purporting to come from the first century except the New Testament, in which the first day is even referred to. That this furnishes no support for Sunday observance, even Mosheim acknowledges.

The next document that claims our attention is the letter of Pliny, the Roman governor of Bythinia, to the emperor Trajan. It was written about A.D. 104. He says of the Christians of his province:

"They affirmed that the whole of their guilt or error was, that they met on a certain stated day, before it was light, and addressed themselves in a form of prayer to Christ, as to some god, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery; never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then re-assemble to eat in common a harmless meal."¹⁸

This epistle of Pliny certainly furnishes no support for Sunday observance. The case is presented in a candid manner by Coleman. He says of this extract:

"This statement is evidence that these Christians kept a day as holy time, but whether it was the last or the first day of the week, does not appear."¹⁹

Charles Buck, an eminent first-day writer, saw no evidence in this epistle of first-day observance, as is manifest from the indefinite translation which he gives it. Thus he cites the epistle:

"These persons declare that their whole crime, if they are guilty, consists in this: that on certain days they assemble before sunrise to sing alternately the praises of Christ as of God."²⁰

Tertullian, who wrote A.D. 200, speaks of this very statement of Pliny thus:

"He found in their religious services nothing but meetings at early morning for singing hymns to Christ and God, and sealing home their way of life by a united pledge to be faithful to their religion, forbidding murder, adultery, dishonesty, and other crimes."²¹

Tertullian certainly found in this no reference to the festival of Sunday.

Mr. W. B. Tayler speaks of this stated day as follows:

"As the Sabbath day appears to have been quite as commonly observed at this date as the sun's day (if not even more so), it is just as probable that this 'stated day' referred to by Pliny was the seventh day, as that it was the first day; though the latter is generally taken for granted."²²

Taking for granted the very point that should be proved, is no new feature in the evidence thus far examined in support of first-day observance. Although Mosheim relies on this expression of Pliny as a chief support of Sunday, yet he speaks thus of the opinion of another learned man:

"B. Just. Hen. Boehmer, would indeed have us to understand this day to have been the same with the Jewish Sabbath."²³

This testimony of Pliny was written a few years subsequent to the time of the apostles. It relates to a church which probably had been founded by the apostle Peter.²⁴ It is certainly far more probable that this church, only forty years after the death of Peter, was keeping the fourth commandment, than that it was observing a day never enjoined by divine authority. It must be conceded that this testimony from Pliny proves nothing in support of Sunday observance; for it does not designate what day of the week was thus observed.

The epistles of Ignatius of Antioch so often quoted in behalf of first-day observance, next claim our attention. He is represented as saying:

"Wherefore if they who are brought up in these ancient laws came nevertheless to the newness of hope; no longer observing sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's day, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, whom yet some deny (by which mystery we have been brought to believe, and therefore wait that we may be found the disciples of Jesus Christ, our only master): how shall we be able to live different from him; whose disciples the very prophets themselves being, did by the Spirit expect him as their master."²⁵

Two important facts relative to this quotation are worthy of particular notice: 1. That the epistles of Ignatius are acknowledged to be spurious by first-day writers of high authority; and those epistles which some of them except as possibly genuine, do not include in their number the epistle to the Magnesians from which the above quotation is made, nor do they say anything relative to first-day observance. 2. That the epistle to Magnesians would say nothing of any day, were it not that the word day had been fraudulently inserted by the translator! In support of the first of these propositions the following testimony is adduced. Dr. Killen speaks as follows:

"In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the mantle of a hoary antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused to receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered form, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was roused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real epistles. Greece, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, were ransacked in

search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general gratulation; it is confessed that four of the epistles so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal; and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and sternly disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three epistles abundantly attests that, like the last three books of the Sibyl, they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture."²⁶

The same writer thus states the opinion of Calvin:

"It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that, upwards of three hundred years ago, he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles."²⁷

Of the three epistles of Ignatius still claimed as genuine, Prof. C. F. Hudson speaks as follows:

"Ignatius of Antioch was martyred probably A.D. 115. Of the eight epistles ascribed to him, three are genuine; viz., those addressed to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans."²⁸

It will be observed that the three epistles which are here mentioned as genuine do not include that epistle from which the quotation in behalf of Sunday is taken, and it is a fact also that they contain no allusion to Sunday. Sir. Wm. Domville, an anti-Sabbatarian writer, uses the following language:

"Every one at all conversant with such matters is aware that the works of Ignatius have been more interpolated and corrupted than those of any other of the ancient fathers; and also that some writings have been attributed to him which are wholly spurious."²⁹

Robinson, an eminent English Baptist writer of the last century, expresses the following opinion of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, Barnabas, and others:

"If any of the writings attributed to those who are called apostolical fathers, as Ignatius, teacher at Antioch, Polycarp, at Smyrna, Barnabas, who was half a Jew, and Hermas, who was brother to Pius, teacher at Rome, if any of these be genuine, of which there is great reason to doubt, they only prove the piety and illiteracy of the good men. Some are worse, and the best not better, than the godly epistles of the lower sort of Baptists and Quakers in the time of the civil war in England. Barnabas and Hermas both mention baptism; but both of these books are contemptible reveries of wild and irregular geniuses."³⁰

The doubtful character of these Ignatian epistles is thus sufficiently attested. The quotation in behalf of Sunday is not taken from one of the three epistles that are still claimed as genuine; and what is still further to be observed, it would say nothing in behalf of any day were it not for an extraordinary license, not to say fraud, which the translator has used in inserting the word day. This fact is shown with critical accuracy by Kitto, whose Cyclopedia is in high repute among first-day scholars. Thus he presents the original of Ignatius with comments and a translation as follows:

"We must here notice one other passage . . . 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. . . . The passage is as follows:

Ei oun oi en palaios pragmasin anastrophentes eis kainoteta elpidos elthon-meketi sabbatixontes, alla kata kuriaken xoen xontes-(en e kai e xoe emon aneteilen oi autou, etc.)³¹

"Now many commentators assume (on what ground does not appear), that after kuriaken [Lord's] the word emeran [day] is to be understood. . . . Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of a substantive to which autou can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring by the introduction of emera. Now if we take kuriake xon as simply 'the life of the Lord,' having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to autou. . . . 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, &c.). . . .

"On this view the passages does not refer at all to the Lord's day; but even on the opposite supposition it can not 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 emera [day] is purely conjectural."³²

The learned Morer, a clergyman of the church of England, confirms this statement of Kitto. He renders Ignatius thus:

"If therefore they who were well versed in the works of ancient days came to newness of hope, not sabbatizing, but living according to the dominical life, &c. . . . The Medicean copy, the best and most like that of Eusebius, leaves no scruple, because xoen is expressed and determines the word dominical to the person of Christ, and not to the day of his resurrection."³³

Sir Wm. Domville speaks on this point as follows:

"Judging therefore by the tenor of the epistle itself, the literal translation of the passage in discussion, 'no longer observing sabbaths, but living according to the Lord's life,' appears to give its true and proper meaning; and if this be so, Ignatius, whom Mr. Gurney³⁴ puts forward as a material witness to prove the observance of the Lord's day in the beginning of the second century, fails to prove any such fact, it appearing on a thorough examination of his testimony that he does not even mention the Lord's day, nor in any way allude to the religious observance of it, whether by that name or by any other."³⁵

It is manifest, therefore, that this famous quotation has no reference whatever to the first day of the week, and that it furnishes no evidence that that day was known in the time of Ignatius by the title of Lord's day.³⁶ The evidence is now before the reader which must determine whether Moshieim or Neander spoke in accordance with the facts in the case. And thus it appears that in the New Testament, and in the uninspired writers of the period referred to, there is absolutely nothing to sustain the strong Sunday statement of Mosheim. When we come to the fourth century, we shall find a statement by him which essentially modifies what

he has here said. Of the epistles ascribed to Barnabas, Pliny, and Ignatius, we have found that the first is a forgery; that the second speaks of a stated day without defining what one; and that the third, which is probably a spurious document, would say nothing relative to Sunday, if the advocates of first-day sacredness had not interpolated the word day into the document! We can hardly avoid the conclusion that Mosheim spoke on this subject as a doctor of divinity, and not as a historian; and with the firmest conviction that we speak the truth, we say with Neander, "The festival of Sunday was always only a human ordinance."

1 Maclaine's Mosheim, cent. 1, part ii. chap. iv. sec. 4. I have given Maclaine's translation, not because it is an accurate version of Mosheim, but because it is so much used in support of the first day Sabbath. Maclaine in his preface to Mosheim says: "I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author." And he tells us what these liberties were by saying that he had "often added a few sentences, to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finished." The present quotation is an instance of these liberties. Dr. Murdock of New Haven who has given "a close, literal version" of Mosheim, gives the passage thus:

"The Christians of this century, assembled for the worship of God, and for their advancement in piety, on the first day of the week, the day on which Christ reassumed his life: for that this day was set apart for religious worship, by the apostles themselves, and that, after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed, we have unexceptionable testimony." - Murdock's Mosheim, cent. 1, part ii. chap. iv. sec. 4.

2 Neander's Church History, translated by H. J. Rose, p. 186. To break the force of this strong statement of Neander that "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," two things have been said:

1. That Neander, in a later edition of his work, retracted this declaration. It is true that in re-writing his work he omitted this sentence. But he inserted nothing of a contrary character, and the general tenor of the revised edition is in this place precisely the same as in that from which this out-spoken statement is taken.

In proof of this, we cite from the later edition of Neander his statement in this very place of what constituted Sunday observance in the early church. He says:

"Sunday was distinguished as a day of joy, by being exempted from fasts, and by the circumstance that prayer was performed on this day in a standing and not in a kneeling posture, as Christ, by his resurrection, had raised up fallen man again to Heaven." - Torrey's Neander, vol. i. p. 295, ed. 1852.

This is an accurate account of early Sunday observance, as we shall hereafter show; and that such observance was only a human ordinance, of which no feature was ever commanded by the apostles, will be very manifest to every person who attempts to find any precept for any particular of it in the New Testament.

2. But the other method of setting aside this testimony of Neander is to assert that he did not mean to deny that the apostles established a divine command for Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, but meant to assert that they did not

establish a divine command for Sunday as a Catholic festival! Those who make this assertion must know that it is false. Neander expressly denies that the apostles either constituted or recognized Sunday as a Sabbath, and he represents Sunday as a mere festival from the very first of its observance, and established only by human authority.

3 See chapters x. and xi., in which the New Testament has been carefully examined on this point.

4 Epistle of Barnabas 13:9, 10; or, as others divide the epistle, chapter 15.

5 Eccl. Hist., cent. 1, part ii. chap. ii. sect. 21.

6 Historical Commentaries, cent. 1, sect. 53.

7 Rose's Neander, p. 407.

8 Note appended to Gurney's History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath, p. 86.

9 Ancient Church, pp. 367, 368.

10 Commentary on Acts, p. 251.

11 History of the Church, cent. 1, chap. xv.

12 Cyc. Bib. Lit., art. Lord's day, tenth ed. 1858.

13 Encyc. of Rel. Knowl., art. Barnabas' Epistle.

14 Eccl. Hist., Book iii. chap. xxv.

15 The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in proof of a Christian Sabbath, p. 233.

16 Ancient Christianity, chap. i. sect. 2.

17 Epistle of Barnabas, 9:8. In some editions it is chap. 10.

18 Coleman's Ancient Christianity, pp. 35, 36.

19 Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 26, sect. 2.

20 Buck's Theological Dictionary, art. Christians.

21 Tertullian's Apology, sect. 2.

22 Obligation of the Sabbath, p. 300.

23 Historical Commentaries, cent. 1, sect. 47.

24 1Pet.1:1. See Clarke's Commentary, preface to the epistles of Peter.

25 Ignatius to the Magnesians, 3:3-5; or, as others divide the epistle, chap. 9.

26 Ancient Church, pp. 413, 414.

27 Id. p. 427.

28 Future Life, p. 290.

29 Examination of the Six Tests, p. 237.

30 Ecclesiastical Researches, chap. vi. pp. 50, 51, ed. 1792.

31 Ignatius ad Magnesios, sect. 9.

32 Cyc. Bib. Lit., art. Lord's day.

33 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, pp. 206, 207.

34 A first-day writer, author of the "History, Authority, and Use, of the Sabbath."

35 Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 250, 251.

36 For a more full statement of the case of Ignatius, see the "Testimony of the Fathers," pp. 26-30. The quotation from Ignatius examined in this chapter is there shown, according to the connection, to relate, not to New Testament Christians, but to the ancient prophets.

CHAPTER 15

EXAMINATION OF A FAMOUS FALSEHOODE

Were the martyrs in Pliny's time and afterward tested by the question whether they had kept Sunday or not? - Argument in the affirmative quoted from Edwards-Its origin-No facts to sustain such an argument prior to the fourth century-A single instance at the opening of that century all that can be claimed in support of the assertion-Sunday not even alluded to in that instance-Testimony of Mosheim relative to the work in which this is found.

Certain doctors of divinity have made a special effort to show that the "stated day" of Pliny's epistle is the first day of the week. For this purpose they adduce a fabulous narrative which the more reliable historians of the church have not deemed worthy of record. The argument is this: That in Pliny's time and afterward, that is, from the close of the first century and onward, whenever the Christians were brought before their persecutors for examination, they were asked whether they had kept the Lord's day, this term being used to designate the first day of the week. And hence two facts are asserted to be established: 1. That when Pliny says that the Christians who were examined by him were accustomed to meet on a stated day, that day was undoubtedly the first day of the week. 2. That the observance of the first day of the week was the grand test by which Christians were known to their heathen persecutors. 3. That Lord's day was the name by which the first day of the week was known in the time of Pliny, a few years after the death of John. To prove these points, Dr. Edwards makes the following statement:

"Hence the fact that their persecutors, when they wished to know whether men were Christians, were accustomed to put to them this question, viz., 'Dominicum servasti?' - 'Hast thou kept the Lord's day?' If they had they were Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity, in distinction from Jews and pagans. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they must be put to death. And what, when they continued steadfast, was their answer? 'Christianus sum; intermittere non possum;'-'I am a Christian; I cannot omit it.' It is a badge of my religion, and the man who assumes it must of course keep the Lord's day, because it is the will of his Lord; and should he abandon it, he would be an apostate from his religion."¹

Mr. Gurney, an English first-day writer of some note, uses the same argument and for the same purpose.² The importance attached to this statement, and the prominence given to it by the advocates of first-day sacredness, render it proper that its merits should be examined. Dr. Edwards gives no authority for his statement; but Mr. Gurney traces the story to Dr. Andrews, bishop of Winchester, who claimed to have taken it from the Acta Martyrum, an ancient collection of the acts of the martyrs. It was in the early part of the seventeenth century that Bishop Andrews first brought this forward in his speech in the court of Star Chamber, against Thraske, who was accused before that arbitrary tribunal of maintaining the heretical opinion that Christians are bound to keep the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. The story was first produced, therefore, for the purpose of confounding an observer of the Sabbath when on

trial by his enemies for keeping that day. Sir Wm. Domville, an able anti-Sabbatarian writer, thus traces out the matter:

"The bishop, as we have seen, refers to the Acta of the martyrs as justifying his assertion respecting the question, *Dominicum servasti?* but he does not cite a single instance from them in which that question was put. We are left therefore to hunt out the instances for ourselves, wherever, if anywhere, they are to be found. The most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant, relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs, is that by Ruinart, entitled, '*Acta primorum Martyrum sincera et selecta.*' I have carefully consulted that work, and I take upon myself to affirm that among the questions there stated to have been put to the martyrs in and before the time of Pliny, and for nearly two hundred years afterwards, the question, *Dominicum servasti?* does not once occur; nor any equivalent question."³

This shows at once that no proof can be obtained from this quarter, either that the "stated day" of Pliny was the first day of the week, or that the martyrs of the early church were tested by the question whether they had observed it or not. It also shows the statement to be false that the martyrs of Pliny's time called Sunday the Lord's day and kept it as such. After quoting all the questions put to martyrs in and before Pliny's time, and thus proving that no such question as is alleged, was put to them, Domville says:

"This much may suffice to show that *Dominicum servasti?* was no question in Pliny's time, as Mr. Gurney intends us to believe it was. I have, however, still other proof of Mr. Gurney's unfair dealing with the subject, but I defer stating it for the present, that I may proceed in the inquiry, What may have been the authority on which bishop Andrews relied when stating that *Dominicum servasti?* was ever a usual question put by the heathen persecutors? I shall with this view pass over the martyrdoms which intervened between Pliny's time and the fourth century, as they contain nothing to the purpose, and shall come at once to that martyrdom the narrative of which was, I have no doubt, the source from which Bishop Andrews derived his question, *Dominicum servasti?* 'Hold you the Lord's day?' This martyrdom happened A.D. 304.⁴ The sufferers were Saturninus and his four sons, and several other persons. They were taken to Carthage, and brought before the proconsul Amulinus. In the account given of their examinations by him, the phrases, '*CELEBRARE Dominicum,*' and '*AGERE Dominicum,*' frequently occur, but in no instance is the verb '*servare*' used in reference to *Dominicum*. I mention this chiefly to show that when Bishop Andrews, alluding, as no doubt he does, to the narrative of this martyrdom, says the question was, *Dominicum servasti?* it is very clear he had not his author at hand, and that in trusting to his memory, he coined a phrase of his own."⁵

Domville quotes at length the conversation between the proconsul and the martyrs, which is quite similar in most respects to Gurney's and Edwards's quotation from Andrews. He then adds:

"The narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus being the only one which has the appearance of supporting the assertion of Bishop Andrews that, 'Hold you the Lord's day?' was the usual question to the martyrs, what if I should prove that even this narrative affords no support to that assertion? yet nothing is more

easy than this proof; for Bishop Andrews has quite mistaken the meaning of the word *Dominicum* in translating it 'the Lord's day.' It had no such meaning. It was a barbarous word in use among some of the ecclesiastical writers in, and subsequent to, the fourth century, to express sometimes a church, and at other times the Lord's supper, but NEVER the Lord's day.⁶ My authorities on this point, are—

"1. Ruinart, who, upon the word *Dominicum*, in the narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus, has a note, in which he says it is a word signifying the Lord's supper⁷ ('*Dominicum vero desinat sacra mysteria*'), and he quotes Tertullian and Cyprian in support of this interpretation.

"2. The editors of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine's works. They state that the word *Dominicum* has the two meanings of a church and the Lord's supper. For the former they quote among other authorities, a canon of the council of Neo Cesarea. For the latter meaning they quote Cyprian, and refer also to St. Augustine's account of his conference with the Donatists, in which allusion is made to the narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus.⁸

"3. Gesner, who, in his Latin Thesaurus published in 1749, gives both meanings to the word *Dominicum*. For that of the Lord's supper he quotes Cyprian; for that of a church he quotes Cyprian and also Hillary."⁹

Domville states other facts of interest bearing on this point, and then pays his respects to Mr. Gurney as follows:

"It thus appearing that the reference made by Bishop Andrews to the 'Acts of Martyrs' completely fails to establish his dictum respecting the question alleged to have been put to the martyrs, and it also appearing that there existed strong and obvious reasons for not placing implicit reliance upon that dictum, what are we to think of Mr. Gurney's regard for truth, when we find he does not scruple to tell his readers that the 'stated day' mentioned in Pliny's letter as that on which the Christians held their religious assemblies, was 'clearly the first day of the week,' is proved by the very question which it was customary for the Roman persecutors to address to the martyrs, *Dominicum servasti?*- 'Hast thou kept the Lord's day?' For this unqualified assertion, prefixed as it is by the word 'clearly,' in order to make it the more impressive, Mr. Gurney is without any excuse."¹⁰

The justice of Domville's language cannot be questioned when he characterizes this favorite first-day argument as-

"One of those daring misstatements of facts so frequent in theological writings, and which, from the confident tone so generally assumed by the writers on such occasions, are usually received without examination, and allowed, in consequence, to pass current for truth."¹¹

The investigation to which this statement has been subjected, shows,

1. That no such question as, Hast thou kept the Lord's day? is upon record as proposed to the martyrs in the time of Pliny.
2. That no such question was asked to any martyr prior to the commencement of the fourth century.
3. That a single instance of martyrdom in which any question of the kind was asked, is all that can be claimed.
4. That in this one case, which is all that has even the slightest appearance of sustaining the story under examination, a correct translation of the original Latin shows that the question had no relation whatever to the observance of Sunday! All this has been upon the assumption that the *Acta Martyrum*, in which this story is found, is an authentic work. Let Mosheim testify relative to the character of this work for veracity:

"As to those accounts which have come down to us under the title of *Acta Martyrum*, or, the Acts of the Martyrs, their authority is certainly for the most part of a very questionable nature; indeed, speaking generally, it might be coming nearer to the truth, perhaps, were we to say that they are entitled to no sort of credit whatever."¹²

Such is the authority of the work from which this story is taken. It is not strange that first-day historians should leave the repetition of it to theologians.

Such are the facts respecting this extraordinary falsehood. They constitute so complete an exposure of this famous historical argument for Sunday as to consign it to the just contempt of all honest men. But this is too valuable an argument to be lightly surrendered, and moreover it is as truthful as are certain other of the historical arguments for Sunday. It will not do to give up this argument because of its dishonesty; for others will have to go with it for possessing the same character.

Since the publication of Domville's elaborate work, James Gilfillan of Scotland has written a large volume entitled, "The Sabbath," which has been extensively circulated both in Europe and in America, and is esteemed a standard work by the American Tract Society and by first-day denominations in general. Gilfillan had read Domville as appears from his statements on pages 10, 142, 143, 616, of his volume. He was therefore acquainted with Domville's exposure of the fraud respecting "*Dominicum servasti?*" But though he was acquainted with this exposure, he offers not oneword in reply. On the contrary, he repeats the story with as much assurance as though it had not been proved a falsehood. But as Domville had shown up the matter from the *Acta Martyrum*, it was necessary for Gilfillan to trace it to some other authority, and so he assigns it to Cardinal Baronius. Here are Gilfillan's words:

"From the days of the apostles downwards for many years, the followers of Christ had no enemies more fierce and unrelenting than that people [the Jews], who cursed them in the synagogue, sent out emissaries into all countries to calumniate their Master and them, and were abettors wherever they could, of the martyrdom of men, such as Polycarp, of whom the world was not worthy. Among the reasons of this deadly enmity was the change of the Sabbatic day. The Romans, though they had no objection on this score, punished the Christians for the faithful observance of their day of rest, one of the testing questions put to the martyrs being, *Dominicum servasti?*- Have you kept the Lord's day? - Baron. An. Eccles., A.D. 303, Num.35, etc."¹³

Gilfillan having reproduced this statement and assigned as his authority the annalist Baronius, more recent first-day writers take courage and repeat the story after him. Now they are all right, as they think. What if the *Acta Martyrum* has failed them? Domville ought to have gone to Baronius, who, in their judgment, is the true source of information in this matter. Had he done this, they say, he would have been saved from misleading his readers. But let us ascertain what evil Domville has done in this case. It all consists in the assertion of two things out of the *Acta Martyrum*.¹⁴

1. That no such question as "Dominicum servasti?" was addressed to any martyr till the early part of the fourth century, some two hundred years after the time of Pliny.
2. That the question even then did not relate to what is called the Lord's day, but to the Lord's supper.

Now it is a remarkable fact that Gilfillan has virtually admitted the truth of the first of these statements, for the earliest instance which he could find in Baronius is A.D. 303, as his reference plainly shows. It differs only one year from the date assigned in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum*, and relates to the very case which Domville has quoted from that work! Domville's first and most important statement is therefore vindicated by Gilfillan himself, though he has not the frankness to say this in so many words.

Domville's second point is that *Dominicum*, when used as a noun, as in the present case, signifies either a church or the Lord's supper, but never signifies Lord's day. He establishes the fact by incontestable evidence. Gilfillan was acquainted with all this. He could not answer Domville, and yet he was not willing to abandon the falsehood which Domville had exposed. So he turns from the *Acta Martyrum* in which the compiler expressly defines the word to mean precisely what Domville asserts, and brings forward the great Romish annalist, Cardinal Baronius. Now, say our first-day friends, we are to have the truth from a high authority. Gilfillan has found in Baronius an express statement that the martyrs were tested by the question, "Have you kept the Lord's day?" No matter then as to the *Acta Martyrum* from which Bishop Andrews first produced this story. That, indeed, has failed us, but we have in its stead the weighty testimony of the great Baronius. To be sure he fixes this test no earlier than the fourth century, which renders it of no avail as proof that Pliny's stated day was Sunday; but it is worth much to have Baronius bear witness that certain martyrs in the fourth century were put to death because they observed the Sunday-Lord's day.

But these exultant thoughts are vain. I must state a grave fact in plain language: Gilfillan has deliberately falsified the testimony of Baronius! That historian records at length the martyrdom of Saturninus and his company in northern Africa in A.D. 303. It is the very story which Domville has cited from the *Acta Martyrum*, and Baronius repeatedly indicates that he himself copied it from that work. He gives the various questions propounded by the proconsul, and the several answers which were returned by each of the martyrs. I copy from Baronius the most important of these. They were arrested while they were celebrating the Lord's sacrament according to custom.¹⁵ The following is the charge on which they were arrested: They had celebrated the *Collectam Dominicam* against the command of the emperors.¹⁶ The proconsul asked the first whether he had celebrated the *Collectam*, and he replied that he was a Christian, and had done this.¹⁷ Another says, "I have not only been in the *Collecta*, but I have celebrated the *Dominicum* with the brethren because I am a Christian."¹⁸ Another says we have celebrated the *Dominicum*, because the *Dominicum* cannot be neglected.¹⁹ Another said that the *Collecta* was made (or observed) at his house.²⁰ The

proconsul questioning again one of those already examined, received this answer: "The Dominicum cannot be disregarded, the law so commands."²¹ When one was asked whether the Collecta was made (or observed) at his house, he answered, "In my house we have celebrated the Dominicum." He added, "Without the Dominicum we cannot be," or live.²² To another, the proconsul said that he did not wish to know whether he was a Christian, but whether he participated in the Collecta. His reply was: "As if one could be a Christian without the Dominicum, or as if the Dominicum can be celebrated without the Christian."²³ And he said further to the proconsul: "We have observed the Collecta most sacredly; we have always convened in the Dominicum for reading the Lord's word."²⁴ Another said: "I have been in [literally, have made] the Collecta with my brethren, I have celebrated the Dominicum."²⁵ After him another proclaimed the Dominicum to be the hope and safety of the Christian, and when tortured as the others, he exclaimed, "I have celebrated the Dominicum with a devoted heart, and with my brethren I have made the collecta because I am a Christian."²⁶ When the proconsul again asked one of these whether he had conducted the Dominicum, he replied that he had because Christ was his Saviour.²⁷

I have thus given the substance of this famous examination, and have set before the reader the references therein made to the Dominicum. It is to be observed that Collecta is used as another name for Dominicum. Now does Baronius use either of these words to signify Lord's day? It so happens that he has defined these words with direct reference to this very case no less than seven times. Now let us read these seven definitions:

When Baronius records the first question addressed to these martyrs, he there defines these words as follows: "By the words Collectam, Collectionem, and Dominicum, the author always understands the sacrifice of the Mass."²⁸ After recording the words of that martyr who said that the law commanded the observance of the Dominicum, Baronius defines his statement thus: "Evidently the Christian law concerning the Dominicum, no doubt about celebrating the sacrifice."²⁹ Baronius, by the Romish words sacrifice and Mass refers to the celebration of the Lord's supper by these martyrs. At the conclusion of the examination, he again defines the celebration of the Dominicum. He says: "It has been shown above in relating these things that the Christians were moved, even in the time of severe persecution, to celebrate the Dominicum. Evidently, as we have declared elsewhere in many places, it was a sacrifice without bloodshed, and of divine appointment."³⁰ He presently defines Dominicum again, saying, "Though it is a fact that the same expression was employed at times with reference to the temple of God, yet since all the churches upon the earth have united in this matter, and from other things related above, it has been sufficiently shown concerning the celebration of the Dominicum, that only the sacrifice of the Mass can be understood."³¹ Observe this last statement. He says though the word has been employed to designate the temple of the Lord, yet in the things here related it can only signify the sacrifice of the Mass. These testimonies are exceedingly explicit. But Baronius has not yet finished. In the index to Tome 3, he explains these words again with direct reference to this very martyrdom. Thus under Collecta is this statement: "The Collecta, the Dominicum, the Mass, the same [A.D.] 303, xxxix."³² Under Missa: "The Mass is the same as the Collecta, or Dominicum [A.D.], 303, xxxix."³³ Under Dominicum: "To celebrate the Dominicum is the same as to conduct the Mass [A.D.], 303. xxxix.; xlix.; li."³⁴

It is not possible to mistake the meaning of Baronius. He says that Dominicum signifies the Mass! The celebration of the supper by these martyrs was doubtless very different from the pompous ceremony which the church of Rome now observes under the name of Mass. But it was the sacrament of the Lord's supper, concerning which they were tested, and for observing which they were put to a cruel death. The word Dominicum signifies "the sacred mysteries,"

as Ruinart defines it; and Baronius, in seven times affirming this definition, though acknowledging that it has sometimes been used to signify temple of God, plainly declares that in this record, it can have no other meaning than that service which the Romanists call the sacrifice of the Mass. Gilfillan had read all this, yet he dares to quote Baronius as saying that these martyrs were tested by the question, "Have you kept Lord's day?" He could not but know that he was writing a direct falsehood; but he thought the honor of God, and the advancement of the cause of truth, demanded this act at his hands.

Before Gilfillan wrote his work, Domville had called attention to the fact that the sentence, "Dominicum servasti?" does not occur in the *Acta Martyrum*, a different verb being used every time. But this is the popular form of this question, and must not be given up. So Gilfillan declares that Baronius uses it in his record of the martyrdoms in A.D. 303. But we have cited the different forms of question recorded by Baronius, and find them to be precisely the same with those of the *Acta Martyrum*. "Dominicum servasti?" does not occur in that historian, and Gilfillan, in stating that it does, is guilty of untruth. This, however, is comparatively unimportant. But for asserting that Baronius speaks of Lord's day under the name of *Dominicum*, Gilfillan stands convicted of inexcusable falsehood in matters of serious importance.

1 Sabbath Manual, p. 120.

2 See his "History, Authority, and Use, of the Sabbath," chap. iv. pp. 87, 88.

3 Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 258-261.

4 The date in Baronius is A.D. 303.

5 Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 263-265.

6 Note by Domville. "*Dominicum* is not, as may at first be supposed, and adjective, of which *diem* [day] is the understood substantive. It is itself a substantive, neuter as appears from the passage, '*Quia non potest intermitteri Dominicum*;' in the narrative respecting Saturninus. The Latin adjective *Dominicus*, when intended to refer to the Lord's day, is never, I believe, used without its substantive *dies* [day] being expressed. In all the narratives contained in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum*, I find but two instances of mention being made of the Lord's day, and in both these instances the substantive *dies* [day] is expressed."

7 This testimony is certainly decisive. It is the interpretation of the compiler of the *Acta Martyrum*, himself, and is given with direct reference to the particular instance under discussion. An independent confirmation of Domville's authorities, may be found in Lucius's *Eccl. Hist.*, cent. 4, chap.vi: "*Fit mentio aliquoties locorum istorum in quibus convenerint Christiani, in historia persecutionis sub Diocletiano & Maximino. Et apparet, ante Constantinum etiam, locos eos fuisse mediocriter exstructos atque exornatos: quos seu Tempia appellarunt seu Dominica; ut apud Eusebium (li.9.c.10) & Ruffinum (li. 1,c.3).*" It is certain that *Dominicum* is here used as designating a place of divine worship. Dr. Twisse in his "Morality of the Fourth Commandment," p. 122, says: "The ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, called temples by the name of *dominica* and *kuriaka*."

8 Domville cites St. Augustine's Works, vol. v. pp. 116, 117, Antwerp ed. A.D. 1700.

9 Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 267,268.

10 Id. pp. 270, 271.

11 Id. pp. 272, 273.

12 Historical Commentaries, cent. 1, sect. xxxii. Sabbath History.

13 The Sabbath, by James Gilfillan, p. vii.

14 To break the force of Domville's statement in which he exposes the story originally told by Bishop Andrews as coming from the Acta Martyrum, it is said that Domville used Ruinart's Acta Martyrum, and that Ruinart was not born till thirty-one years after Bishop Andrews' death, so that Domville did not go to the same book that was used by the bishop, and therefore failed to find what he found. Those who raise this point betray their ignorance or expose their dishonesty. The Acta Martyrum is a collection of the memoirs of the martyrs, written by their friends from age to age. Ruinart did not write a new work, but simply edited "the most valued collection" of these memoirs that has ever appeared. See McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. i. pp. 56,57. Domville used Ruinart's edition, because, as he expresses it, it is "the most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant, relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs." Domville's use of Ruinart was, therefore, in the highest degree just and right.

15 Ibique celebrantes ex more Dominica Sacramenta.-Baronius, Tome 3, p. 348, A.D. 303, No. xxxvi. Lucae, A.D. 1738.

16 Qui contra edictum Imperatorum, & Caesarum Collectam Dominicam celebrassent.-Baronius, Tome 3, p. 348, A.D. 303, No. xxxix.

17 Utrum Collectam fecisset. Qui cum se Christianum, & in Collecta fuisse profiteretur.-Id.Ib.

18 Nam & in Collecta fui, & Dominicum cum fratribus celebravi, quia Christiana sum.-Id. No. xliii. p. 344. This was spoken by a female martyr.

19 Dominicum celebravimus. Proconsul ait: Quare? respondit: Quia non potest intermittere Dominicum.-Id. No. xlii. p. 350.

20 In cujus domo Collecta facta fuit.-Id. No. xlvii. p. 350.

21 Intermitti Dominicum non potest, ait. Lex sic jubet.-Id. No. xlvii. p. 350.

22 In tua, inquit proconsul, domo Collectae factae sunt, contra praecepta Imperatorum? Cui Emeritus sancto Spiritu inundatus:
In domo mea, inquit, egimus Dominicum. . . . Quoniam sine Dominico esse non possumus.-Id. No. xlix. pp. 350, 351.

23 Non quaero an Christianus sis sed an Collectam feceris. . . .Quasi Christianus sine Dominico esse possit.-Id. No. li. p. 351.

24 Collectam, inquit, religiosissime celebravimus; ad scripturas Dominicas legendas in Dominicum convenimus semper.-Id. Ib. p. 351.

25 Cum fratribus feci Collectam, Dominicum celebravi.-Id. No. lii. p. 351.

26 Post quem junior Felix, spem salutemque Christianorum Dominicum esse proclamans. . . Ego, inquit, devota menta celebravi Domincum; colletam cum fratribus feci, quia Christianus sum.-Id. liii.

27 Utrum egeris dominicum. Cui respondit Saturninus: Egi Dominicum, quia Salvator est christus.-Id. Ib. p. 352.

28 Per Collectam namque, and Ciollectionem, and Dominicum, intellegit semper auctor sacrificium Missae.-Baronius, Tome 3, A.D. 303, No. xxxix. p. 348.

29 Scilicet lex Christiana de Dominico, nempe sacrificio celebrando.-Id. No. xlvii. p. 350.

30 De celebratione Dominici; quod autem superuis in recitatis actis sit demonstratum, flagrantis persecutionis etiam tempore sollicitos fuisse Christianos celebrare Dominicum, nempe (ut alias pluribus declararimus) ipsum sacrosanctum sacrificium incruentum.-Id. No. lxxxiii. p. 358.

31 Quod etsi sciamus eamdem vocem pro Dei templo interdum accipi solitam; tamen quod ecclesiae omnes solo aequitatae fuissent; ex aliis superius recitatis de celebratione Dominici, nonisi sacrificium missae posse intelligo, satis est declaratum.-Id. lxxxiv. p. 359.

32 Collecta, Dominicum, Missa, idem, 303, xxxix. p. 677.

33 Missa idem quod Collecta, sive Dominicum, 303, xxxix. p. 702.

34 Dominicum celebrare idem quod Missas agere, 303, xxxix.; xlix.; li. p. 684.

CHAPTER 16

ORIGIN OF FIRST-DAY OBSERVANCE

Sunday a heathen festival from remote antiquity - Origin of the name - Reasons which induced the leaders of the church to adopt this festival - It was the day generally observed by the Gentiles in the first centuries of the Christian era - To have taken a different day would have exceedingly inconvenient - They hoped to facilitate the conversion of the Gentiles by keeping the same day that they observed - Three voluntary weekly festivals in the church in memory of the Redeemer - Sunday soon elevated above the other two - Justin Martyr - Sunday observance first found in the church of Rome - Irenaeus - First act of papal usurpation was on behalf of Sunday - Tertullian - Earliest trace of abstinence from labor on Sunday - General statement of facts - The Roman church made its first great attack upon the Sabbath by turning it into a fast.

The festival of Sunday is more ancient than the Christian religion, its origin being lost in remote antiquity. It did not originate, however, from any divine command nor from piety toward God: on the contrary, it was set apart as a sacred day by the heathen world in honor of their chief god, the sun. It is from this fact that the first day of the week has obtained the name of Sunday, a name by which it is known in many languages. Webster thus defines the word:

"Sunday; so called because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun or to its worship. The first day of the week; the Christian Sabbath; a day consecrated to rest from secular employments, and to religious worship; the Lord's day."

And Worcester, in his large dictionary, uses similar language:

"Sunday; so named because anciently dedicated to the sun or to its worship. The first day of the week; the Christian Sabbath, consecrated to rest from labor and to religious worship; the Lord's day."

These lexicographers call Sunday the Christian Sabbath, etc., because in the general theological literature of our language, it is thus designated, though never thus in the Bible. Lexicographers do not undertake to settle theological questions, but simply to define terms as currently used in a particular language. Though all the other days of the week have heathen names, Sunday alone was a conspicuous heathen festival in the days of the early church. The North British Review, in a labored attempt to justify the observance of Sunday by the Christian world, styles that day, "THE WILD SOLAR HOLIDAY [i.e., festival in honor of the sun] OF ALL PAGAN TIMES."¹

Verstegan says:

"The most ancient Germans being pagans, and having appropriated their first day of the week to the peculiar adoration of the sun, whereof that day doth yet in our English tongue retain the name of Sunday, and appropriated the next day unto it unto the especial adoration of the moon, whereof it yet retaineth with us, the name of Monday; they ordained the next day to these most heavenly planets to the particular adoration of their great reputed god, Tuisco, whereof we do yet retain in our language the name of Tuesday."²

The same author thus speaks concerning the idols of our Saxon ancestors:

"Of these, though they had many, yet seven among the rest they especially appropriated unto the seven days of the week. . . . Unto the day dedicated unto the especial adoration of the idol of the sun, they gave the name of Sunday, as much as to say the sun's day or the day of the sun. This idol was placed in a temple, and there adored and sacrificed unto, for that they believed that the sun in the firmament did with or in this idol correspond and co-operate."³

Jennings makes this adoration of the sun more ancient than the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. For, in speaking of the time of that deliverance, he speaks of the Gentiles as,

"The idolatrous nations who in honor to their chief god, the sun, began their day at his rising."⁴

He represents them also as setting apart Sunday in honor of the same object of adoration:

"The day which the heathens in general consecrated to the worship and honor of their chief god, the sun, which, according to our computation, was the first day of the week."⁵

The North British Review thus defends the introduction of this ancient heathen festival into the Christian church:

"That very day was the Sunday of their heathen neighbors and respective countrymen; and patriotism gladly united with expediency in making it at once their Lord's day and their Sabbath. . . . If the authority of the church is to be ignored altogether by Protestants, there is no matter; because opportunity and common expediency are surely argument enough for so ceremonial a change as the mere day of the week for the observance of the rest and holy convocation of the Jewish Sabbath. That primitive church, in fact, was shut up to the adoption of the Sunday, until it became established and supreme, when it was too late to make another alteration; and it was no irreverent nor undelightful thing to adopt it, inasmuch as the first day of the week was their own high day at any rate; so that their compliance and civility were rewarded by the redoubled sanctity of their quiet festival."⁶

It would seem that something more potent than "patriotism" and "expediency" would be requisite to transform this heathen festival into the Christian Sabbath, or even to justify its introduction into the Christian church. A further statement of the reasons which prompted its introduction, and a brief notice of the earlier steps toward transforming it into a Christian institution, will occupy the remainder of this chapter. Chafie, a clergyman of the English Church, in 1652, published a work in vindication of first-day observance, entitled, "The Seventh-day Sabbath." After showing the general observance of Sunday by the heathen world in the early ages of the church, Chafie thus states the reasons which forbid the Christians attempting to keep any other day:

"1. Because of the contempt, scorn, and derision they thereby should be had in, among all the Gentiles with whom they lived. . . . How grievous would be their taunts and reproaches against the poor Christians living with them and under their power for their new set sacred day, had the Christians chosen any other than the Sunday . . . 2. Most Christians then were either servants or of the poorer sort of people; and the Gentiles, most probably, would not give their

servants liberty to cease from working on any other set day constantly, except on their Sunday. . . . 3. Because had they assayed such a change it would have been but labor in vain; . . . they could never have brought it to pass."⁷

Thus it is seen that at the time when the early church began to apostatize from God and to foster in its bosom human ordinances, the heathen world - as they had long done - very generally observed the first day of the week in honor of the sun. Many of the early fathers of the church had been heathen philosophers. Unfortunately they brought with them into the church many of their old notions and principles. Particularly did it occur to them that by uniting with the heathen in the day of weekly celebration they should greatly facilitate their conversion. The reasons which induced the church to adopt the ancient festival of the heathen as something made ready to hand, are thus stated by Morer:-

"It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him. And we find by the influence of their examples, other nations, and among them the Jews themselves, doing him homage;⁸ yet these abuses did not hinder the fathers of the Christian church simply to repeal, or altogether lay by, the day or its name, but only to sanctify and improve both, as they did also the pagan temples polluted before with idolatrous services, and other instances wherein those good men were always tender to work any other change than what was evidently necessary, and in such things as were plainly inconsistent with the Christian religion; so that Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet, and called it Sunday, partly from its influence on that day especially, and partly in respect to its divine body (as they conceived it), the Christians thought fit to keep the same day and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles, and bring a greater prejudice than might be otherwise taken against the gospel."⁹

In the time of Justin Martyr, Sunday was a weekly festival, widely celebrated by the heathen in honor of their god, the sun. And so, in presenting to the heathen emperor of Rome an "Apology" for his brethren, Justin takes care to tell him thrice that the Christians held their assemblies on this day of general observance.¹⁰ Sunday therefore makes its first appearance in the Christian church as an institution identical in time with the weekly festival of the heathen, and Justin, who first mentions this festival, had been a heathen philosopher. Sixty years later, Tertullian acknowledges that it was not without an appearance of truth that men declared the sun to be the god of the Christians. But he answered that though they worshiped toward the east like the heathen, and devoted Sunday to rejoicing, it was for a reason far different from sun-worship.¹¹ And on another occasion, in defending his brethren from the charge of sun-worship, he acknowledges that these acts, prayer toward the east, and making Sunday a day of festivity, did give men a chance to think the sun was the God of the Christians.¹² Tertullian is therefore a witness to the fact that Sunday was a heathen festival when it obtained a foothold in the Christian church, and that the Christians, in consequence of observing it, were taunted with being sun-worshippers. It is remarkable that in his replies he never claims for their observance any divine precept or apostolic example. His principal point was that they had as good a right to do it as the heathen had. One hundred and twenty one years after Tertullian, Constantine, while yet a heathen, put forth his famous edict in behalf of the heathen festival of the sun, which day he pronounced "venerable." And this heathen law caused the day to be observed everywhere throughout the Roman Empire, and firmly established it both in Church

and State. It is certain, therefore, that at the time of its entrance into the Christian church, Sunday was an ancient weekly festival of the heathen world.

That this heathen festival was upon the day of Christ's resurrection doubtless powerfully contributed to aid "patriotism" and "expediency" in transforming it into the Lord's day or Christian Sabbath. For, with pious motives, as we may reasonably conclude, the professed people of God early paid a voluntary regard to several days, memorable in the history of the Redeemer. Mosheim, whose testimony in behalf of Sunday has been presented already, uses the following language relative to the crucifixion day:

"It is also probable that Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, was early distinguished by particular honors from the other days of the week."¹³

And of the second century, he says:

"Many also observed the fourth day of the week, on which Christ was betrayed; and the sixth, which was the day of his crucifixion."¹⁴

Dr. Peter Heylyn says of those who chose Sunday:

"Because our Saviour rose that day from amongst the dead, so chose they Friday for another, by reason of our saviour's passion; and Wednesday on the which he had been betrayed: the Saturday, or ancient Sabbath, being meanwhile retained in the eastern churches."¹⁵

Of the comparative sacredness of these three voluntary festivals, the same writer testifies:

"If we consider either the preaching of the word, the ministration of the sacraments, or the public prayers: the Sunday in the eastern churches had no great prerogative above other days, especially above the Wednesday and the Friday, save that the meetings were more solemn, and the concourse of people greater than at other times, as is most likely."¹⁶

And besides these three weekly festivals, there were also two annual festivals of great sacredness. These were the Passover and the Pentecost. And it is worthy of special notice that although the Sunday festival can be traced no higher in the church than Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, the Passover can be traced to a man who claimed to have received it from the apostles. See chapter thirteen. Among these festivals, considered simply as voluntary memorials of the Redeemer, Sunday had very little pre-eminence. For it is well stated by Heylyn:-

"Take which you will, either the fathers or the moderns, and we shall find no Lord's day instituted by any apostolical mandate; no Sabbath set on foot by them upon the first day of the week."¹⁷

Domville bears the following testimony, which is worthy of lasting remembrance:

"Not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to his apostles."¹⁸

"Patriotism" and "expediency," however, ere long elevated immeasurably above its fellows that one of these voluntary festivals which corresponded to "the wild solar holiday" of the heathen world, making that day at last "the Lord's day" of the Christian church. The earliest testimony in behalf of first-day observance that has any claim to be regarded as genuine is that of Justin Martyr, written about A.D. 140. Before his conversion, he was a heathen

philosopher. The time, place, and occasion of his first Apology or Defense of the Christians, addressed to the Roman Emperor, is thus stated by an eminent Roman Catholic historian. He says that Justin Martyr

"Was at Rome when the persecution that was raised under the reign of Antoninus Pius, the successor of Adrian, began to break forth, where he composed an excellent apology in behalf of the Christians."¹⁹

Of the works ascribed to Justin Martyr, Milner says:

"Like many of the ancient fathers he appears to us under the greatest disadvantage. Works really his have been lost; and others have been ascribed to him, part of which are not his; and the rest, at least, of ambiguous authority."²⁰

If the writings ascribed to him are genuine, there is little propriety in the use made of his name by the advocates of the first-day Sabbath. He taught the abrogation of the Sabbatic institution; and there is no intimation in his words that the Sunday festival which he mentions was other than a voluntary observance. Thus he addresses the emperor of Rome:

"And upon the day called Sunday, all that live either in city or country meet together at the same place, where the writings of the apostles and prophets are read, as much as time will give leave; when the reader has done, the bishop makes a sermon, wherein he instructs the people, and animates them to the practice of such lovely precepts: at the conclusion of this discourse, we all rise up together and pray; and prayers being over, as I now said, there is bread and wine and water offered, and the bishop, as before, sends up prayers and thanksgivings, with all the fervency he is able, and the people conclude all with the joyful acclamation of Amen. Then the consecrated elements are distributed to, and partaken of, by all that are present, and sent to the absent by the hands of the deacons. But the wealthy and the willing, for every one is at liberty, contribute as they think fitting; and this collection is deposited with the bishop, and out of this he relieves the orphan and the widow, and such as are reduced to want by sickness or any other cause, and such as are in bonds, and strangers that come from far; and, in a word, he is the guardian and almoner to all the indigent. Upon Sunday we all assemble, that being the first day in which God set himself to work upon the dark void, in order to make the world, and in which Jesus Christ our Saviour rose again from the dead; for the day before Saturday he was crucified, and the day after, which is Sunday, he appeared unto his apostles and disciples, and taught them what I have now proposed to your consideration."²¹

This passage, if genuine, furnishes the earliest reference to the observance of Sunday as a religious festival in the Christian church. It should be remembered that this language was written at Rome, and addressed directly to the emperor. It shows therefore what was the practice of the church in that city and vicinity, but does not determine how extensive this observance was. It contains strong incidental proof that apostasy had made progress at Rome; the institution of the Lord's supper being changed in part already to a human ordinance; water being now as essential to the Lord's supper as the wine or the bread. And what is still more dangerous as perverting the institution of Christ, the consecrated elements were sent to the absent, a step which speedily resulted in their becoming objects of superstitious veneration,

and finally of worship. Justin tells the emperor that Christ thus ordained; but such a statement is a grave departure from the truth of the New Testament.

This statement of reasons for Sunday observance is particularly worthy of attention. He tells the emperor that they assembled upon the day called Sunday. This was equivalent to saying to him, We observe the day on which our fellow-citizens offer their adoration to the sun. Here both "patriotism" and "expediency" discover themselves in the words of Justin, which were addressed to a persecuting emperor in behalf of the Christians. But as if conscious that the observance of a heathen festival as the day of Christian worship was not consistent with their profession as worshipers of the Most High, Justin bethinks himself for reasons in defense of this observance. He assigns no divine precept nor apostolic example for this festival. For his reference to what Christ taught his disciples, as appears from the connection, was to the general system of the Christian religion, and not to the observance of Sunday. If it be said that Justin might have learned from tradition what is not to be found in the New Testament relative to Sunday observance, and that after all Sunday may be a divinely-appointed festival, it is sufficient to answer, 1. That this plea would show only tradition in favor of the Sunday festival. 2. That Justin Martyr is a very unsafe guide; his testimony relative to the Lord's supper differs from that of the New Testament. 3. That the American Tract Society, in a work which it publishes against Romanism, bears the following testimony relative to the point before us:

"Justin Martyr appears indeed peculiarly unfitted to lay claim to authority. It is notorious that he supposed a pillar erected on the island of the Tiber to Semo Sanchus, an old Sabine deity, to be a monument erected by the Roman people in honor of the impostor Simon Magus. Were so gross a mistake to be made by a modern writer in relating a historical fact, exposure would immediately take place, and his testimony would thenceforward be suspected. And assuredly the same measure should be meted to Justin Martyr, who so egregiously errs in reference to a fact alluded to by Livy the historian."²²

Justin assigns the following reasons in support of Sunday observance: "That being the first day in which God set himself to work upon the dark void in order to make the world, and in which Jesus Christ our Saviour rose again from the dead." Bishop Jeremy Taylor most fittingly replies to this:

"The first of these looks more like an excuse than a just reason; for if anything of the creation were made the cause of a Sabbath, it ought to be the end, not the beginning; it ought to be the rest, not the first part of the work; it ought to be that which God assigned, not [that] which man should take by way of after justification."²³

It is to be observed, therefore, that the first trace of Sunday as a Christian festival is found in the church of Rome. Soon after this time, and thenceforward, we shall find "the bishop" of that church making vigorous efforts to suppress the Sabbath of the Lord, and to elevate in its stead the festival of Sunday.

It is proper to note the fact also that Justin was a decided opponent of the ancient Sabbath. In his "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew" he thus addressed him:

"This new law teaches you to observe a perpetual Sabbath; and you, when you have spent one day in idleness, think you have discharged the duties of religion. . . . If any one is guilty of adultery, let him repent, then he hath kept

the true and delightful Sabbath unto God. . . . For we really should observe that circumcision which is in the flesh, and the Sabbath, and all the feasts, if we had not known the reason why they were imposed upon you, namely, upon the account of your iniquities. . . . It was because of your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers, that God appointed you to observe the Sabbath. . . . You see that the heavens are not idle, nor do they observe the Sabbath. Continue as ye were born. For if before Abraham there was no need of circumcision, nor of the sabbaths, nor of feasts, nor of offerings before Moses; so now in like manner there is no need of them, since Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was by the determinate counsel of God, born of a virgin of the seed of Abraham without sin."²⁴

This reasoning of Justin deserves no reply. It shows, however, the unfairness of Dr. Edwards, who quotes Justin Martyr as a witness for the change of the Sabbath;²⁵ whereas Justin held that God made the Sabbath on account of the wickedness of the Jews, and that he totally abrogated it in consequence of the first advent of Christ; the Sunday festival of the heathen being evidently adopted by the church at Rome from motives of "expediency" and perhaps of "patriotism." The testimony of Justin, if genuine, is peculiarly valuable in one respect. It shows that as late as A.D. 140 the first day of the week had acquired no title of sacredness; for Justin several times mentions the day: thrice as "the day called Sunday;" and twice as "the eighth day;" and by other terms also, but never by any sacred name.²⁶

The next important witness in behalf of first-day sacredness is thus presented by Dr. Edwards:

"Hence Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A.D. 167, says that the Lord's day was the Christian Sabbath. His words are, 'On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.' "²⁷

This testimony is highly valued by first-day writers, and is often and prominently set forth in their publications. Sir Wm. Domville, whose elaborate treatise on the Sabbath has been several times quoted, states the following important fact relative to this quotation:

"I have carefully searched through all the extant works of Irenaeus and can with certainty state that no such passage, or any one at all resembling it, is there to be found. The edition I consulted was that by Massuet (Paris, 1710); but to assure myself still further, I have since looked to the editions by Erasmus (Paris, 1563), and Grabe (Oxford, 1702), and in neither do I find the passage in question."²⁸

It is a remarkable fact that those who quote this as the language of Irenaeus, if they give any reference, cite their readers to Dwight's Theology instead of referring them to the place in the works of Irenaeus where it is to be found. It was Dr. Dwight who first enriched the theological world with this invaluable quotation. Where, then, did Dwight obtain this testimony which has so many times been given as that of Irenaeus? On this point Domville remarks:

"He had the misfortune to be afflicted with a disease in his eyes from the early age of twenty-three, a calamity (says his biographer) by which he was deprived of the capacity for reading and study. . . . The knowledge which he gained from books after the period above mentioned [by which the editor must mean

his age of twenty-three] was almost exclusively at second hand, by the aid of others."²⁹

Domville states another fact which gives us unquestionably the origin of this quotation:

"But although not to be found in Irenaeus, there are in the writings ascribed to another father, namely, in the interpolated epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, and in one of its interpolated passages, expressions so clearly resembling those of Dr. Dwight's quotation as to leave no doubt of the source from which he quoted."³⁰

Such, then, is the end of this famous testimony of Irenaeus, who had it from Polycarp, who had it from the apostles! It was furnished the world by a man whose eyesight was impaired; who in consequence of this infirmity took at second hand an interpolated passage from an epistle falsely ascribed to Ignatius, and published it to the world as the genuine testimony of Irenaeus. Loss of eyesight, as we may charitably believe, led Dr. Dwight into the serious error which he has committed; but by the publication of this spurious testimony, which seemed to come in a direct line from the apostles, he has rendered multitudes as incapable of reading aright the fourth commandment, as he, by loss of natural eyesight, was of reading Irenaeus for himself. This case admirably illustrates tradition as a religious guide; it is the blind leading the blind until both fall into the ditch.

Nor is this all that should be said in the case of Irenaeus. In all his writings there is no instance in which he calls Sunday the Lord's day! And what is also very remarkable, there is no sentence extant written by him in which he even mentions the first day of the week!³¹ It appears, however, from several statements in ancient writers, that he did mention the day, though no sentence of his in which it is mentioned is in existence. He held that the Sabbath was a typical institution, which pointed to the seventh thousand years as the great day of rest to the church;³² he said that Abraham was "without observance of Sabbaths;"³³ and yet he makes the origin of the Sabbath to be the sanctification of the seventh day.³⁴ But he expressly asserts the perpetuity and authority of the ten commandments, declaring that they are identical with the law of nature implanted from the beginning in mankind, that they remain permanently with us, and that if any one does not observe them he has no salvation."³⁵

It is a remarkable fact that the first instance upon record in which the bishop of Rome attempted to rule the Christian church was by AN EDICT IN BEHALF OF SUNDAY. It had been the custom of all the churches to celebrate the passover, but with this difference: that while the eastern churches observed it upon the fourteenth day of the first month, no matter what day of the week this might be, the western churches kept it upon the Sunday following that day; or rather, upon the Sunday following Good Friday. Victor, bishop of Rome, in the year 196,³⁶ took upon him to impose the Roman custom upon all the churches; that is, to compel them to observe the passover upon Sunday. "This bold attempt," says Bower, "we may call the first essay of papal usurpation."³⁷ And Dowling terms it the "earliest instance of Romish assumption."³⁸ The churches of Asia Minor informed Victor that they could not comply with his lordly mandate. Then, says Bower:

"Upon the receipt of this letter, Victor, giving the reins to an impotent and ungovernable passion, published bitter invectives against all the churches of Asia, declared them cut off from his communion, sent letters of excommunication to their respective bishops; and, at the same time, in order to have them cut off from the communion of the whole church, wrote to the other

bishops, exhorting them to follow his example, and forbear communicating with their refractory brethren of Asia."³⁹

The historian informs us that "not one followed his example or advice; not one paid any sort of regard to his letters, or showed the least inclination to second him in such a rash and uncharitable attempt." He further says:

"Victor being thus baffled in his attempt, his successors took care not to revive the controversy; so that the Asiatics peaceably followed their ancient practice till the Council of Nice, which out of complaisance to Constantine the Great, ordered the solemnity of Easter to be kept everywhere on the same day, after the custom of Rome."⁴⁰

The victory was not obtained for Sunday in this struggle, as Heylyn testifies,

"Till the great Council of Nice [A.D. 325] backed by the authority of as great an emperor [Constantine] settled it better than before; none but some scattered schismatics, now and then appearing, that durst oppose the resolution of that famous synod."⁴¹

Constantine, by whose powerful influence the Council of Nice was induced to decide this question in favor of the Roman bishop that is, to fix the passover upon Sunday, urged the following strong reason for the measure:

"Let us then have nothing in common with the most hostile rabble of the Jews."⁴²

This sentence is worthy of notice. A determination to have nothing in common with the Jews had very much to do with the suppression of the Sabbath in the Christian church. Those who rejected the Sabbath of the Lord and chose in its stead the more popular and more convenient Sunday festival of the heathen, were so infatuated with the idea of having nothing in common with the Jews, that they never even questioned the propriety of a festival in common with the heathen.

This festival was not weekly, but annual; but the removal of it from the fourteenth of the first month to the Sunday following Good Friday was the first legislation attempted in honor of Sunday as a Christian festival; and as Heylyn quaintly expresses it, "The Lord's day found it no small matter to obtain the victory."⁴³ In a brief period after the Council of Nice, by the laws of Theodosius, capital punishment was inflicted upon those who should celebrate the feast of the passover upon any other day than Sunday.⁴⁴ The Britons of Wales were long able to maintain their ground against this favorite project of the Roman church, and as late as the sixth century "obstinately resisted the imperious mandates of the Roman pontiffs."⁴⁵

Four years after the commencement of the struggle just narrated, bring us to the testimony of Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin fathers, who wrote about A.D. 200. Dr. Clarke tells us that the fathers "blow hot and cold." Tertullian is a fair example of this. He places the origin of the Sabbath at the creation, but elsewhere says that the patriarchs did not keep it. He says that Joshua broke the Sabbath at Jericho, and afterward shows that he did not break it. He says that Christ broke the Sabbath, and in another place proves that he did not. He represents the eighth day as more honorable than the seventh, and elsewhere states the reverse. He states that the law is abolished, and in other places teaches its perpetuity and authority. He declares that the Sabbath was abrogated by Christ, and afterward asserts that "Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath," but imparted "an additional sanctity" to "the Sabbath day itself, which from the

beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father." And he goes on to say that Christ "furnished to this day divine safeguards - a course which his adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honoring the Creator's Sabbath."

This last statement is very remarkable. The Saviour furnished additional safeguards to the Creator's Sabbath. But "his adversary" would have done this to some other days. Now it is plain, first, that Tertullian did not believe that Christ sanctified some other day to take the place of the Sabbath; and second, that he believed the consecration of another day to be the work of the adversary of God! When he wrote these words he certainly did not believe in the sanctification of Sunday by Christ. But Tertullian and his brethren found themselves observing as a festival that day on which the sun was worshipped, and they were, in consequence, taunted with being worshipers of the sun. Tertullian denies the charge, though he acknowledges that there was some appearance of truth in it. He says:

"Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our God. We shall be counted Persians, perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, "having himself everywhere in his own disk. The idea, no doubt, has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also, under pretense sometimes of worshiping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sunday 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 they are ignorant."⁴⁶

Tertullian pleads no divine command nor apostolic example for this practice. In fact, he offers no reason for the practice, though he intimates that he had one to offer. But he finds it necessary in another work to repel this same charge of sun-worship, because of Sunday observance. In this second answer to this charge he states the ground of defense more distinctly, and here we shall find his best reason. These are his words:

"Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray toward 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 worshiping 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 for 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."⁴⁷

Tertullian, in this discourse, addresses himself to the nations still in idolatry. With some of these, Sunday was an ancient festival; with others, it was of comparatively recent date. But some of these heathen reproached the Sunday Christians with being sun-worshipers. And now observe the answer. He does not say, "We Christians are commanded to celebrate the first day of the week in honor of Christ's resurrection." His answer is doubtless the best that he knew how to frame. It is a mere retort, and consists in asserting, first, that the Christians had done no more than their accusers, the heathen; and second, that they had as good a right to make Sunday a day of festivity as had the heathen!

The origin of first-day observance has been the subject of inquiry in this chapter. We have found that Sunday from remote antiquity was a heathen festival in honor of the sun, and that in the first centuries of the Christian era this ancient festival was in general veneration in the heathen world. We have learned that patriotism and expediency, and a tender regard for the conversion of the Gentile world, caused leaders of the church to adopt as their religious festival the day observed by the heathen, and to retain the same name which the heathen had given it. We have seen that the earliest instance upon record of the actual observance of Sunday in the Christian church, is found in the church of Rome about A.D. 140. The first great effort in its behalf, A.D. 196, is by a singular coincidence the first act of papal usurpation. The first instance of a sacred title being applied to this festival, and the earliest trace of abstinence from labor on that day, are found in the writings of Tertullian at the close of the second century. The origin of the festival of Sunday is now before the reader; the steps by which it has ascended to supreme power will be pointed out in their proper order and place.

One fact of deep interest will conclude this chapter. The first great effort made to put down the Sabbath was the act of the church of Rome in turning it into a fast while Sunday was made a joyful festival. While the eastern churches retained the Sabbath, a portion of the western churches, with the church of Rome at their head, turned it into a fast. As a part of the western churches refused to comply with this ordinance, a long struggle ensued, the result of which is thus stated by Heylyn:

"In this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast almost through all the parts of the western world. I say the western world, and of that alone: the eastern churches being so far from altering their ancient custom that in the sixth council of Constantinople, A.D. 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day upon pain of censure."⁴⁸

Wm. James, in a sermon before the University of Oxford, thus states the time when this fast originated:

"The western church began to fast on Saturday at the beginning of the third century."⁴⁹

Thus it is seen that this struggle began with the third century, that is, immediately after the year 200. Neander thus states the motive of the Roman church:

"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."⁵⁰

By Judaism, Neander meant the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Dr. Charles Hase, of Germany, states the object of the Roman church in very explicit language:

"The Roman church regarded Saturday as a fast day in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath. Sunday remained a joyful festival in which all fasting and worldly business was avoided as much as possible, but the original commandment of the decalogue respecting the Sabbath was not then applied to that day."⁵¹

Lord King attests this fact in the following words:

"Some of the western churches, that they might not seem to Judaize, fasted on Saturday, as Victorinus Petavionensis writes: We use to fast on the seventh day. And it is our custom then to fast, that we may not seem, with the Jews, to observe the Sabbath."⁵²

Thus the Sabbath of the Lord was turned into a fast in order to render it despicable before men. Such was the first great effort of the Roman church toward the suppression of the ancient Sabbath of the Bible.

1 Vol. xviii. p. 409.

2 Verstegan's Antiquities, p. 10, London, 1628.

3 Antiquities, p. 68.

4 Jewish Antiquities, book iii. chap. i. See also McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, 4, 472, article Idolatry; Dr. A. Clarke on Job 1:26; and Dr. Gill on the same; Webster under the word Sabianism, and Worcester, under Sabian.

5 Id. book iii. chap. iii.

6 1 Vol. xviii. p. 409.

7 Pp. 61, 62.

8 2Kings 23:5; Jer.43:13, margin.

9 Dialogues on the Lord's day, pp. 22, 23.

10 Apology, chap. lxvii.; Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 34, 35.

11 Apology, sect. 16; Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 64, 65.

12 Ad Nationes, book i. chap. xiii.; Testimony of the Fathers, p. 70.

13 Eccl. Hist., cent. 1, part ii. chap. iv. note + to sect. 4.

14 Eccl. Hist. cent. 2, part ii. chap. i. sect. 12.

15 History of the Sabbath, part ii. chap. i. sect. 12.

16 Id. part ii. chap. iii. sect. 4.

17 Hist. of the Sabbath, part ii. chap. i. sect. 10.

18 Examination of the Six Texts, Supplement, pp. 6, 7.

19 Du Pin's Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 50.

20 Hist. Church, cent. 2, chap. iii.

21 Justin Martyr's First Apology, translated by Wm. Reeves, p. 127, sects. 87, 88, 89.

22 The Spirit of Popery, pp. 44, 45.

23 Ductor Dubitantium, part i. book ii. chap. ii. rule 6, sect. 45.

- 24 Brown's Translation, pp. 48, 44, 52, 59, 63, 64.
- 25 Sabbath Manual, p. 121.
- 26 Dialogue with Trypho, p. 65.
- 27 Sabbath Manual, p. 114.
- 28 Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 131, 132.
- 29 Id. p. 128.
- 30 Id. p. 130.
- 31 See his full testimony in the Testimony of the Fathers, pp.. 44-52.
- 32 Against Heresies, book iv. chap. xvi. sects. 1, 2; Id. book v. chap.. xxviii. sect. 3.
- 33 Id. book iv. chap. xvi. sects 1, 2.
- 34 Id. book v. chap. xxxiii. sect. 2.
- 35 Against Heresies, book iv. chap. xv. sect. 1; chap. xiii. sect. 4.
- 36 Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i. pp. 18, 19; Rose's Neander, pp. 188-190; Dowling's History of Romanism, book i, chap. ii. sect. 9.
- 37 History of the Popes, vol. i. p. 18.
- 38 History of Romanism, heading of page 32.
- 39 History of the Popes, vol. i. p. 18.
- 40 Id. pp. 18, 19; Giesler's Eccl. Hist. vol. i. sect. 57.
- 41 History of the Sabbath, part ii. chap. ii. sects. 4, 5.
- 42 Boyle's Historical View of the Council of Nice, p. 52, ed. 1842.
- 43 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. ii. sect. 5.
- 44 Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. xxvii.
- 45 Id. chap. xxxviii.
- 46 Tertullian's Apology, sect. 16.
- 47 Tertullian Ad Nationes, book i. chap. xiii.
- 48 History of the Sabbath, part 2, chap. ii. sect. 3.
- 49 Sermons on the Sacraments and Sabbath, p. 166.
- 50 Neander, p. 186.
- 51 Ancient Church History, part i. div. 2, A.D. 100-312. sect. 69.
- 52 Enquiry into the Constitution of the Primitive Church, part ii. chap.. vii. sect. 11. See also Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. i. p. 373

CHAPTER 17

THE NATURE OF EARLY FIRST-DAY OBSERVANCE

The history of first-day observance compared with that of the popes - First-day observance defined in the very words of each of the early fathers who mention it - The reasons which each had for its observance stated in his own words - Sunday in their judgment of no higher sacredness than Easter or Whitsunday, or even than the fifty days between those festivals - Sunday not a day of abstinence from labor - The reasons which are offered by those of them who rejected the Sabbath stated in their own words.

The history of first-day observance in the Christian church may be fitly illustrated by that of the bishops of Rome. The Roman bishop now claims supreme power over all the churches of Christ. He asserts that this power was given to Peter, and by him was transmitted to the bishops of Rome; or rather that Peter was the first Roman bishop, and that a succession of such bishops from his time to the present have exercised this absolute power in the church. They are able to trace back their line to apostolic times, and they assert that the power now claimed by the pope was claimed and exercised by the first pastors of the church of the Romans. Those who now acknowledge the supremacy of the pope believe this assertion, and with them it is a conclusive evidence that the pope is by divine right possessed of supreme power. But the assertion is absolutely false. The early pastors, or bishops, or elders, of the church of the Romans were modest, unassuming ministers of Christ, wholly unlike the arrogant bishop of Rome, who now usurps the place of Christ as the head of the Christian church.

The first day of the week now claims to be the Christian Sabbath, and enforces its authority by means of the fourth commandment, having set aside the seventh day, which that commandment enjoins, and usurped its place. Its advocates assert that this position and this authority were given to it by Christ. As no record of such gift is found in the Scriptures, the principal argument in its support is furnished by tracing first-day observance back to the early Christians, who, it is said, would not have hallowed the day if they had not been instructed to do it by the apostles; and the apostles would not have taught them to do it if Christ had not, in their presence, changed the Sabbath.

But first-day observance can be traced no nearer to apostolic times than A.D. 140, while the bishops of Rome can trace their line to the very times of the apostles. Herein is the papal claim to apostolic authority better than is that of the first-day Sabbath. But with this exception, the historical argument in behalf of each is the same. Both began with very moderate pretensions, and gradually gaining in power and sacredness, grew up in strength together.

Let us now go to those who were the earliest observers of Sunday and learn from them the nature of that observance at its commencement. We shall find, first, that no one claimed for first-day observance any divine authority; second, that none of them had ever heard of change of the Sabbath, and none believed the first-day festival to be a continuation of the Sabbatic institution; third, that labor on that day is never set forth as sinful, and that abstinence from labor is never mentioned as a feature of its observance, nor even implied, only so far as necessary in order to spend a portion of the day in worship; fourth, that if we put together all

the hints respecting Sunday observance, which are scattered through the fathers of the first three centuries, for no one of them gives more than two of these, and generally a single hint is all that is found in one writer, we shall find just four items: (1) an assembly on that day in which the Bible was read and expounded, and the supper celebrated and money collected; (2) that the day must be one of rejoicing; (3) that it must not be a day of fasting; (4) that the knee must not be bent in prayer on that day.

The following are all the hints respecting the nature of first-day observance during the first three centuries. The epistle falsely ascribed to Barnabas simply says: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness."¹ Justin Martyr, in words already quoted at full length, describes the kind of meeting which they held at Rome and in that vicinity on that day, and this is all that he connects with its observance.² Irenaeus taught that to commemorate the resurrection, the knee must not be bent on that day, and mentions nothing else as essential to its honor. This act of standing in prayer was a symbol of the resurrection, which was to be celebrated only on that day, as he held.³ Bardesanes the Gnostic represents the Christians as everywhere meeting for worship on that day, but he does not describe that worship, and he gives no other honor to the day.⁴ Tertullian describes Sunday observance as follows: "We devote Sunday to rejoicing," and he adds, "We have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury."⁵ In another work he gives us a further idea of the festive character of Sunday. Thus he says to his brethren: "If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the heathens each festive day occurs but once annually; you have a festive day every eighth day."⁶ Dr. Heylyn spoke the truth when he said:

"Tertullian tells us that they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when in a hundred years after Tertullian's time there was no law or constitution to restrain men from labor on this day in the Christian church."⁷

The Sunday festival in Tertullian's time was not like the modern first-day Sabbath, but was essentially the German festival of Sunday, a day for worship and for recreation, and one on which labor was not sinful. But Tertullian speaks further respecting Sunday observance, and the words now to be quoted have been used as proof that labor on that day was counted sinful. This is the only statement that can be found prior to Constantine's Sunday law that has such an appearance, and the proof is decisive that such was not its meaning. Here are his words:

"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, deferring even our businesses, lest we give any place to the devil. Similarly, too, in the period of Pentecost; which period we distinguish by the same solemnity of exultation."⁸

He speaks of "deferring even our businesses;" but this does not necessarily imply anything more than its postponement during the hours devoted to religious services. It falls very far short of saying that labor on Sunday is a sin. But we will quote Tertullian's next mention of Sunday observance before noticing further the words last quoted. Thus he says:

"We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday."⁹

These two things, fasting and kneeling, are the only acts which the fathers set down as unlawful on Sunday, unless, indeed, mourning may be included by some in the list. It is

certain that labor is never thus mentioned. And observe that Tertullian repeats the important statement of the previous quotation that the honor due to Sunday pertains also to the "period of Pentecost," that is, to the fifty days between Easter and Passover and Whitsunday or Pentecost. If, therefore, labor on Sunday was in Tertullian's estimation sinful, the same was true for the period of Pentecost, a space of fifty days! But this is not possible. We can conceive of the deferral of business for one religious assembly each day for fifty days, and also that men should neither fast nor kneel during that time, which was precisely what the religious celebration of Sunday actually was. But to make Tertullian assert that labor on Sunday was a sin is to make him declare that such was the case for fifty days together, which no one will venture to say was the doctrine of Tertullian.

In another work Tertullian gives us one more statement respecting the nature of Sunday observance: "We make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this?"¹⁰ His language is very extraordinary when it is considered that he was addressing heathen. It seems that Sunday as a Christian festival was so similar to the festival which these heathen observed that he could challenge them to show wherein the Christians went further than did these heathen whom he here addressed.

The next father who gives us the nature of early Sunday observance is Peter of Alexandria. He says: "But the Lord's day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it he rose again, on which day we have received it for a custom not even to bow the knee."¹¹ He marks two things essential. It must be a day of joy, and Christians must not kneel on that day. Zonaras, an ancient commentator on these words of Peter, explains the day of joy by saying, "We ought not to fast; for it is a day of joy for the resurrection of the Lord."¹² Next in order, we quote the so-called Apostolical Constitutions. These command Christians to assemble for worship every day, "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," etc. The object of assembling was "to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection," to "pray thrice standing," to have the prophets read, to have preaching and also the supper.¹³ These "Constitutions" not only give the nature of the worship on Sunday as just set forth, but they also give us an idea of Sunday as a day of festivity:

"Now we exhort you, brethren and fellow-servants, to avoid vain talk and obscene discourses, and jestings, drunkenness, lasciviousness, luxury, unbounded passions, with foolish discourses, since we do not permit you so much as on the Lord's days, which are days of joy, to speak or act anything unseemly."¹⁴

This language plainly implies that the so-called Lord's day was a day of greater mirth than the other days of the week. Even on the Lord's day they must not speak or act anything unseemly, though it is evident that their license on that day was greater than on other days. Once more these "Constitutions" give us the nature of Sunday observance: "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."¹⁵ But no one can read so much as once that "he is guilty of sin who performs work on this day."

Next we quote the epistle to the Magnesians in its longer form, which though not written by Ignatius was actually written about the time that the Apostolical Constitutions were committed to writing. Here are the words of this epistle:

"And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days."¹⁶

The writer of the Syriac Documents concerning Edessa comes last, and he defines the services of Sunday as follows: "On the first [day] of the week, let there be service, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the oblation."¹⁷ These are all the passages in the writings of the first three centuries which describe early first-day observance. Let the reader judge whether we have correctly stated the nature of that observance. Next we invite attention to the several reasons offered by these fathers for celebrating the festival of Sunday.

The reputed epistle of Barnabas supports the Sunday festival by saying that it was the day "on which Jesus rose again from the dead," and it intimates that it prefigures the eighth thousand years, when God shall create the world anew.¹⁸

Justin Martyr has four reasons:

1. "It is the first day on which God having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world."¹⁹
2. "Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead."²⁰
3. "It is possible for us to show how the eighth day possessed a certain mysterious import, which the seventh day did not possess, and which was promulgated by God through these rites,"²¹ i.e., through circumcision.
4. "The command of circumcision, again, bidding [them] always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath."²²

Clement, of Alexandria, appears to treat solely a mystical eighth day or Lord's day. It is perhaps possible that he has some reference to Sunday. We therefore quote what he says in behalf of this day, calling attention to the fact that he produces his testimony, not from the Bible, but from a heathen philosopher. Thus he says:

"And the Lord's day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the Republic, in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow on the eighth day they are to set out and arrive in four days.'"²³

Clement's reasons for Sunday are found outside the Scriptures. The next father will give us a good reason for Clement's action in this case. Tertullian is the next writer who gives reasons for the Sunday festival. He is speaking of "offerings for the dead," the manner of Sunday observance, and the use of the sign of the cross upon the forehead. Here is the ground on which these observances rest:

"If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom, as their strengthener, and faith, as their observer. That reason will support tradition, and custom, and faith, you will either yourself perceive, or learn from some one who has."²⁴

Tertullian's frankness is to be commended. He had no Scripture to offer, and he acknowledges the fact. He depended on tradition, and he was not ashamed to confess it. The next of the fathers who gives Scripture evidence in support of the Sunday festival, is Origen. Here are his words:

"The manna fell on the Lord's day, and not on the Sabbath to show the Jews that even then the Lord's day was preferred before it."²⁵

Origen seems to have been of Tertullian's judgment as to the inconclusiveness of the arguments adduced by his predecessors. He therefore coined an original argument which seems to have been very conclusive in his estimation as he offers this alone. But he must have forgotten that the manna fell on all the six working days, or he would have seen that while his argument does not elevate Sunday above the other five working days, it does make the Sabbath the least reputable day of the seven! And yet the miracle of the manna was expressly designed to set forth the sacredness of the Sabbath and to establish its authority before the people. Cyprian is the next father who gives an argument for the Sunday festival. He contents himself with one of Justin's old arguments, viz., that one drawn from circumcision. Thus he says:

"For in respect of the observance of the eighth day in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh, a sacrament was given beforehand in shadow and in usage; but when Christ came, it was fulfilled in truth. For because the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give us circumcision of the Spirit, the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day, went before in the figure; which figure ceased when by and by the truth came, and spiritual circumcision was given to us."²⁶

Such is the only argument adduced by Cyprian in behalf of the first-day-day festival. The circumcision of infants when eight days old was, in his judgment, a type of infant baptism. But circumcision on the eighth day of the child's life, in his estimation, did not signify that baptism need to be deferred till the infant is eight days old, but, as here stated, did signify that the eighth day was to be the Lord's day! But the eighth day, on which circumcision took place, was not the first day of the week, but the eighth day of each child's life, whatever day of the week that might be.

The next father who gives a reason for celebrating Sunday as a day of joy, and refraining from kneeling on it, is Peter of Alexandria, who simply says, "Because on it he rose again."²⁷

Next in order come the Apostolic Constitutions, which assert that the Sunday festival is a memorial of the resurrection:

"But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's day festival; because the former is a memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection."²⁸

The writer, however, offers no proof that Sunday was set apart by divine authority in memory of the resurrection. But the next person who gives his reasons for keeping Sunday "as a festival" is the writer of the longer form of the reputed epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians. He finds the eighth day prophetically set forth in the title to the sixth and twelfth psalms! In the margin, the word Sheminith is translated "the eighth." Here is this writer's argument for Sunday:

"Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, 'To the end for the eighth day,' on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ."²⁹

There is yet another of the fathers of the first three centuries who gives the reasons then used in support of the Sunday festival.

This is the writer of the Syriac Documents concerning Edessa. He comes next in order and closes the list. Here are four reasons:

1. "Because on the first day of the week our Lord rose from the place of the dead."³⁰
2. "On the first day of the week he arose upon the world,"³¹ i.e., he was born upon Sunday.
3. "On the first day of the week he ascended upon to Heaven."³²
4. "On the first day of the week he will appear at last with the angels of Heaven."³³

The first of these reasons is as good a one as man can devise out of his own heart for doing what God never commanded; the second and fourth are mere assertions of which mankind know nothing; while the third is a positive untruth, for the ascension was upon Thursday.

We have now presented every reason for the Sunday festival which can be found in all the writings of the first three centuries. Though generally very trivial, and sometimes worse than trivial, they are nevertheless worthy of careful study. They constitute a decisive testimony that the change of the Sabbath by Christ or by his apostles from the seventh to the first day of the week was absolutely unknown during that entire period. But were it true that such change had been made they must have known it. Had they believed that Christ changed the Sabbath to commemorate his resurrection, how emphatically would they have stated that fact instead of offering reasons for the festival of Sunday which are so worthless as to be, with one or two exceptions, entirely discarded by modern first-day writers. Or had they believed that the apostles honored Sunday as the Sabbath or Lord's day, how would they have produced these facts in triumph! But Tertullian said that they had no positive Scripture injunction for the Sunday festival, and the others, by offering reasons that were only devised in their own hearts, corroborated his testimony, and all of them together establish the fact that even in their own estimation the day was only sustained by the authority of the church. They were totally unacquainted with the modern doctrine that the seventh day in the commandment means simply one day in seven, and that the Saviour, to commemorate his resurrection, appointed that the first day of the week should be that one of the seven to which the commandment should apply!

We have given every statement in the fathers of the first three centuries in which the manner of celebrating the Sunday festival is set forth. We have also given every reason for that observance which is to be found in any of them. These two classes of testimonies show clearly that ordinary labor was not one of the things which were forbidden on that day. We now offer direct proof that other days which on all hands are accounted nothing but church festivals were expressly declared by the fathers to be equal if not superior in sacredness to the Sunday festival.

The "Lost Writings of Irenaeus" gives us his mind concerning the relative sacredness of the festival of Sunday and that of either Easter or Pentecost. This is the statement:

"Upon which [feast] we do not bend the knee, because it is of equal significance with the Lord's day, for the reason already alleged concerning it."³⁴

Tertullian in a passage already quoted, which by omitting the sentence we are about to quote, has been used as the strongest testimony to the first-day Sabbath in the fathers, expressly equals in sacredness the period of Pentecost - a space of fifty days - with the festival which he calls Lord's day. Thus he says:

"Similarly, too, in the period of Pentecost; which period we distinguish by the same solemnity of exaltation."³⁵

He states the same fact in another work:

"We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday."³⁶

Origen classes the so-called Lord's day with three other church festivals:

"If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as for example the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words, and deeds, serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day."³⁷

Irenaeus and Tertullian make the Sunday Lord's day equal in sacredness with the period from the Passover to the Pentecost; but Origen, after classing the day with several church festivals, virtually confesses that it has no pre-eminence above other days.

Commodianus, who once uses the term Lord's day, speaks of the Catholic festival of the Passover as "Easter, that day of ours most blessed."³⁸ This certainly indicates that in his estimation no other sacred day was superior in sanctity to Easter.

The "Apostolical Constitutions" treat the Sunday festival in the same manner that it is treated by Irenaeus and Tertullian. They make it equal to the sacredness of the period from Easter to the Pentecost. Thus they say:

"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."³⁹

These testimonies prove conclusively that the festival of Sunday, in the judgment of such men as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others, stood in the same rank with that of Easter, or Whitsunday. They had no idea that one was commanded by God, while the others were only ordained by the church. Indeed, Tertullian, as we have seen, expressly declares that there is no precept for Sunday observance.⁴⁰

Besides these important facts, we have decisive evidence that Sunday was not a day of abstinence from labor, and our first witness is Justin, the earliest witness to the Sunday festival in the Christian church. Trypho the Jew said to Justin, by way of reproof, "You observe no festivals or Sabbaths."⁴¹ This was exactly adapted to bring out from Justin the

statement that, though he did not observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, he did thus rest on the first day of the week, if it were true that that day was with him a day of abstinence from labor. But he gives no such answer. He sneers at the very idea of abstinence from labor, declaring that "God does not take pleasure in such observances." Nor does he intimate that this is because the Jews did not rest upon the right day, but he condemns the very idea of refraining from labor for a day, stating that "the new law," which has taken the place of the commandments given on Sinai⁴² requires a perpetual Sabbath, and this is kept by repenting of sin and refraining from its commission. Here are his words:

"The new law requires you to keep a perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; 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 the sweet and true Sabbaths of God."⁴³

This language plainly implies that Justin did not believe that any day should be kept as a Sabbath by abstinence from labor, but that all days should be kept as sabbaths by abstinence from sin. This testimony is decisive, and it is in exact harmony with the facts already adduced from the fathers, and with others yet to be presented. Moreover, it is confirmed by the express testimony of Tertullian. He says:

"By us (to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons, and festivals formerly beloved by God) the saturnalia and new year's and mid-winter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented."⁴⁴

And he adds in the same paragraph, in words already quoted:

"If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the heathens each festive day occurs but once annually; you have a festive day every eighth day."⁴⁵

Tertullian tells his brethren in plain language that they kept no sabbaths, but did keep many heathen festivals. If the Sunday festival, which was a day of "indulgence" to the flesh, and which he here mentions as the "eighth day," was kept by them as the Christian Sabbath in place of the ancient seventh day, then he would not have asserted that to us "sabbaths are strange."

But Tertullian has precisely the same Sabbath as Justin Martyr. He does not keep the first day in place of the seventh, but he keeps a "perpetual sabbath," in which he professes to refrain from sin every day, and actually abstains from labor on none. Thus, after saying that the Jews teach that "from the beginning God sanctified the seventh day" and therefore observe that day, he says:

"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."⁴⁶

Tertullian certainly had no idea that Sunday was the Sabbath in any other sense than were all the seven days of the week. We shall find a decisive confirmation of this when we come to quote Tertullian respecting the origin of the Sabbath. We shall also find that Clement expressly makes Sunday a day of labor.

Several of the early fathers wrote in opposition to the observance of the seventh day. We now give the reasons assigned by each for that opposition. The writer called Barnabas did not keep the seventh day, not because it was a ceremonial ordinance unworthy of being observed by a Christian, but because it was so pure an institution that even Christians cannot truly sanctify it till they are made immortal. Here are his words:

"Attend, my children, to the meaning of this expression, 'He finished in six days.' This implieth that the Lord will finish all things in six thousand years, for a day is with him a thousand years. And he himself testifieth, saying, 'Behold, to-day will be as a thousand years.' Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. 'And he rested on the seventh day.' This meaneth: When his Son, coming [again], shall destroy the time of the wicked man, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall he truly rest on the seventh day. Moreover, he says, 'Thou shalt sanctify it with pure hands and a pure heart.' If, therefore, any one can now sanctify the day which God hath sanctified, except he is pure in heart in all things, we are deceived. Behold, therefore: certainly then one properly resting sanctifies it, when we ourselves, having received the promise, wickedness no longer existing, and all things having been made new by the Lord, shall be able to work righteousness. Then we shall be able to sanctify it, having been first sanctified ourselves. Further he says to them, 'Your new moons and your sabbaths I cannot endure.' Ye perceive how he speaks: Your present sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made [namely this], when giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world, wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day, also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead."⁴⁷

Observe the points embodied in this statement of doctrine: 1. He asserts that the six days of creation prefigure the six thousand years which our world shall endure in its present state of wickedness. 2. He teaches that at the end of that period Christ shall come again and make an end of wickedness, and "then shall he truly rest on the seventh day." 3. That no "one can now sanctify the day which God hath sanctified, except he is pure in heart in all things." 4. But that cannot be the case until the present world shall pass away, "when we ourselves, having received the promise, wickedness no longer existing, and all things having been made new by the Lord, shall be able to work righteousness. Then we shall be able to sanctify it, having been first sanctified ourselves." Men cannot, therefore, keep the Sabbath while this wicked world lasts. 5. Therefore, he says, "Your present sabbaths are not acceptable," not because they are not pure, but because you are not now able to keep them as purely as their nature demands. 6. That is to say, the keeping of the day which God has sanctified is not possible in such a wicked world as this. 7. But though the seventh day cannot now be kept, the eighth day can be, and ought to be, because when the seven thousand years are past, there will be at the beginning of the eighth thousand, the new creation. 8. Therefore, he did not attempt to keep the seventh day, which God had sanctified; for that is too pure to be kept in the present wicked world, and can only be kept after the Saviour comes at the commencement of the seventh thousand years; but he kept the eighth day, with joyfulness on which Jesus arose from the dead. 9. So it appears that the eighth day which God never sanctified, is exactly suitable for observance in our world during its present state of wickedness. 10. But when all things have been made new, and we are able to work righteousness, and wickedness no longer exists, then we shall be able to sanctify the seventh day, having first been sanctified ourselves.

The reason of Barnabas for not observing the Sabbath of the Lord is not that the commandment enjoining it is abolished, but that the institution is so pure that men in their present imperfect state cannot acceptably sanctify it. They will keep it, however, in the new creation, but in the meantime they keep with joyfulness the eighth day, which having never been sanctified by God is not difficult to keep in the present state of wickedness.

Justin Martyr's reasons for not observing the Sabbath are not at all like those of the so-called Barnabas, for Justin seems to have heartily despised the Sabbatic institution. He denies that it was obligatory before the time of Moses, and affirms that it was abolished by the advent of Christ. He teaches that it was given to the Jews because of their wickedness, and he expressly affirms the abolition of both the Sabbath and the law. So far is he from teaching the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, or from making the Sunday festival a continuation of the ancient Sabbatic institution, that he sneers at the very idea of days of abstinence from labor, or days of idleness, and though God gives as his reason for the observance of the Sabbath, that that was the day on which he rested from all his work, Justin gives as his first reason for the Sunday festival that that was the day on which God began his work! Of abstinence from labor as an act of obedience to the Sabbath, Justin says:

"The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances."⁴⁸

A second reason for not observing the Sabbath is thus stated by him:

"For we too would observe the fleshly circumcision, and the Sabbaths, and in short, all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined you - namely, on account of your transgressions and the hardness of your hearts."⁴⁹

As Justin never discriminates between the Sabbath of the Lord and the annual sabbaths he doubtless here means to include it as well as them. But what a falsehood is it to assert that the Sabbath was given to the Jews because of their wickedness! The truth is, it was given to the Jews because of the universal apostasy of the Gentiles.⁵⁰ But in the following paragraph Justin gives three more reasons for not keeping the Sabbath:

"Do you see that the elements are not idle, and keep no Sabbaths? Remain as you were born. For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or of the observance of Sabbaths, of feasts and sacrifices, before Moses; no more need is there of them now, after that, according to the will of God, Jesus Christ the Son of God has been born without sin, of a virgin sprung from the stock of Abraham."⁵¹

Here are three reasons: 1. "That the elements are not idle, and keep no Sabbaths." Though this reason is simply worthless as an argument against the seventh day, it is a decisive confirmation of the fact already proven, that Justin did not make Sunday a day of abstinence from labor. 2. His second reason here given is that there was no observance of Sabbath before Moses, and yet we do know that God at the beginning did appoint the Sabbath to a holy use, a fact to which as we shall see quite a number of the fathers testify, and we also know that in that age were men who kept all the precepts of God. 3. There is no need of Sabbatic observance since Christ. Though this is mere assertion, it is by no means easy for those to meet it fairly who represent Justin as maintaining the Christian Sabbath.

Another argument by Justin against the obligation of the Sabbath is that God "directs the government of the universe on this day equally as on all others!"⁵² as though this were inconsistent with the present sacredness of the Sabbath, when it is also true that God thus

governed the world in the period when Justin acknowledges the Sabbath to have been obligatory. Though this reason is trivial as an argument against the Sabbath, it does show that Justin could have attached no Sabbatic character to Sunday. But he has yet one more argument against the Sabbath. The ancient law has been done away by the new and final law, and the old covenant has been superseded by the new.⁵³ But he forgets that the design of the new covenant was not to do away with the law of God, but to put that law into the heart of every Christian. And many of the fathers, as we shall see expressly repudiate this doctrine of the abrogation of the Decalogue.

Such were Justin's reasons for rejecting the ancient sabbath.

But though he was a decided asserter of the abrogation of the law, and of the Sabbatic institution itself, and kept Sunday only as a festival, modern first-day writers cite him as a witness in support of the doctrine that the first day of the week should be observed as the Christian Sabbath on the authority of the fourth commandment.

Now let us learn what stood in the way of Irenaeus' observance of the Sabbath. It was not that the commandments were abolished, for we shall presently learn that he taught their perpetuity. Nor was it that he believed in the change of the Sabbath, for he gives no hint of such an idea. The Sunday festival in his estimation appears to have been simply of "equal significance" with the Pentecost.⁵⁴ Nor was it that Christ broke the Sabbath, for Irenaeus says that he did not.⁵⁵ But because the Sabbath is called a sign he regarded it as significant of the future kingdom, and appears to have considered it no longer obligatory, though he does not expressly say this. Thus he sets forth the meaning of the Sabbath as held by him:

"Moreover the Sabbaths of God, that is, the kingdom, was, as it were, indicated by created things," etc.⁵⁶

"These [promises to the righteous] are [to take place] in the times of the kingdom, that is, upon the seventh day which has been sanctified, in which God rested from all the works which he created, which is the true Sabbath of the righteous,"⁵⁷ etc.

"For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years: and in six days created things were completed: it is evident, therefore, that they will come to an end at the sixth thousand year."⁵⁸

But Irenaeus did not notice that the Sabbath as a sign does not point forward to the restitution, but backward to the creation, that it may signify that the true God is the Creator.⁵⁹ Nor did he observe the fact that when the Kingdom of God shall be established under the whole heaven all flesh shall hallow the Sabbath.⁶⁰

But he says that those who lived before Moses were justified "without observance of Sabbaths," and offers as proof that the covenant at Horeb was not made with the fathers. Of course if this proves that the patriarchs were free from obligation toward the fourth commandment, it is equally good as proof that they might violate any other. These things indicate that Irenaeus was opposed to Sabbatic observance, though he did not in express language assert its abrogation, and did in most decisive terms assert the continued obligation of the ten commandments.

Tertullian offers numerous reasons for not observing the Sabbath, but there is scarcely one of these that he does not in some other place expressly contradict. Thus he asserts that the patriarchs before Moses did not observe the Sabbath.⁶¹ But he offers no proof, and he

elsewhere dates the origin of the Sabbath at the creation,⁶² as we shall show hereafter. In several places he teaches the abrogation of the law, and seems to set aside moral law as well as ceremonial. But elsewhere, as we shall show, he bears express testimony that the ten commandments are still binding as the rule of the Christian's life.⁶³ He quotes the words of Isaiah in which God is represented as hating the feasts, new-moons, and sabbaths observed by the Jews,⁶⁴ as proof that the seventh-day Sabbath was a temporary institution which Christ abrogated. But in another place he says: "Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: he kept the law thereof."⁶⁵ And he also explains this very text by stating that God's aversion toward the Sabbaths observed by the Jews was "because they were celebrated without the fear of God by a people full of iniquities," and adds that the prophet, in a later passage speaking of Sabbaths celebrated according to God's commandment, "declares them to be true, delightful, and inviolable."⁶⁶ Another statement is that Joshua violated the Sabbath in the siege of Jericho.⁶⁷ Yet he elsewhere explains this very case, showing that the commandment forbids our own work, not God's. Those who acted at Jericho did not do their own work, but God's, which they executed, and that, too, from his express commandment."⁶⁸ He also both asserts and denies that Christ violated the Sabbath.⁶⁹ Tertullian was a double-minded man. He wrote much against the law and the Sabbath, but he also contradicted and exposed his own errors.

Origen attempts to prove that the ancient Sabbath is to be understood mystically or spiritually, and not literally. Here is his argument:

" 'Ye shall sit, every one in your dwelling: no one shall move from his place on the Sabbath day.' Which precept it is impossible to observe literally; for no man can sit a whole day so as not to move from the place where he sat down."⁷⁰

Great men are not always wise. There is no such precept in the Bible. Origen referred to that which forbade the people to go out for manna on the Sabbath, but which did not conflict with another that commanded holy convocations or assemblies for worship on the Sabbath.⁷¹

Victorinus is the latest of the fathers before Constantine who offers reasons against the observance of the Sabbath. His first reason is that Christ said by Isaiah that his soul hated the Sabbath; which Sabbath he in his body abolished; and these assertions we have seen answered by Tertullian.⁷² His second reason is that "Jesus [Joshua] the son of Nave [Nun], the successor of Moses, himself broke the Sabbath day,"⁷³ which is false. His third reason is that "Matthias [a Maccabean] also, prince of Judah, broke the Sabbath,"⁷⁴ which is doubtless false, but is of no consequence as authority. His fourth argument is original, and may fitly close the list of reasons assigned in the early fathers for not observing the Sabbath. It is given in full without an answer:

"And in Matthew we read, that it is written Isaiah also and the rest of his colleagues broke the Sabbath."⁷⁵

1 Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xv.

2 Justin Martyr's First Apology, chap. 1xvii.

3 Lost Writings of Irenaeus, Fragments 7 and 50.

4 Book of the Laws of Countries.

5 Tertullian's Apology, sect. 16.

- 6 On Idolatry, chap. xiv.
- 7 Hist. Sab. part 2, chap. viii. sect. 13.
- 8 On Prayer, chap. xxiii.
- 9 De Corona, sect. 3.
- 10 Ad Nationes, book i. chap. xiii.
- 11 Canon 15.
- 12 Ante-Nicene Library, vol. xiv. p. 322.
- 13 Apostolical Constitutions, book ii. sect. 7, par. 59.
- 14 Id. book v. sect. ii. par. 10.
- 15 Id. book v. sect. iii. par. 20.
- 16 Epistle to the Magnesians (longer form), chap. ix.
- 17 Syriac Documents, p. 38.
- 18 Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xv.
- 19 Justin's First Apology, chap. lxvii.
- 20 Id.Ib.
- 21 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xxiv.
- 22 Id. chap. xli.
- 23 Clement's Miscellanies, book v. chap. xiv.
- 24 De Corona, sect. 4.
- 25 Origen's Opera. Tome ii. p. 158, Paris, A.D. 1733, "Quod si ex Divinis Scripturis hoc constat, quod die Dominica Deus pluit manna de caelo et in Sabbato non pluit, intelligent Judaei jam tunc praelatam esse Dominicam nostram Judaico Sabbato."
- 26 Cyprian's Epistle, No. lviii. sect. 4.
- 27 Peter's Canons, No. xv.
- 28 Apostolical Constitutions, book vii. sect. ii. par. 23.
- 29 Epistle to the Magnesians, chap. ix.
- 30 Syriac Documents, p. 38.
- 31 Id.Ib.
- 32 Id.Ib.
- 33 Id.Ib.

- 34 Fragment 7.
- 35 Tertullian on Prayer, chap. xxiii.
- 36 De Corona, sect. 3.
- 37 Origen against Celsus, book viii. chap. xxii.
- 38 Instructions of Commodianus, sect. 75.
- 39 Apostolical Constitutions, book v. sect. 3, par. 20.
- 40 De Corona, sects. 3 and 4.
- 41 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. x.
- 42 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xi.
- 43 Id. Chap. xii.
- 44 Tertullian on Idolatry, chap. xiv.
- 45 Id.Ib.
- 46 Tertullian Against the Jews, chap. iv.
- 47 Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xv.
- 48 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xii.
- 49 Id. chap. xviii.
- 50 See the third chapter of this History.
- 51 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xxiii.
- 52 Id. chap. xxix.
- 53 Id. chap. xi.
- 54 Lost Writings of Irenaeus, Fragment 7.
- 55 Against Heresies, book iv. chap. viii. sect. 2.
- 56 Id. book iv. chap. xvi. sect. 1.
- 57 Irenaeus against Heresies, book v. chap. xxxiii. sect. 2.
- 58 Id. book. v. chap. xxviii. sect. 3.
- 59 Ex.31:17; Eze.20:12,20.
- 60 Isa.66:22,23; Dan.7:18,27.
- 61 Answer to the Jews, chap. ii.
- 62 Tertullian against Marcion, book iv. chap. xii.

63 Compare his works as follows: Answer to the Jews, chaps. ii, iii,, iv, vi; Against Marcion, book i. chap. xx; book v. chaps. iv, xix.. with De Anima, Chap. xxxvii.; and, On Modesty, chap. v.

64 Isa.1:13,14.

65 Answer to the Jews, chap. iv.; Against Marcion, book iv. chap.. xii.

66 Isa.56:2; 58:13.

67 Answer to the Jews, chap. iv.; Against Marcion, book iv. chap.. xii.

68 Against Marcion, book ii. chap. xxi.

69 Against Marcion, book iv. chap. xii.

70 De Principiis, book iv. chap. i. sect. 17.

71 Ex.16:29; Lev.23:3.

72 Creation of the World, sect. 4.

73 Id. sect. 5.

74 Id.Ib.

75 Creation of the World, sect. 5.

CHAPTER 18

THE SABBATH IN THE RECORD OF THE EARLY FATHERS

The first reasons for neglecting the Sabbath are now mostly obsolete - A portion of the early fathers taught the perpetuity of the decalogue, and made it the standard of moral character - What they say concerning the origin of the Sabbath at Creation - Their testimony concerning the perpetuity of the ancient Sabbath, and concerning its observance - Enumeration of the things which caused the suppression of the Sabbath and the elevation of Sunday.

The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they had no special light on the subject by reason of living in the first centuries, which we in this later age do not possess. The fact is, so many of the reasons offered by them are manifestly false and absurd that those who in these days discard the Sabbath, do also discard the most of the reasons offered by these fathers for this same course. We have also learned from such of the early fathers as mention first-day observance, the exact nature of the Sunday festival, and all the reasons which in the first centuries were offered in its support. Very few indeed of these reasons are now offered by modern first-day writers.

But some of the fathers bear emphatic testimony to the perpetuity of the ten commandments, and make their observance the condition of eternal life. Some of them also distinctly assert the origin of the Sabbath at creation. Several of them moreover either bear witness to the existence of Sabbath-keepers, or bear decisive testimony to the perpetuity and obligation of the Sabbath, or define the nature of proper Sabbatic observance, or connect the observance of the Sabbath and first day together. Let us now hear the testimony of those who assert the authority of the ten commandments. Irenaeus asserts their perpetuity, and makes them a test of Christian character. Thus he says:

"For God at the first, indeed, warning them [the Jews] by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning he had implanted in mankind, that is, by means of the DECALOGUE (which, if any one does not observe, he has no salvation,) did then demand nothing more of them."¹

This is a very strong statement. He makes the ten commandments the law of nature implanted in man's being at the beginning; and so inherited by all mankind. This is no doubt true. It is the presence of the carnal mind or law of sin and death, implanted in man by the fall, that has partially obliterated this law, and made the work of the new covenant a necessity.² He again asserts the perpetuity and authority of the ten commandments:

"Preparing man for this life, the Lord himself did speak in his own person to all alike the words of the Decalogue: and therefore, in the like manner, do they remain permanently with us, receiving, by means of his advent in the flesh, extension and increase, but not abrogation."³

By the "extension" of the decalogue, Irenaeus doubtless means the exposition which the Saviour gave of the meaning of the commandments in his sermon on the mount.⁴ Theophilus speaks in like manner concerning the decalogue:-

"For God has given us a law and holy commandments; and every one who keeps these can be saved, and, obtaining the resurrection, can inherit incorruption."⁵

"We have learned a holy law; but we have as lawgiver him who is really God, who teaches us to act righteously, and to be pious, and to do good."⁶

"Of this great and wonderful law which tends to all righteousness, the TEN HEADS are such as we have already rehearsed."⁷

Tertullian calls the ten commandments "the rules of our regenerate life," that is to say, the rules which govern the life of a converted man:

"They who theorize respecting numbers, honor the number ten as the parent of all the others, and as imparting perfection to the human nativity. For my own part, I prefer viewing this measure of time in reference to God, as if implying that the ten months rather initiated man into the ten commandments; so that the numerical estimate of the time needed to consummate our natural birth should correspond to the numerical classification of the rules of our regenerate life."⁸

In showing the deep guilt involved in the violation of the seventh commandment, Tertullian speaks of the sacredness of the commandments which precede it, naming several of them in particular, and among them the fourth, and then says of the precept against adultery that

It stands "in the very forefront of the most holy law, among the primary counts of the celestial edict."⁹

Clement of Rome, or rather the author whose works have been ascribed to this father, speaks thus of the decalogue as a test:

"On account of those, therefore, who, by neglect of their own salvation, please the evil one, and those who, by study of their own profit, seek to please the good One, ten things have been prescribed as a test to this present age, according to the number of the ten plagues which were brought upon Egypt."¹⁰

Novation, who wrote about A.D. 250, is accounted the founder of the sect called Cathari or Puritans. He wrote a treatise on the Sabbath, which is not extant. There is no reference to Sunday in any of his writings. He makes the following striking remarks concerning the moral law:

"The law was given to the children of Israel for this purpose, that they might profit by it, and RETURN to those virtuous manners which, although they had received them from their fathers, they had corrupted in Egypt by reason of their intercourse with a barbarous people. Finally, also, those ten commandments on the tables teach nothing new, but remind them of what had been obliterated - that righteousness in them, which had been put to sleep, might revive again as it were by the afflatus of the law, after the manner of a fire [nearly extinguished]."¹¹

It is evident that in the judgment of Novation, the ten commandments enjoined nothing that was not sacredly regarded by the patriarchs before Jacob went down into Egypt. It follows, therefore, that, in his opinion, the Sabbath was made, not at the fall of the Manna, but when God sanctified the seventh day, and that holy men from the earliest ages observed it.

The Apostolical Constitutions, written about the third century, give us an understanding of what was widely regarded in the third century as apostolic doctrine. They speak thus of the ten commandments:

"Have before thine eyes the fear of God, and always remember the ten commandments of God, - to love the one and only Lord God with all thy strength; to give no heed to idols, or any other beings, as being lifeless gods, or irrational beings or demons."¹²

"He gave a plain law to assist the law of nature, such a one as is pure, saving, and holy, in which his own name was inscribed, perfect, which is never to fail, being complete in ten commands, unspotted, converting souls."¹³

This writer, like Irenaeus, believed in the identity of the decalogue with the law of nature. These testimonies show that in the writings of the early fathers are some of the strongest utterances in behalf of the perpetuity and authority of the ten commandments. Now let us hear what they say concerning the origin of the Sabbath at creation. The epistle ascribed to Barnabas, says:

"And he says in another place, 'If my sons keep the Sabbath, then will I cause my mercy to rest upon them.' The Sabbath is mentioned at the beginning of the creation [thus]: 'And God made in six days the works of his hands, and made an end on the seventh day, and rested on it, and sanctified it.' "¹⁴

Irenaeus seems plainly to connect the origin of the Sabbath with the sanctification of the seventh day:

"These [things promised] are [to take place] in the times of the kingdom, that is, upon the seventh day, which has been sanctified, in which God rested from all his works which he created, which is the true Sabbath, in which they shall not be engaged in any earthly occupation."¹⁵

Tertullian, likewise, refers the origin of the Sabbath to "the benediction of the Father:"

"But inasmuch as birth is also completed with the seventh month, I more readily recognize in this number than in the eighth the honor of numerical agreement with the Sabbatical period; so that the month in which Gods' image is sometimes produced in a human birth, shall in its number tally with the day on which God's creation was completed and hallowed."¹⁶

"For even in the case before us he [Christ] fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition; [moreover] he exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath, [and] while imparting to the Sabbath day itself which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by his own beneficent action."¹⁷

Origen, who, as we have seen, believed in a mystical Sabbath, did nevertheless fix its origin at the sanctification of the seventh day:

"For he [Celsus] knows nothing of the day of the Sabbath and rest of God, which follows the completion of the worlds creation, and which lasts during the duration of the world, and in which all those will keep festival with God who have done all their works in their six days."¹⁸

The testimony of Novation which has been given relative to the sacredness and authority of the decalogue plainly implies the existence of the Sabbath in the patriarchal ages, and its observance by those holy men of old. It was given to Israel that they might

"RETURN to those virtuous manners which, although they had received them from their fathers, they had corrupted in Egypt."

And he adds,

"Those ten commandments on the tables teach nothing new, but remind them of what had been obliterated."¹⁹

He did, not, therefore, believe the Sabbath to have originated at the fall of the manna, but counted it one of those things which were practiced by their fathers before Jacob went down to Egypt.

Lactantius places the origin of the Sabbath at creation:

"God completed the world and this admirable work of nature in the space of six days (as is contained in the secrets of holy Scripture) and CONSECRATED the seventh day on which he had rested from his works. But this is the Sabbath day, which, in the language of the Hebrews, received its name from the number, whence the seventh is the legitimate and complete number."²⁰

In a poem on Genesis written about the time of Lactantius, but by an unknown author, we have an explicit testimony to the divine appointment of the seventh day to a holy use while man was yet in Eden, the garden of God:

"The seventh came, when God
At his work's end did rest, DECREEING IT
SACRED UNTO THE COMING AGE'S JOYS."²¹

The Apostolical Constitution, while teaching the present obligation of the Sabbath, plainly indicate its origin to have been at creation:

"O Lord Almighty, thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast appointed the Sabbath in memory thereof, because that on that day thou hast made up rest from our works, for the meditation upon thy laws."²²

Such are the testimonies of the early fathers to the primeval origin of the Sabbath, and to the sacredness and perpetual obligation of the ten commandments. We now call attention to what they say relative to the perpetuity of the Sabbath, and to its observance in the centuries during which they lived. Tertullian defines Christ's relation to the Sabbath:

"He was called 'Lord of the Sabbath' because he maintained the Sabbath as his own institution."²³

He affirms that Christ did not abolish the Sabbath:

"Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: he kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of his disciples (for he indulged them with the relief of food when they were hungry), and in the present instance cured the withered hand; in each case intimating by facts, 'I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it.' "²⁴

Nor can it be said that while Tertullian denied that Christ abolished the Sabbath he did believe that he transferred its sacredness from the seventh day of the week to the first, for he continues thus:

"He [Christ] exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath, [and] while imparting to the Sabbath day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by his own beneficent action. For he furnished to this day DIVINE SAFEGUARDS - a course which his adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honoring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it." ²⁵

This is a very remarkable statement. The modern doctrine of the change of the Sabbath was unknown in Tertullian's time. Had it then been in existence, there could be no doubt that in the words last quoted he was aiming at it a heavy blow; for the very thing which he asserts Christ's adversary, Satan, would have had him do, that modern first-day writers assert he did do in consecrating another day instead of adding to the sanctity of his Father's Sabbath.

Archelaus of Cascar in Mesopotamia emphatically denies the abolition of the Sabbath:

"Again, as to the assertion that the Sabbath has been abolished, we deny that he has abolished it plainly; for he was himself also Lord of the Sabbath." ²⁶

Justin Martyr, as we have seen, was an outspoken opponent of Sabbatic observance, and of the authority of the law of God. He was by no means always candid in what he said. He has occasion to refer to those who observed the seventh day, and he does it with contempt. Thus he says:

"But if some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses (from which they expect some virtue, but which we believe were appointed by reason of the hardness of the people's hearts), 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." ²⁷

These words are spoken of Sabbath-keeping Christians. Such of them as were of Jewish descent no doubt generally retained circumcision. But there were many Gentile Christians who observed the Sabbath, as we shall see, and it is not true that they observed circumcision. Justin speaks of this class as acting from "weak-mindedness," yet he inadvertently alludes to the keeping of the commandments as the performance of "the ETERNAL and NATURAL ACTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS," a most appropriate designation indeed. Justin would

fellowship those who act thus, provided they would fellowship him in the contrary course. But though Justin, on this condition could fellowship these "week-minded" brethren, he says that there are those who "do not venture to have any intercourse with, or to extend hospitality to, such persons; but I do not agree with them."²⁸ This shows the bitter spirit which prevailed in some quarters toward the Sabbath, even as early as Justin's time. Justin has no word of condemnation for these intolerant professors; he is only solicitous lest those persons who perform "the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety" should condemn those who do not perform them.

Clement of Alexandria, though a mystical writer, bears an important testimony to the perpetuity of the ancient Sabbath, and to man's present need thereof. He comments thus on the fourth commandment:

"And the fourth word is that which intimates that the world was created by God, and that he gave us the seventh day as a rest, on account of the trouble that there is in life. For God is incapable of weariness, and suffering, and want. But we who bear flesh need rest. The seventh day therefore, is proclaimed a rest - abstraction from ills - preparing for the primal day, our true rest."²⁹

Clement recognized the authority of the moral law; for he treats of the ten commandments, one by one, and shows what each enjoins. He plainly teaches that the Sabbath was made for man, and that he now needs it as a day of rest, and his language implies that it was made at the creation. But in the next paragraph, he makes some curious suggestions, which deserve notice:

"Having reached this point, we must mention these things by the way; since the discourse has turned on the seventh and the eighth. For the eighth may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the latter properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work. For the creation of the world was concluded in six days."³⁰

This language has been adduced to show that Clement called the eighth day, or Sunday, the Sabbath. But first-day writers in general have not dared to commit themselves to such an interpretation, and some of them have expressly discarded it. Let us notice this statement with especial care. He speaks of the ordinals seventh and eighth in the abstract, but probably with reference to the days of the week. Observe then,

1. That he does not intimate that the eighth day has become the Sabbath in place of the seventh which was once such, but he says that the eighth day may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh.
2. That in Clement's time, A.D. 194, there was not any confusion in the minds of men as to which day was the ancient Sabbath, and which one was the first day of the week, or eighth day, as it was often called, nor does he intimate that there was.
3. But Clement, from some cause, says that possibly the eighth day should be counted the seventh, and the seventh day the sixth. Now, if this should be done, it would change the numbering of the days, not only as far back as the resurrection of Christ, but all the way back to the creation.
4. If, therefore, in this place, designed to teach that Sunday is the Sabbath, he must also have held that it always had been such.

5. But observe that, while he changes the numbering of the days of the week, he does not change the Sabbath from one day to another. He says the eighth may possibly be the seventh, and the seventh, properly the sixth, and the latter, or this one [Greek, *e men kurios einai sabbaton*], properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work.

6. By the latter must be understood the day last mentioned, which he says should be called, not the seventh, but the sixth; and by the seventh must certainly be intended that day which he says is not the eighth, but the seventh, that is to say, Sunday.

There remains but one difficulty to be solved, and that is why he should suggest the changing of the numbering of the days of the week by striking one from the count of each day, thus making the Sabbath the sixth day in the count instead of the seventh; and making Sunday the seventh day in the count instead of the eighth. The answer seems to have eluded the observation of the first-day and anti-Sabbatarian writers who have sought to grasp it. But there is a fact which solves the difficulty. Clement's commentary on the fourth commandment, from which these quotations are taken, is principally made up of curious observations on "the perfect number six," "the number seven motherless and childless," and the number eight, which is "a cube," and the like matters, and is taken with some change of arrangement almost word for word from Philo Judaeus, a teacher who flourished at Alexandria about one century before Clement. Whoever will take pains to compare these two writers will find in Philo nearly all the ideas and illustrations which Clement has used, and the very language also in which he has expressed them.³¹ Philo was a mystical teacher to whom Clement looked up as to a master. A statement which we find in Philo, in immediate connection with several curious ideas, which Clement quotes from him, gives, beyond all doubt, the key to Clement's suggestion that possibly the eighth day should be called the seventh, and the seventh day called the sixth. Philo said that, according to God's purpose, the first day of time was not to be numbered with the other days of the creation week. Thus he says:

"And he allotted each of the six days to one of the portions of the whole, **TAKING OUT THE FIRST DAY** which he does not even call the first day, that it may not be numbered with the others, but entitling it **ONE**, he names it rightly, perceiving in it, and ascribing to it, the nature and appellation of the limit."³²

This would simply change the numbering of the days, as counted by Philo, and afterward partially adopted by Clement, and make the Sabbath, not the seventh day, but the sixth, and Sunday, not the eighth day, but the seventh; but it would still leave the Sabbath day and the Sunday the same identical days as before. It would, however, give to the Sabbath the name of sixth day, because the first of the six days of creation was not counted; and it would cause the eighth day, so called in the early church because of its coming next after the Sabbath, to be called seventh day. Thus the Sabbath would be the sixth day, and the seventh a day of work, and yet the Sabbath would be the identical day that it had ever been, and the Sunday, though called seventh day, would still, as ever before, remain a day on which ordinary labor was lawful. Of course, Philo's idea that the first day of time should not be counted, is wholly false; for there is not one fact in the Bible to support it, but many which expressly contradict it, and even Clement, with all deference to Philo, only timidly suggests it. But when the matter is laid open, it shows that Clement had no thought of calling Sunday the Sabbath, and that he does

expressly confirm what we have fully proved out of other of the fathers, that Sunday was a day on which, in their judgment, labor was not sinful.

Tertullian, at different periods of his life, held different views respecting the Sabbath, and committed them all to writing. We last quoted from him a decisive testimony to the perpetuity of the Sabbath, coupled with an equally decisive testimony against the sanctification of the first day of the week. In another work, from which we have already quoted his statement that Christians should not kneel on Sunday, we find another statement that "some few" abstained from kneeling on the Sabbath. This has probable reference to Carthage, where Tertullian lived. He speaks thus:

"In the matter of kneeling also, prayer is subject to diversity of observance, through the act of some few who abstain from kneeling on the Sabbath; and since this dissension is particularly on its trial before the churches, the Lord will give his grace that the dissentients may either yield, or else indulge their opinion without offense to others."³³

The act of standing in prayer was one of the chief honors conferred upon Sunday. Those who refrained from kneeling on the seventh day, without doubt did it because they desired to honor that day. This particular act is of no consequence; for it was adopted in imitation of those who, from tradition and custom, thus honored Sunday; but we have in this an undoubted reference to Sabbath-keeping Christians. Tertullian speaks of them, however, in a manner quite unlike that of Justin in his reference to the commandment-keepers of his time.

Origen, like many other of the fathers, was far from being consistent with himself. Though he has spoken against Sabbatic observance, and has honored the so-called Lord's day as something better than the ancient Sabbath, he has nevertheless given a discourse expressly designed to teach Christians the proper method of observing the Sabbath. Here is a portion of this sermon:

"But what is the feast of the Sabbath except that of which the apostle speaks, 'There remaineth therefore a Sabbatism,' that is, the observance of the Sabbath by the people of God? Leaving the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be observed by a Christian. On the Sabbath day all worldly labors ought to be abstained from. If, therefore, you cease from all secular works, and execute nothing worldly, but give yourselves up to spiritual exercises, repairing to church, attending to sacred reading and instruction, thinking of celestial things, solicitous for the future, placing the Judgment to come before your eyes, not looking to things present and visible, but to those which are future and invisible, this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath."³⁴

This is by no means a bad representation of the proper observance of the Sabbath. Such a discourse addressed to Christians is a strong evidence that many did then hallow that day. Some, indeed, have claimed that these words were spoken concerning Sunday. They would have it that he contrasts the observance of the first day with that of the seventh. But the contrast is not between the different methods of keeping two days, but between two methods of observing one day. The Jews in Origen's time spent the day mainly in mere abstinence from labor, and often added sensuality to idleness. But the Christians were to observe it in divine worship, as well as sacred rest. What day he intends cannot be doubtful. It is *DIES SABBATI*, a term which can signify only the seventh day. Here is the first instance of the

term Christian Sabbath, Sabbati Christiani, and it is expressly applied to the seventh day observed by Christians.

The longer form of the reputed epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians was not written till after Origen's time, but, though not written by Ignatius, it is valuable for the light which it sheds upon the existing state of things at the time of its composition, and for marking the progress which apostasy had made with respect to the Sabbath. Here is its reference to the Sabbath and first day:-

"Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for 'he that does not work, let him not eat.' For say the [holy] oracles, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, 'To the end, for the eighth day,' on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ."³⁵

This writer specifies the different things which made up the Jewish observance of the Sabbath. They may be summed up under two heads. 1. Strict abstinence from labor. 2. Dancing and carousal. Now, in the light of what Origen has said, we can understand the contrast which this writer draws between the Jewish and Christian observance of the Sabbath. The error of the Jews in the first part of this was that they contented themselves with mere bodily relaxation, without raising their thoughts to God, the Creator, and this mere idleness soon gave place to sensual folly.

The Christian, as Origen draws the contrast, refrains from labor on the Sabbath that he may raise his heart in grateful worship. Or, as this writer draws it, the Christian keeps the Sabbath in a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law; but to do thus, he must hallow it in the manner which that law commands, that is, in the observance of a sacred rest which commemorates the rest of the Creator. The writer evidently believed in the observance of the Sabbath as an act of obedience to that law on which they were to meditate on that day. And the nature of the epistle indicates that it was observed, at all events, in the country where it was written. But mark the work of apostasy. The so-called Lord's day for which the writer could offer nothing better than an argument drawn from the title of the sixth psalm (see its marginal reading) is exalted above the Lord's holy day, and made the queen of all days!

The Apostolical Constitutions, though not written in apostolic times, were in existence as early as the third century, and were then very generally believed to express the doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important historical testimony to the practice of the church at that time, and also indicate the great progress which apostasy had made. Guericke speaks thus of them:

"This is a collection of ecclesiastical statutes purporting to be the work of the apostolic age, but in reality formed gradually in the second, third, and fourth centuries, and is of much value in reference to the history of polity, and Christian archaeology generally."³⁶

Mosheim says of them:

"The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed amongst the Christians of the second and third centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions."³⁷

These Constitutions indicate that the Sabbath was extensively observed in the third century. They also show the standing of the Sunday festival in that century. After solemnly enjoining the sacred observance of the ten commandments, they thus enforce the Sabbath:

"Consider the manifold workmanship of God, which received its beginning through Christ. Thou shalt observe the Sabbath, on account of Him who ceased from his work of creation, but ceased not from his work of providence: it is a rest for meditation of the law, not for idleness of the hands."³⁸

This is sound Sabbatarian doctrine. To show how distinctly these Constitutions recognize the decalogue as the foundation of Sabbatic authority we quote the words next preceding the above, though we have quoted them on another occasion:

"Have before thine eyes the fear of God, and always remember the ten commandments of God, - to love the one and only Lord God with all thy strength; to give no heed to idols, or any other beings, as being lifeless gods, or irrational beings or daemons."³⁹

But though these Constitutions thus recognize the authority of the decalogue and the sacred obligation of the seventh day, they elevate the Sunday festival in some respects to higher honor than the Sabbath, though they claim for it no precept of the Scriptures. Thus they say:

"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."⁴⁰

"For the Sabbath is the ceasing of the creation, the completion of the world, the inquiry after laws, and the grateful praise to God for the blessings he has bestowed upon men. All which the Lord's day excels, and shows the Mediator himself, the Provider, the Law-giver, the Cause of the resurrection, the First-born of the whole creation."⁴¹

"So that the Lord's day commands us to offer unto thee, O Lord, thanksgiving for all. For this is the grace afforded by thee, which, on account of its greatness, has obscured all other blessings."⁴²

Tested by his own principles, the writer of these Constitutions was far advanced in apostasy; for he held a festival, for which he claimed no divine authority, more honorable than one which he acknowledged to be ordained of God. There could be but one step more in this course, and that would be to set aside the commandment of God for the ordinance of man, and this step was not very long afterward actually taken. One other point should be noticed. It is said:

"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."⁴³

The question of the sinfulness of labor on either of these days is not here taken into the account; for the reason assigned is that the slaves may have leisure to attend public worship. But while these Constitutions elsewhere forbid labor on the Sabbath on the authority of the decalogue, they do not forbid it upon the first day of the week. Take the following as an example:

"O Lord Almighty, thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast appointed the Sabbath in memory thereof, because that on that day thou hast made us rest from our works, for the meditation upon thy laws."⁴⁴

The Apostolical Constitutions are valuable to us, not as authority respecting the teaching of the apostles, but as giving us a knowledge of the views and practices which prevailed in the third century. As these Constitutions were extensively regarded as embodying the doctrine of the apostles, they furnish conclusive evidence that, at the time when they were put in writing, the ten commandments were very generally revered as the immutable rule of right, and that the Sabbath of the Lord was by many observed as an act of obedience to the fourth commandment, and as the divine memorial of the creation. They also show that the first-day festival had, in the third century, attained such strength and influence as to clearly indicate that ere long it would claim the entire ground. But observe that the Sabbath and the so-called Lord's day were then regarded as distinct institutions, and that no hint of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first is even once given.

Thus much out of the fathers concerning the authority of the decalogue, and concerning the perpetuity and observance of the ancient Sabbath. The suppression of the Sabbath of the Bible, and the elevation of Sunday to its place, has been shown to be in no sense the work of the Saviour. But so great a work required the united action of powerful causes, and these causes we now enumerate.

1. Hatred toward the Jews. This people, who retained the ancient Sabbath, had slain Christ. It was easy for men to forget that Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, had claimed it as his own institution, and to call the Sabbath a Jewish institution which Christians should not regard.⁴⁵

2. The hatred of the church of Rome toward the Sabbath, and its determination to elevate Sunday to the highest place. This church, as the chief in the work of apostasy, took the lead in the earliest effort to suppress the Sabbath by turning it into a fast. And the very first act of papal aggression was by an edict in behalf of Sunday. Thenceforward, in every possible form, this church continued this work until the pope announced that he had received a divine mandate for Sunday observance [the very thing lacking] in a roll which fell from Heaven.

3. The voluntary observance of memorable days. In the Christian church, almost from the beginning, men voluntarily honored the fourth, the sixth, and the first days of the week, and also the anniversary of the Passover and the Pentecost, to commemorate the betrayal, the death, and the resurrection, of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, which acts in themselves could not be counted sinful.

4. The making of tradition of equal authority with the Scriptures. This was the great error of the early church, and the one to which that church was specially exposed, as having in it those who had seen the apostles, or who had seen

those who had seen them. It was this which rendered the voluntary observance of memorable days a dangerous thing. For what began as a voluntary observance became, after the lapse of a few years, a standing custom, established by tradition, which must be obeyed because it came from those who had seen the apostles, or from those who had seen others who had seen them. This is the origin of the various errors of the great apostasy.

5. The entrance of the no-law heresy. This is seen in Justin Martyr, the earliest witness to the Sunday festival, and in the church of Rome of which he was then a member.

6. The extensive observance of Sunday as a heathen festival. The first day of the week corresponded to the widely observed heathen festival of the sun. It was therefore easy to unite the honor of Christ in the observance of the day of his resurrection with the convenience and worldly advantage of his people in having the same festival day with their heathen neighbors, and to make it a special act of piety in that the conversion of the heathen was thereby facilitated, while the neglect of the ancient Sabbath was justified by stigmatizing that divine memorial as a Jewish institution with which Christians should have no concern.

1 Irenaeus Against Heresies, book iv. chap. xv. sect. 1.

2 Jer.31:33; Rom.7:21-25; 8:1-7.

3 Irenaeus Against Heresies, book iv. chap. xvi. sect. 4.

4 Matt. Chapters 5, 6, 7.

5 Theophilus to Autolycus, book ii. chap. xxvii.

6 Id. BOOK III. CHAP IX.

7 Id.Ib.

8 De Anima, chap. xxxvii.

9 On Modesty, chap. v.

10 Recognitions of Clement, book iii. chap. lv.

11 Novation on the Jewish Meats, chap. iii.

12 Apostolical Constitutions, book ii. sect. 4. par. 36.

13 Id. book vi. sect. 4, par. 19.

14 Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xv.

15 Irenaeus Against Heresies, book v. chap. xxxiii. sect. 2.

16 De Anima, chap. xxxvii.

17 Tertullian Against Marcion, book iv, chap. xii.

- 18 Origen Against Celsus, book vi. chap. lxi.
- 19 Novatian on the Jewish Meats, chap. iii.
- 20 Divine Institutes of Lactantius, book vii. chap. xiv.
- 21 Poem on Genesis, Lines 51-53.
- 22 Apostolical Constitutions, book vii. sect. 2, par. 36.
- 23 Tertullian Against Marcion, book iv. chap. xii.
- 24 Id.Ib.
- 25 Tertullian Against Marcion, book iv. chap. xii.
- 26 Disputation with Manes, sect. 42.
- 27 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xlvii.
- 28 Id.Ib.
- 29 Clement's Miscellanies, book vi. chap. xvi.
- 30 Id.Ib.
- 31 Compare Clement of Alexandria, vol. ii. pp. 386-390, Ante-Nicene library edition, or the Miscellanies of Clement, book vi. chap. xvi. with Bohn's edition of Philo, vol. i. pp. 3, 4, 29, 30, 31, 32, 54, 55; vol. iii. p. 159; vol. iv. p. 452.
- 32 Bohn's edition of Philo Judaeus, vol. i. p. 4.
- 33 Tertullian on Prayer, chap. xxiii.
- 34 Origen's Opera, Tome 2, p. 358, Paris, 1733, "Quo est autem festivitas Sabbati nisi illa de qua Apostolus dicit, 'relinqueretur ergo Sabbatismus,' hoc est, Sabbati observatio, 'populo Dei?' Relinquentes ergo Judaicas Sabbati observationes, qualis debeat esse Christiano Sabbati observatio, videamus. Die Sabbati nihil ex omnibus mundi actibus oportet operari. Si ergo desinas ab omnibus saecularibus operibus, et nihil mundanum geras, sed spiritualibus operibus vaces, ad ecclesiam convenias, lectionibus divinis et tractatibus aurem praebeas, et de ecclestibus cogites, de futura spe sollicitudinem geras, venturum judicium prae oculis habeas, non respicias ad prae sientia et visibilia, sed ad invisibilia et futura, haec est observatio Sabbati Christiani." - Origenis in Numeras Homilia 23.
- 35 Epistle to the Magnesians (longer form) chap. ix.
- 36 Ancient church, p. 212.
- 37 Historical Commentaries, cent. 1. sect. 51.
- 38 Apostolical Constitutions, book ii. sect. 4, par. 36.
- 39 Id.Ib.
- 40 Id. book. vii. sect. 2, par. 23.

41 Id. book vii. sect. 2, par. 36.

42 Apostolical Constitutions, book ii, sec. 4. par. 36.

43 Id. book viii. sect. 4, par. 33.

44 Id. book vii. sect. 2, par. 36.

45 Victorinus says, "Let the sixth day become a rigorous fast, lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews." - On the creation of the World, sect. 4. And Constantine says, "It becomes us to have nothing in common with the perfidious Jews." - Socrates' Eccl. Hist. book v. chap. xxii.

CHAPTER 19

THE SABBATH AND FIRST-DAY DURING THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES

Origin of the Sabbath and of the festival of the sun contrasted - Entrance of that festival into the church - The Moderns with the Ancients - The Sabbath observed by the early Christians - Testimony of Morer - Of Twisse - Of Giesler - Of Mosheim - Of Coleman - Of Bishop Tayler - The Sabbath loses ground before the Sunday festival - Several bodies of decided Sabbatarians - Testimony of Brerewood - Constantine's Sunday law - Sunday a day of labor with the primitive church - Constantine's edict a heathen law, and himself at that time a heathen - The bishop of Rome authoritatively confers the name of Lord's day upon Sunday - Heylyn narrates the steps by which Sunday arose to power - A marked change in the history of that institution - Paganism brought into the church - The Sabbath weakened by Constantine's influence - Remarkable facts concerning Eusebius - The Sabbath recovers strength again - The council of Laodicea pronounces a curse upon the Sabbath-keepers - The progress of apostasy marked - Authority of church councils considered - Chrysostom - Jerome - Augustine - Sunday edicts - Testimony of Socrates relative to the Sabbath about the middle of the fifth century - Of Sozomen - Effectual suppression of the Sabbath at the close of the fifth century.

The origin of the Sabbath and of the festival of Sunday is now distinctly understood. When God made the world, he gave to man the Sabbath that he might not forget the Creator of all things. When men apostatized from God, Satan turned them to the worship of the sun, and, as a standing memorial of their veneration for that luminary, caused them to dedicate to his honor the first day of the week. When the elements of apostasy had sufficiently matured in the Christian church, this ancient festival stood forth as a rival to the Sabbath of the Lord. The manner in which it obtained a foothold in the Christian church has been already shown; and many facts which have an important bearing upon the struggle between these rival institutions have also been given. We have, in the preceding chapters, given the statements of the most ancient Christian writers respecting the Sabbath and first-day in the early church. As we now trace the history of these two days during the first five centuries of the Christian era, we shall give the statements of modern church historians, covering the same ground with the early fathers, and shall also quote in continuation of the ancient writers the testimonies of the earliest church historians. The reader can thus discover how nearly the ancients and moderns agree. Of the observance of the Sabbath in the early church, Morer speaks thus:

"The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted but they derived this practice from the apostles themselves, as appears by several scriptures to that purpose; who, keeping both that day and the first of the week, gave occasion to the succeeding ages to join them together, and make it one festival, though there was not the same reason for the continuance of the custom as there was to begin it."¹

A learned English first-day writer of the seventeenth century, William Twisse, D. D., thus states the early history of these two days:

"Yet for some hundred years in the primitive church, not the Lord's day only, but the seventh day also, was religiously observed, not by Ebion and Cerinthus only, but by pious Christians also, as Baronius writeth, and Gomarus confesseth, and Rivet also, that we are bound in conscience under the gospel, to allow for God's service a better proportion of time, than the Jews did under the law, rather than a worse."²

That the observance of the Sabbath was not confined to Jewish converts, the learned Giesler explicitly testifies:

"While the Jewish Christians of Palestine retained the entire Mosaic law, and consequently the Jewish festivals, the Gentile Christians observed also the Sabbath and the passover,³ with reference to the last scenes of Jesus' life, but without Jewish superstition. In addition to these, Sunday, as the day of Christ's resurrection, was devoted to religious services."⁴

The statement of Mosheim may be thought to contradict that of Giesler. Thus he says:

"The seventh day of the week was also observed as a festival, not by the Christians in general, but by such churches only as were principally composed of Jewish converts, nor did the other Christians censure this custom as criminal and unlawful."⁵

It will be observed that Mosheim does not deny that the Jewish converts observed the Sabbath. He denies that this was done by the Gentile Christians. The proof on which he rests this denial is thus stated by him:

"The churches of Bithynia, of which Pliny speaks, in his letter to Trajan, had only one stated day for the celebration of public worship; and that was undoubtedly the first day of the week, or what we call the Lord's day."⁶

The proposition to be proved is this: The Gentile Christians did not observe the Sabbath. The proof is found in the following fact: The churches of Bithynia assembled on a stated day for the celebration of divine worship. It is seen therefore that the conclusion is gratuitous, and wholly unauthorized by the testimony.⁷ But this instance shows the dexterity of Mosheim in drawing inferences, and gives us some insight into the kind of evidence which supports some of these sweeping statements in behalf of Sunday. Who can say that this "stated day" was not the very day enjoined in the fourth commandment? Of the Sabbath and first day in the early ages of the church, Coleman speaks as follows:

"The last day of the week was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discontinued."⁸

This is a most explicit acknowledgment that the Bible Sabbath was long observed by the body of the Christian church. Coleman is a first-day writer, and therefore not likely to state the case too strongly in behalf of the seventh day. He is a modern writer, but we have already proved his statements true out of the ancients. It is true that Coleman speaks also of the first day of

the week, yet his subsequent language shows that it was a long while before this became a sacred day. Thus he says:

"During the early ages of the church it was never entitled 'the Sabbath,' this word being confined to the seventh day of the week, the Jewish Sabbath, which, as we have already said, continued to be observed for several centuries by the converts to Christianity."⁹

This fact is made still clearer by the following language, in which this historian admits Sunday to be nothing but a human ordinance:

"No law or precept appears to have been given by Christ or the apostles, either for the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, or the institution of the Lord's day, or the substitution of the first for the seventh day of the week."¹⁰

Coleman does not seem to realize that in making this truthful statement he has directly acknowledged that the ancient Sabbath is still in full force as a divine institution, and that first-day observance is only authorized by the traditions of men. He next relates the manner in which this Sunday festival which had been nourished in the bosom of the church usurped the place of the Lord's Sabbath; a warning to all Christians of the tendency of human institutions, if cherished by the people of God, to destroy those which are divine. Let this important language be carefully pondered. He speaks thus:

"The observance of the Lord's day was ordered while yet the Sabbath of the Jews was continued; nor was the latter superseded until the former had acquired the same solemnity and importance, which belonged, at first, to that great day which God originally ordained and blessed. . . . But in time, after the Lord's day was fully established, the observance of the Sabbath of the Jews was gradually discontinued, and was finally denounced as heretical."¹¹

Thus is seen the result of cherishing this harmless Sunday festival in the church. It only asked toleration at first; but gaining strength by degrees, it gradually undermined the Sabbath of the Lord, and finally denounced its observance as heretical.

Jeremy Taylor, a distinguished bishop of the Church of England, and a man of great erudition, but a decided opponent of Sabbatic obligation, confirms the testimony of Coleman. He affirms that the Sabbath was observed by the Christians of the first three hundred years, but denies that they did this out of respect to the authority or the law of God. But we have shown from the fathers that those who hallowed the Sabbath did it as an act of obedience to the fourth commandment, and that the decalogue was acknowledged as of perpetual obligation, and as the perfect rule of right. As Bishop T. denies that this was their ground of observance, he should have shown some other, which he has not done. Thus he says:

"The Lord's day did not succeed in the place of the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was wholly abrogated, and the Lord's day was merely an ecclesiastical institution. 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."¹²

That such an opinion relative to the obligation of the fourth commandment had gained ground extensively among the leaders of the church, as early at least as the fourth century, and probably in the third, is sufficiently attested by the action of the council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, which anathematized those who should observe the Sabbath, as will be noticed in its

place. That this loose view of the morality of the fourth commandment was resisted by many, is shown by the existence of various bodies of steadfast Sabbatharians in that age, whose memory has come down to us; and also by the fact that that council made such a vigorous effort to put down the Sabbath. Coleman has clearly portrayed the gradual depression of the Sabbath, as the first-day festival arose in strength, until Sabbath-keeping became heretical, when, by ecclesiastical authority, the Sabbath was suppressed, and the festival of Sunday became fully established as a new and different institution. The natural consequence of this is seen in the rise of distinct sects, or bodies, who were distinguished for their observance of the seventh day. That they should be denounced as heretical and falsely charged with many errors is not surprising, when we consider that their memory has been handed down to us by their opponents, and that Sabbath-keepers in our own time are not unfrequently treated in this very manner. The first of these ancient Sabbatharian bodies was the Nazarenes. Of these, Morer testifies that,

They "retained the Sabbath; and though they pretended to believe as Christians, yet they practiced as Jews, and so were in reality neither one nor the other."¹³

And Dr. Frances White, lord bishop of Ely, mentions the Nazarenes as one of the ancient bodies of Sabbath-keepers who were condemned by the church leaders for that heresy; and he classes them with heretics as Morer has done.¹⁴ Yet the Nazarenes have a peculiar claim to our regard, as being in reality the apostolic church of Jerusalem, and its direct successors. Thus Gibbon testifies:

"The Jewish converts, or, as they were afterwards called, the Nazarenes, who had laid the foundations of the church, soon found themselves overwhelmed by the increasing multitudes, that from all the various religions of polytheism enlisted under the banner of Christ . . . The Nazarenes retired from the ruins of Jerusalem to the little town of Pella beyond the Jordan, where that ancient church languished above sixty years in solitude and obscurity."¹⁵

It is not strange that that church which fled out of Judea at the word of Christ¹⁶ should long retain the Sabbath, as it appears that they did, even as late as the fourth century. Morer mentions another class of Sabbath-keepers in the following language:

"About the same time were the Hypsistarii who closed with these as to what concerned the Sabbath, yet would by no means accept circumcision as too plain a testimony of ancient bondage. All these were heretics, and so adjudged to be by the Catholic church. Yet their hypocrisy and industry were such as gained them a considerable footing in the Christian world."¹⁷

The bishop of Ely names these also as a body of Sabbath-keepers whose heresy was condemned by the church.¹⁸ The learned Joseph Bingham, M. A. gives the following account of them:

"There was another sect which called themselves Hypsistarians, that is, worshipers of the most high God, whom they worshiped as the Jews only in one person. And they observed their Sabbaths and used distinction of meats, clean and unclean, though they did not regard circumcision, as Gregory Nazianzen, whose father was once one of this sect, gives the account of them."¹⁹

It must ever be remembered that these people, whom the Catholic church adjudged to be heretics, are not speaking for themselves: their enemies who condemned them have transmitted to posterity all that is known of their history. It would be well if heretics, who meet with little mercy at the hand of ecclesiastical writers, could at least secure the impartial justice of a truthful record.

Another class are thus described by Cox in his elaborate work entitled "Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties:"

"In this way [that is, by presenting the testimony of the Bible on the subject] arose the ancient Sabbatarians, a body it is well known of very considerable importance in respect both to numbers and influence, during the greater part of the third and the early part of the next century,"²⁰

The close of the third century witnessed the Sabbath much weakened in its hold upon the church in general, and the festival of Sunday, although possessed of no divine authority, steadily gaining in strength and in sacredness. The following historical testimony from a member of the English Church, Edward Brerewood, professor in Gresham College, London, gives a good general view of the matter, though the author's anti-Sabbatarian views are mixed with it. He says:

"The ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed together with the celebration of the Lord's day by the Christians of the east church above three hundred years after our Saviour's death; and besides that, no other day for more hundreds of years than I spake of before, was known in the church by the name of Sabbath but that: let the collection thereof and conclusion of all be this: The Sabbath of the seventh day as touching the alligations of God's solemn worship to time was ceremonial; that Sabbath was religiously observed in the east church three hundred years and more after our Saviour's passion. That church being the great part of Christendom, and having the apostles' doctrine and example to instruct them, would have restrained it if it had been deadly."²¹

Such was the case in the eastern churches at the end of the third century; but in such of the western churches as sympathized with the church of Rome, the Sabbath had been treated as a fast from the beginning of that century, to express their opposition toward those who observed it according to the commandment.

In the early part of the fourth century occurred an event which could not have been foreseen, but which threw an immense weight in favor of Sunday into the balances already trembling between the rival institutions, the Sabbath of the Lord and the festival of the sun. This was nothing less than an edict from the throne of the Roman Empire in behalf of "the venerable day of the sun." It was issued by the emperor Constantine in A.D. 321, and is thus expressed:

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven. Given the seventh day of March; Crispus and Constantine being consuls, each of them for the second time."²²

Of this law, a high authority thus speaks:

"It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; and who, according to Eusebius, appointed it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire. Before him, and even in his time, they observed the Jewish Sabbath, as well as Sunday; both to satisfy the law of Moses, and to imitate the apostles who used to meet together on the first day. By Constantine's law, promulgated in 321, it was decreed that for the future the Sunday should be kept as a day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work."²³

Another eminent authority thus states the purport of this law:

"Constantine the Great made a law for the whole empire (A.D. 321) that Sunday should be kept as a day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work on that day."²⁴

Thus the fact is placed beyond all dispute that this decree gave full permission to all kinds of agricultural labor. The following testimony of Mosheim is therefore worthy of strict attention:

"The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of the Christians, was in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been."²⁵

What will the advocates of first-day sacredness say to this? They quote Mosheim respecting Sunday observance in the first century - which testimony has been carefully examined in this work²⁶ - and they seem to think that his language in support of first-day sacredness is nearly equal in authority to the language of the New Testament; in fact, they regard it as supplying an important omission in that book. Yet Mosheim states respecting Constantine's Sunday law, promulgated in the fourth century, which restrained merchants and mechanics, but allowed all kinds of agricultural labor on that day, that it caused the day to be "observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been." It follows, therefore, on Mosheim's own showing, that Sunday, during the first three centuries, was not a day of abstinence from labor in the Christian church. On this point, Bishop Taylor thus testifies:

"The primitive Christians did all manner of works upon the Lord's day, even in the times of persecution, when they are the strictest observers of all the divine commandments; but in this they knew there was none; and therefore when Constantine the emperor had made an edict against working upon the Lord's day, yet he excepts and still permitted all agriculture or labors of the husbandman whatsoever."²⁷

Morer tells us respecting the first three centuries, that is to say, the period before Constantine, that

"The Lord's day had no command that it should be sanctified, but it was left to God's people to pitch on this or that day for the public worship. And being taken up and made a day of meeting for religious exercises, yet for three hundred years there was no law to bind them to it, and for want of such a law, the day was not wholly kept in abstaining from common business; nor did they any longer rest from their ordinary affairs (such was the necessity of those times) than during the divine service."²⁸

And Sir Wm. Domville says:

"Centuries of the Christian era passed away before the Sunday was observed by the Christian church as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the Sabbatical edict of Constantine in A.D. 321."²⁹

What these able modern writers set forth as to labor on Sunday before the edict of Constantine was promulgated, we have fully proved in the preceding chapters out of the most ancient ecclesiastical writers. That such an edict could not fail to strengthen the current already strongly set in favor of Sunday, and greatly to weaken the influence of the Sabbath, cannot be doubted. Of this fact, an able writer bears witness:

"Very shortly after the period when Constantine issued his edict enjoining the general observance of Sunday throughout the Roman Empire, the party that had contended for the observance of the seventh day dwindled into insignificance. The observance of Sunday as a public festival, during which all business, with the exception of rural employments, was intermitted, came to be more and more generally established ever after this time, throughout both the Greek and the Latin churches. There is no evidence however that either at this, or at a period much later, the observance was viewed as deriving any obligation from the fourth commandment; it seems to have been regarded as an institution corresponding in nature with Christmas, Good Friday, and other festivals of the church; and as resting with them on the ground of ecclesiastical authority and tradition."³⁰

This extraordinary edict of Constantine caused Sunday to be observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been. Yet we have the most indubitable proof that this law was a heathen enactment; that it was put forth in favor of Sunday as a heathen institution and not as a Christian festival; and that Constantine himself not only did not possess the character of a Christian, but was at that time in truth a heathen. It is to be observed that Constantine did not designate the day which he commanded men to keep, as Lord's day, Christian Sabbath, or the day of Christ's resurrection; nor does he assign any reason for its observance which would indicate it as a Christian festival. On the contrary, he designates the ancient heathen festival of the sun in language that cannot be mistaken. Dr. Hessey thus sustains this statement:

"Others have looked at the transaction in a totally different light, and refused to discover in the document, or to suppose in the mind of the enactor, any recognition of the Lord's day as a matter of divine obligation. They remark, and very truly, that Constantine designates it by its astrological or heathen title, Dies Solis, and insist that the epithet venerabilis with which it is introduced has reference to the rites performed on that day in honor of Hercules, Apollo, and Mithras."³¹

On this important point, Milman, the learned editor of Gibbon, thus testifies:

"The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week."³²

And he adds in a subsequent chapter:

"In fact, as we have before observed, the day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by almost all the pagan world, especially that part which had admitted any tendency towards the Oriental theology."³³

On the seventh day of March, Constantine published his edict commanding the observance of that ancient festival of the heathen, the venerable day of the sun. On the following day, March eighth,³⁴ he issued a second decree in every respect worthy of its heathen predecessor.³⁵ The purport of it was this: That if any royal edifice should be struck by lightning, the ancient ceremonies of propitiating the deity should be practiced, and the haruspices were to be consulted to learn the meaning of the awful portent.³⁶ The haruspices were soothsayers who foretold future events by examining the entrails of beasts slaughtered in sacrifice to the gods!³⁷ The statute of the seventh of March enjoining the observance of the venerable day of the sun, and that of the eighth of the same month commanding the consultation of the haruspices, constitute a noble pair of well-matched heathen edicts. That Constantine himself was a heathen at the time these edicts were issued, is shown not only by the nature of the edicts themselves, but by the fact that his nominal conversion to Christianity is placed by Mosheim two years after his Sunday law. Thus he says:

"After well considering the subject, I have come to the conclusion, that subsequently to the death of Licinius in the years 323 when Constantine found himself sole emperor, he became an absolute Christian, or one who believes no religion but the Christian to be acceptable to God. He had previously considered the religion of one God as more excellent than the other religions, and believed that Christ ought especially to be worshiped: yet he supposed there were also inferior deities, and that to these some worship might be paid, in the manner of the fathers, without fault or sin. And who does not know, that in those times, many others also combined the worship of Christ with that of the ancient gods, whom they regarded as the ministers of the supreme God in the government of human and earthly affairs."³⁸

As a heathen, Constantine was the worshiper of Apollo or the sun, a fact that sheds much light upon his edict enjoining men to observe the venerable day of the sun. Thus Gibbon testifies:

"The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelar deity. . . . The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."³⁹

His character as a professor of Christianity is thus described:

"The sincerity of the man, who in a short period effected such amazing changes in the religious world, is best known to Him who searches the heart. Certain it is that his subsequent life furnished no evidence of conversion to God. He waded without remorse through seas of blood, and was a most tyrannical prince."⁴⁰

A few words relative to his character as a man will complete our view of his fitness to legislate for the church. This man, when elevated to the highest place of earthly power, caused his eldest son, Crispus, to be privately murdered, lest the fame of the son should eclipse that of the father. In the same ruin was involved his nephew Licinius, "whose rank was his only crime," and this was followed by the execution "perhaps of a guilty wife."⁴¹

Such was the man who elevated Sunday to the throne of the Roman Empire; and such the nature of the institution which he thus elevated. A recent English writer says of Constantine's Sunday law that it "would seem to have been rather to promote heathen than Christian worship." And he shows how this heathen emperor became a Christian, and how this heathen statute became a Christian law. Thus he says:

"At a LATER PERIOD, carried away by the current of opinion, he declared himself a convert to the church. Christianity, then, or what he was pleased to call by that name, became the law of the land, and the edict of A.D. 321, being unrevoked, was enforced as a Christian ordinance."⁴²

Thus it is seen that a law, enacted in support of a heathen institution, after a few years came to be considered a Christian ordinance; and Constantine himself, four years after his Sunday edict, was able to control the church, as represented in the general council of Nice, so as to cause the members of that council to establish their annual festival of the passover upon Sunday.⁴³ Paganism had prepared the institution from ancient days, and had now elevated it to supreme power; its work was accomplished.

We have proved that the Sunday festival in the Christian church had no Sabbatical character before the time of Constantine. We have also shown that heathenism, in the person of Constantine, first gave to Sunday its Sabbatical character, and, in the very act of doing it, designated it as a heathen, and not as a Christian, festival, thus establishing a heathen Sabbath. It was now the part of popery authoritatively to effect its transformation into a Christian institution; a work which it was not slow to perform. Sylvester was the bishop of Rome while Constantine was emperor. How faithfully he acted his part in transforming the festival of the sun into a Christian institution is seen in that, by his apostolic authority, he changed the name of the day, giving it the imposing title of LORD'S DAY.⁴⁴ To Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first-day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the empire, making it a day of rest from most kinds of business; the other changed it into a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of Lord's day. It is not a sufficient reason for denying that Pope Sylvester, not far from A.D. 325, authoritatively conferred on Sunday the name of Lord's day, to say that one of the fathers, as early as A.D. 200, calls the day by that name, and that some seven different writers, between A.D. 200 and A.D. 325, viz., Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Anatolius, Commodianus, Victorinus, and Peter of Alexandria, can be adduced, who give this name to Sunday.

No one of these fathers ever claims for this title any apostolic authority; and it has been already shown that they could not have believed the day to be the Lord's day by divine appointment. So far, therefore, is the use of this term by these persons as a name for Sunday from conflicting with the statement that Sylvester, by his apostolic authority, established this name as the rightful title of that day, that it shows the act of Sylvester to be exactly suited to the circumstances of the case. Indeed, Nicephorus asserts that Constantine, who considered himself quite as much the head of the church as was the pope, "directed that the day which the Jews considered the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicated to the sun, should

be called the Lord's day."⁴⁵ The circumstances of the case render the statements of Lucius and Nicephorus in the highest degree probable. They certainly do not indicate that the pope would deem such act on his part unnecessary. Take a recent event in papal history as an illustration of this case. Only a few years since, Pius IX. decreed that the virgin Mary was born without sin. This had long been asserted by many distinguished writers in the papal church, but it lacked authority as a dogma of that church until the pope, A.D. 1854, gave it his official sanction.⁴⁶ It was the work of Constantine and of Sylvester in the early part of the fourth century to establish the festival of the sun, to be a day of rest, by the authority of the empire, and to render it a Christian institution by the authority of St. Peter.

The following from Dr. Heylyn, a distinguished member of the Church of England, is worthy of particular attention. In most forcible language, he traces the steps by which the Sunday festival arose to power, contrasting it in this respect with the ancient Sabbath of the Lord; and then, with equal truth and candor, he acknowledges that, as the festival of Sunday was set up by the emperor and the church, the same power can take it down whenever it sees fit. Thus he says:

"Thus do we see upon what grounds the Lord's day stands; ON CUSTOM FIRST, and VOLUNTARY consecration of it to religious meetings; that custom countenance by the authority of the church of God, which TACITLY approved the same; and FINALLY CONFIRMED and RATIFIED BY CHRISTIAN PRINCES throughout their empires. And as the day for rest from labors and restraint from business upon that day, [it] received its greatest strength from the supreme magistrate as long as he retained that power which to him belongs; as after from the canons and decree of councils, the decretals of popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them.

"I hope it was not so with the former Sabbath, which neither took original from custom, that people being not so forward to give God a day; nor required any countenance or authority from the kings of Israel to confirm and ratify it. The Lord had spoke the word, that he would have one day in seven, precisely the seventh day from the world's creation, to be a day of rest unto all his people; which said, there was no more to do but gladly to submit and obey his pleasure. . . . But thus it was not done in our present business. The Lord's day had no such command that it should be sanctified, but was left plainly to God's people to pitch on this, or any other, for the public use. And being taken up amongst them and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercises; yet for three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from labor or from worldly business required upon it.

"And when it seemed good unto Christian princes, the nursing fathers of God's church, to lay restraints upon their people, yet at the first they were not general; but only thus that certain men in certain places should lay aside their ordinary and daily works, to attend God's service in the church; those whose employments were most toilsome and most repugnant to the true nature of a Sabbath, being allowed to follow and pursue their labors because most necessary to the commonwealth.

"And in the following times, when as the prince and prelate, in their several places endeavored to restrain them from that also, which formerly they had

permitted, and interdicted almost all kinds of bodily labor upon that day; it was not brought about without much struggling and an opposition of the people; more than a thousand years being past, after Christ's ascension, before the Lord's day had attained that state in which now it standeth. . . . And being brought into that state, wherein now it stands, it doth not stand so firmly and on such sure grounds, but that those powers which raised it up may take it lower if they please, yea take it quite away as unto the time, and settle it on any other day as to them seems best."⁴⁷

Constantine's edict marks a signal change in the history of the Sunday festival. Dr. Heylyn thus testifies:

"Hitherto have we spoken of the Lord's day as taken up by the common consent of the church; not instituted or established by any text of Scripture, or edict of emperor, or decree of council. . . . In that which followeth, we shall find both emperors and councils very frequent in ordering things about this day and the service of it."⁴⁸

After his professed conversion to Christianity, Constantine still further exerted his power in behalf of the venerable day of the sun, now happily transformed into the Lord's day, by the apostolic authority of the Roman bishop. Heylyn thus testifies:

"So natural a power it is in a Christian prince to order things about religion, that he not only took upon him to command the day, but also to prescribe the service."⁴⁹

The influence of Constantine powerfully contributed to the aid of those church leaders who were intent upon bringing the forms of pagan worship into the Christian church. Gibbon thus places upon record the motives of these men, and the result of their action:

"The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstition of paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion of Constantine achieved in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman Empire: but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals."⁵⁰

The body of nominal Christians, which resulted from this strange union of pagan rites with Christian worship, arrogated to itself the title of catholic church, while the true people of God, who resisted these dangerous innovations, were branded as heretics, and cast out of the church.

It is not strange that the Sabbath should lose ground in such a body, in its struggle with its rival, the festival of the sun. Indeed, after a brief period, the history of the Sabbath will be found only in the almost obliterated records of those whom the Catholic church cast out and stigmatized as heretics. Of the Sabbath in Constantine's time, Heylyn says:

"As for the Saturday, that retained its wonted credit in the eastern churches, little inferior to the Lord's day, if not plainly equal; not as a Sabbath, think not so; but as a day designed unto sacred meetings."⁵¹

There is no doubt that, after the great flood of worldliness which entered the church at the time of Constantine's pretended conversion, and after all that was done by himself and by

Sylvester in behalf of Sunday, the observance of the Sabbath became, with many, only a nominal thing. But the action of the council of Laodicea, to which we shall presently come, proves conclusively that the Sabbath was still observed, not simply as a festival, as Heylyn would have it, but as a day of abstinence from labor, as enjoined in the commandment. The work of Constantine, however, marks an epoch in the history of the Sabbath and of Sunday. Constantine was hostile to the Sabbath, and his influence told powerfully against it with all those who sought worldly advancement. The historian Eusebius was the special friend and eulogist of Constantine. This fact should not be overlooked in weighing his testimony concerning the Sabbath. He speaks of it as follows:

"They [the patriarchs] did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, nor do we; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions, which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbols, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."⁵²

This testimony shows precisely the views of Constantine and the imperial party relative to the Sabbath. But it does not give the views of Christians as a whole; for we have seen that the Sabbath had been extensively retained up to this point, and we shall soon have occasion to quote other historians, the contemporaries and successors of Eusebius, who record its continued observance. Constantine exerted a controlling influence in the church, and was determined to "have nothing in common with that most hostile rabble of the Jews." Happy would it have been had his aversion been directed against the festivals of the heathen rather than against the Sabbath of the Lord.

Before Constantine's time, there is no trace of the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath. On the contrary, we have decisive evidence that Sunday was a day on which ordinary labor was considered lawful and proper. But Constantine, while yet a heathen, commanded that every kind of business excepting agriculture should be laid aside on that day. His law designated the day as a heathen festival, which it actually was. But within four years after its enactment, Constantine had become, not merely a professed convert to the Christian religion, but, in many respects, practically the head of the church, as the course of things at the council of Nice plainly showed. His heathen Sunday law, being unrevoked, was thenceforward enforced in behalf of that day as a Christian festival. This law gave to the Sunday festival, for the first time, something of a Sabbatic character. It was now a rest-day from most kinds of business by the law of the Roman Empire. God's rest-day was thenceforward more in the way than ever before.

But now we come to a fact of remarkable interest. The way having been prepared, as we have just seen, for the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath, and the circumstances of the case demanding its production, it was at this very point brought forward for the first time. Eusebius, the special friend and flatterer of Constantine, was the man who first put forth this doctrine. In his "Commentary on the Psalms," he makes the following statement on Psalm xcii. respecting the change of the Sabbath:

"Wherefore as they [the Jews] rejected it [the Sabbath law] the Word [Christ], by the new covenant, TRANSLATED and TRANSFERRED the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, viz., the saving Lord's day, the first [day] of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death, and passed the portals of Heaven, having achieved a work superior to the six-days' creation."⁵³

"On this day, which is the first [day] of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths, even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, and do those things according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath."⁵⁴

"And all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has a precedence and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath."⁵⁵

Eusebius was under the strongest temptation to please and even to flatter Constantine; for he lived in the sunshine of imperial favor. On one occasion, he went so far as to say that the city of Jerusalem, which Constantine had rebuilt, might be the New Jerusalem predicted in the prophecies!⁵⁶ But perhaps there was no act of Eusebius that could give Constantine greater pleasure than his publication of such doctrine as this respecting the change of the Sabbath. The emperor had, by the civil law, given to Sunday a Sabbatical character. Though he had done this while yet a heathen, he found it to his interest to maintain this law after he obtained a commanding position in the Catholic Church. When, therefore, Eusebius came out and declared that Christ transferred the Sabbath to Sunday, a doctrine never before heard of, and in support of which he had no Scripture to quote, Constantine could not but feel in the highest degree flattered that his own Sabbatical edict pertained to the very day which Christ had ordained to be the Sabbath in place of the seventh. It was a convincing proof that Constantine was divinely called to his high position in the Catholic church, that he should thus exactly identify his work with that of Christ, though he had no knowledge at the time that Christ had done any work of the kind.

As no writer before Eusebius had ever hinted at the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath, and as there is the most convincing proof, as we have shown, that before his time Sunday possessed no Sabbatic character, and as Eusebius does not claim that this doctrine is asserted in the Scriptures, nor in any preceding ecclesiastical writer, it is certain that he was the father of the doctrine. This new doctrine was not put forth without some motive. That motive could not have been to bring forward some neglected passages of the Scriptures; for he does not quote a single text in its support. But the circumstances of the case plainly reveal the motive. The new doctrine was exactly adapted to the new order of things introduced by Constantine. It was, moreover, peculiarly suited to flatter that emperor's pride, the very thing which Eusebius was under the strongest temptation to do.

It is remarkable, however, that Eusebius, in the very connection in which he announces this new doctrine, unwittingly exposes its falsity. He first asserts that Christ changed the Sabbath, and then virtually contradicts it by indicating the real authors of the change. Thus he says:

"All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these WE have transferred to the Lord's day."⁵⁷

The persons here referred to as the authors of this work are the Emperor Constantine, and such bishops as Eusebius, who loved the favor of princes, and Sylvester, the pretended successor of Saint Peter. Two facts refute the assertion of Eusebius that Christ changed the Sabbath: 1. That Eusebius, who lived three hundred years after the alleged change, is the first man who mentions such change; 2. That Eusebius testifies that himself and others made this change, which they could not have done had Christ made it at the beginning. But though the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath was thus announced by Eusebius, it was not seconded

by any writer of that age. The doctrine had never been heard of before, and Eusebius had simply his own assertion, but no passage of the Holy Scriptures to offer in its support.

But after Constantine, the Sabbath began to recover strength, at least in the eastern churches. Prof. Stuart, in speaking of the period from Constantine to the council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, says:

"The practice of it [the keeping of the Sabbath] was continued by Christians who were jealous for the honor of the Mosaic law, and finally because, as we have seen, predominant throughout Christendom. It was supposed at length that the fourth commandment did require the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath (not merely a seventh part of time), and reasoning as Christians of the present day are wont to do, viz., that all which belonged to the ten commandments was immutable and perpetual, the churches in general came gradually to regard the seventh-day Sabbath as altogether sacred."⁵⁸

Prof. Stuart, however, connects with this the statement that Sunday was honored by all parties. But the council of Laodicea struck a heavy blow at this Sabbath-keeping in the eastern church. Thus Mr. James, in addressing the University of Oxford, bears witness:

"When the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which had become so general at the close of this century, was evidently gaining ground in the eastern church, a decree was passed in the council held at Laodicea [A.D. 364] 'that members of the church should not rest from work on the Sabbath like Jews, but should labor on that day, and preferring in honor the Lord's day, then if it be in their power should rest from work as Christians.'⁵⁹

This shows conclusively that at that period the observance of the Sabbath according to the commandment was extensive in the eastern churches. But the Laodicean council, not only forbade the observance of the Sabbath, they even pronounced a curse on those who should obey the fourth commandment! Prynne thus testifies:

"It is certain that Christ himself, his apostles, and the primitive Christians for some good space of time, did constantly observe the seventh-day Sabbath; . . . the evangelists and St. Luke in the Acts ever styling it the Sabbath day . . . and making mention of its . . . solemnization by the apostles and other Christians, . . . it being still solemnized by many Christians after the apostles' times, even till the council of Laodicea [A.D. 364], as ecclesiastical writers and the twenty-ninth canon of that council testify, which runs thus:⁶⁰ 'Because Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day (which many did refuse at that time to do). But preferring in honor the Lord's day (there being then a great controversy among Christians which of these two days . . . should have precedency) if they desired to rest they should do this as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ.' . . . The seventh-day Sabbath was . . . solemnized by Christ, the apostles and primitive Christians, till the Laodicean council did in a manner quite abolish the observation of it. . . . The council of Laodicea [A. D. 364] . . . first settled the observation of the Lord's day, and prohibited . . . the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath under an anathema."⁶¹

The action of this council did not extirpate the Sabbath from the eastern churches, though it did materially weaken its influence, and cause its observance to become with many only a

nominal thing, while it did most effectually enhance the sacredness and the authority of the Sunday festival. That it did not wholly extinguish Sabbath-keeping is thus certified by an old English writer, John Ley:

"From the apostles' time until the council of Laodicea, which was about the year 364, the holy observation of the Jews' Sabbath continued, as may be proved out of many authors; yes, notwithstanding the decree of that council against it."⁶²

And Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, about A.D. 372, uses this expostulation:

"With what eyes can you behold the Lord's day, when you despise the Sabbath? Do you not perceive that they are sisters, and that in slighting the one, you affront the other?"⁶³

This testimony is valuable in that it marks the progress of apostasy concerning the Sabbath. The Sunday festival entered the church, not as a divine institution, but as a voluntary observance. Even as late as A.D. 200, Tertullian said that it had only tradition and custom in its support.⁶⁴

But in A.D. 372, this human festival had become the sister and equal of that day which God hallowed in the beginning and solemnly commanded in the moral law. How worthy to be called the sister of the Sabbath the Sunday festival actually was, may be judged from what followed. When this self-styled sister had gained an acknowledged position in the family, she expelled the other, and trampled her in the dust. In our days, the Sunday festival claims to be the very day intended in the fourth commandment.

The following testimonies exhibit the authority of church councils in its true light. Jortin is quoted by Cox as saying:

"In such assemblies, the best and the most moderate men seldom have the ascendant, and they are often led or driven by others who are far inferior to them in good qualities."⁶⁵

The same writer gives us Baxter's opinion of the famous Westminster Assembly. Baxter says:

"I have lived to see an assembly of ministers, where three or four leading men were so prevalent as to form a confession in the name of the whole party, which had that in it which particular members did disown. And when about a controverted article, one man hath charged me deeply with questioning the words of the church, others, who were at the forming of that article have laid it all on that same man, the rest being loath to strive much against him; and so it was he himself was the church whose authority he so much urged."⁶⁶

Such has been the nature of councils in all ages; yet they have ever claimed infallibility, and have largely used that infallibility in the suppression of the Sabbath and the establishment of the festival of Sunday. Of first-day sacredness prior to, and as late as, the time of Chrysostom, Kitto thus testifies:

"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 . . . Chrysostom (A.D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations."⁶⁷

It was reserved for modern theologians to discover the divine or apostolic authority for Sunday observance. The ancient doctors of the church were unaware that any such authority existed; and hence they deemed it lawful and proper to engage in usual worldly business on that day when their religious worship was concluded. Thus, Heylyn bears witness concerning St. Chrysostom that he

"Confessed it to be lawful for a man to look unto his worldly business on the Lord's day, after the congregation was dismissed."⁶⁸

St. Jerome, a few years after this, at the opening of the fifth century, in his commendation of the lady Paula, shows his own opinion of Sunday labor. Thus he says:

"Paula, with the women, as soon as they returned home on the Lord's day, they sat down severally to their work, and made clothes for themselves and others."⁶⁹

Morer justifies this Sunday labor in the following terms:

"If we read they did any work on the Lord's day, it is to be remembered that this application to their daily tasks was not till their worship was quite over, when they might with innocency enough resume them, because the length of time or the number of hours assigned for piety was not then so well explained as in after ages. The state of the church is vastly different from what it was in those early days. Christians then for some centuries of years were under persecution and poverty; and besides their own wants, they had many of them severe masters who compelled them to work, and made them bestow less time in spiritual matters than they otherwise would. In St. Jerome's age their condition was better, because Christianity had got into the throne as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly; and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the church made in her constitutions, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business advanced by degrees from one species to another, till the day had got a considerable figure in the world. Now, therefore, the case being so much altered, the most proper use of citing those old examples is only, in point of doctrine, to show that ordinary work, as being a compliance with providence for the support of natural life, is not sinful even on the Lord's day, when necessity is loud, and the laws of that church and nation where we live are not against it. This is what the first Christians had to say for themselves, in the works they did on that day. And if those works had been then judged a prophanation of the festival, I dare believe, they would have suffered martyrdom rather than been guilty."⁷⁰

The bishop of Ely thus testifies:

"In St Jerome's days, and in the very place where he was residing, the devoutest Christians did ordinarily work upon the Lord's day, when the service of the church was ended."⁷¹

St. Augustine, the contemporary of Jerome, gives a synopsis of the argument in that age for Sunday observance, in the following words:

"It appears from the sacred Scriptures, that this day was a solemn one; it was the first day of the age, that is of the existence of our world; in it the elements of the world were formed; on it the angels were created; on it Christ rose also from the dead; on it the Holy Spirit descended from Heaven upon the apostles as manna had done in the wilderness. For these and other such circumstances the Lord's day is distinguished; and therefore the holy doctors of the church have decreed that all the glory of the Jewish Sabbath is transferred to it. Let us therefore keep the Lord's day as the ancients were commanded to do the Sabbath."⁷²

It is to be observed that Augustine does not assign among his reasons for first-day observance, the change of the Sabbath by Christ or his apostles, or that the apostles observed that day, or that John had given it the name of Lord's day. These modern first-day arguments were unknown to Augustine. He gave the credit of the work, not to Christ or his inspired apostles, but to the holy doctors of the church, who, of their own accord, had transferred the glory of the ancient Sabbath to the venerable day of the sun. The first day of the week was considered in the fifth century the most proper day for giving holy orders, that is, for ordinations, and about the middle of the century, says Heylyn,

"A law [was] made by Leo then Pope of Rome, and generally since taken up in the western church, that they should be conferred upon no day else."⁷³

According to Dr. Justin Edwards, this same pope made also this decree in behalf of Sunday:

"WE ORDAIN, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles as thereby directed, that on the sacred day wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labor."⁷⁴

Soon after this edict of the pope, the emperor Leo, A.D. 469, put forth the following decree:

"It is our will and pleasure, that the holy days dedicated to the most high God, should not be spent in sensual recreations, or otherwise prophaned by suits of law, especially the Lord's day, which we decree to be a venerable day, and therefore free it of all citations, executions, pleadings, and the like avocations. Let not the circus or theater be opened, nor combating with wild beasts be seen on it. . . . If any will presume to offend in the premises, if he be a military man, let him lose his commission; or if other, let his estate or goods be confiscated."⁷⁵

And this emperor determined to mend the breach in Constantine's law, and thus prohibit agriculture on Sunday. So he adds:

"We command therefore all, as well husbandmen as others, to forbear work on this day of our restoration."⁷⁶

The holy doctors of the church had by this time very effectually despoiled the Sabbath of its glory, transferring it to the Lord's day of Pope Sylvester; as Augustine testifies; yet was not Sabbatical observance wholly extinguished even in the Catholic church. The historian Socrates, who wrote about the middle of the fifth century, thus testifies:

"For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, refuse to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general - for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening, making their oblations, they partake of the mysteries."⁷⁷

As the church of Rome had turned the Sabbath into a fast some two hundred years before this, in order to oppose its observance, it is probable that this was the ancient tradition referred to by Socrates. And Sozomen, the contemporary of Socrates, speaks on the same point as follows:

"The people of Constantinople, and of several other cities, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the next day; which custom is never observed at Rome, or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usages established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings; and although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries."⁷⁸

On the statement of these historians, Cox remarks:

"It was their practice to Sabbatize on Saturday, and to celebrate Sunday as a day of rejoicing and festivity. While, however, in some places a respect was thus generally paid to both of these days, the Judaizing practice of observing Saturday was by the leading churches expressly condemned, and all the doctrines connected with it steadfastly resisted." - Sabbath Laws, p. 280.

The time had now come, when, as stated by Coleman, the observance of the Sabbath was deemed heretical; and the close of the fifth century witnessed its effectual suppression in the great body of the Catholic church.

1 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 189.

2 Morality of the Fourth Commandment, p. 9, London, 1641.

3 1Cor.5:6-8.

4 Eccl. Hist. vol. i. chap. ii. sect. 30.

5 Eccl. Hist. book i. cent. 1. part ii. chap. iv. sect. 4. Dr. Murdock's translation is more accurate than that above by Maclaine. He gives it thus:- "Moreover, those congregations, which either lived intermingled with Jews, or were composed in great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the seventh day of the week, as a SACRED day: for doing which, the other Christians taxed them with no wrong.

6 Id. margin.

7 See chap. xiv. of this History.

8 Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. xxvi. sect. 2.

9 Anc. Christ. Exem. Chap. xxvi. sect. 2.

10 Id.Ib.

11 Id.Ib.

12 Ductor Dubitantium, part i. book ii. rule 6, sect. 51.

13 Dialogues on the Lord's day, p. 66.

14 A Treatise of the Sabbath Day, containing a "Defence of the Orthodoxal Doctrine of the Church of England against Sabbatarian Novelty," p. 8. It was written in 1635 at the command of the king in reply to Brabourne, a minister of the established church, whose work, entitled "A Defense of that most Ancient and Sacred Ordinance of God's, the Sabbath Day," was dedicated to the king with a request that he would restore the Bible Sabbath! See the preface to Dr. White's Treatise.

15 Dec. and Fall, chap. xv.

16 See chap. x.

17 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 67.

18 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 8.

19 Antiquities of the Christian Church, book xvi, chap. vi. sect. 2.

20 Page 280. Cox here quotes the work, entitled "The Modern Sabbath Examined.

21 Learned Treatise of the Sabbath, p. 77. Oxford, 1631.

22 This edict is the original fountain of first-day authority, and in many respects answers to the festival of Sunday, what the fourth commandment is to the Sabbath of the Lord. The original of this edict may be seen in the library of Harvard College, and is as follows:

IMP. CONSTANT. A. ELPIDIO.

Omnes Judices, urbanaeque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiscant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa. Dat, Nonis Mart. Crispo.2 & Constantino 2. Coss. 321. Corpus Juris Civilis Condictis lib. iii tit. 12.3.

23 Encyc. Brit. art. Sunday, seventh edition, 1842.

24 Encyc. Am. art. Sabbath.

25 Eccl. Hist. cent. iv. part ii. chap. iv. sect. 5.

26 Chap. xiv.

27 Duct. Dubitant. part i. book ii. chap. ii. rule 6, sect. 59.

28 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 233.

29 Examination of the Six Texts, p. 291.

30 Cox's Sabbath Laws, &c. pp. 280, 281. He quotes *The Modern Sabbath Examined*.

31 Hessey's Bampton Lectures, p. 60.

32 History of Christianity, book iii. chap. i.

33 Id. book iii. chap. iv.

34 These dates are worthy of marked attention. See Blair's *Chronological Tables*, p. 193, ed. 1856; Rosse's *Index of Dates*, p. 830.

35 Imp. Constantinus A. Ad Maximum. Si quid de Palatio Nostro, aut ceteris operibus publicis, degustatum fulgore esse conatiterit, retento more veteris observantiae. Quid portendat, ob Haruspibus requiratur, et diligentissime scriptura collecta ad Nostram Scientiam referatur. Ceteris etiam usurpandae huius consuetudinis licentia tribuenda: dummodo sacrificiis domesticis abstineant, quae specialiter prohibita sunt. Eam autem denunciationem adque interpretationem, quae de tactu Amphitheatri scriba est, de qua ad Heraclianum Tribunum, et Magistrum Officiorum scripseras, ad nos scias esse perlatum. Dat. xvi. Kal. Jan. Serdicae Acc. viii. Id. Mart. Crispo ii. & Constantino ii. C. C. Coss. 321. Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 1. - Library of Harvard College.

36 See Jortin's *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. sect. 31; Milman's *Hist. Christianity*, book iii. chap. i.

37 See Webster; for an ancient record of the act, see *Eze.* xxi. 19-22.

38 *Historical Commentaries*, cent. iv. sect. 7.

39 *Dec. and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xx.

40 Marsh's *Eccl. Hist.* period iii. chap. v.

41 *Dec. and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xviii.

42 *Sunday and the Mosaic Sabbath*, p. 4, published by R. Groombridge & Sons, London.

43 See chap. xviii.

44 Omnium vero dierum per septimanam appellationes (ut Solis, Lunae, Martis, etc.), mutasse in ferias: ut Polydorus (li. 6, c. 5) indicat. Mataphrastes vero, nomina dierum Hebraeis usitata retinuisse eum, tradit; SOLIUS PRIMI DIEI APPELLATIONE MUTATA, QUEM DOMINICUM DIXIT. *Historia Ecclesiastica* per M. Ludovicum Lucuim, cent. iv. cap. x. pp. 739, 740, Ed. Basilea, 1624. Library of Andover Theological Seminary. The Ecclesiastical History of Lucius is simply the second edition of the famous "*Magdeburg Centuries*," which was published under his supervision.

45 Quoted in Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticae*, fifth edition, vol. iv. p. 603.

46 McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, vol. iv. p. 506.

47 *Hist. Sab.* part ii. chap. iii. sect. 12.

48 *Hist. Sab.* part ii. chap. iii. sect. 1.

49 Id. *Ib.*

50 Dec. an Fall, chap. xxviii.

51 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. iii. sect. 5.

52 Eccl. Hist. book i. chap. iv.

53 Eusebius' Commentary on the Psalms, quoted in Cox's Sabbath Literature, vol. i. p. 361; also in Justin Edward's Sabbath Manual, pp. 125-127.

54 Id.Ib.

55 Id.Ib.

56 Eusebius' Life of Constantine, 3, 33, quoted in Elliott's Horae Apocalypticæ, vol. i. p. 256.

57 Cox's Sabbath Literature, vol. i. p. 361.

58 Appendix to Gurney's History, &c., of the Sabbath, pp. 115, 116.

59 Sermon's on the Sacraments and Sabbath, pp. 122, 123.

60 Quod non oportet Christianos Judaizare et otiare in Sabbato, sed operari in eodem die. Preferentes autem in veneratione Dominicum diem si vacare voluerint, ut Christiani hoc faciat; quod si reperti fuerint Judaizare Anathema sint a Christo.

61 Dissertation on the Lord's-day Sabbath, pp. 33, 34, 41. 1633.

62 Sunday a Sabbath, p. 163. 1640.

63 Dialogues on the Lord's day, p. 188; Hessey's Bampton Lectures, pp. 72, 304, 305.

64 Tertullian's De Corona, sections 3 and 4.

65 Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 138.

66 Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 138.

67 Cyc. Bib. Lit. art. Lord's Day; Heylyn's Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. ii. sect 7.

68 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. iii. sect. 9.

69 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 234; Hist. Sab. part. ii. chap. iii. sect. 7.

70 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, pp. 236, 237.

71 Treatise of the Sabbath, p. 219.

72 Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 284.

73 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. iv. sect. 8.

74 Sabbath Manual, p. 123.

75 Dialogues on the Lord's day, p. 259.

76 Id p. 260.

77 Socrates, book v. chap. xxii.

78 Sozomen, book vii. chap. 19; Lardner, vol. iv. chap. lxxxv. p. 217.

CHAPTER 20

SUNDAY DURING THE DARK AGES

The pope becomes the head of all the churches - The people of God retire into the wilderness - Sunday to be traced through the Dark Ages in the history of the Catholic church - State of that festival in the sixth century - It did not acquire the title of Sabbath for many ages - Time when it became a day of abstinence from labor in the east - When in the west - Sunday canon of the first council of Orleans - Of the council of Arragon - Of the third council of Orleans - Of a council at Mascon - At Narbon - At Auxerre - Miracles establishing the sacredness of Sunday - The pope advises men to atone, by the pious observance of Sunday, for the sins of the previous week - The Sabbath and Sunday both strictly kept by a class at Rome who were put down by the pope - According to Twisse they were two distinct classes - The Sabbath, like its Lord, crucified between two thieves - Council of Chalons - At Toledo, in which the Jews were forbidden to keep the Sabbath and commanded to keep Sunday - First English law for Sunday - Council at Constantinople - In England - In Bavaria - Canon of the archbishop of York - Statutes of Charlemagne and canons of councils which he called - The pope aids in the work - Council at Paris originates a famous first-day argument - The councils fail to establish Sunday sacredness - The emperors besought to send out some more terrible edict in order to compel the observance of that day - The pope takes the matter in hand in earnest and gives Sunday an effectual establishment - Other statutes and canons - Sunday piety of a Norwegian king - Sunday consecrated to the mass - Curious but obsolete first-day arguments - The eating of meat forbidden upon the Sabbath by the pope - Pope Urban II. ordains the Sabbath of the Lord to be a festival for the worship of the Virgin Mary - Apparition from St. Peter - The pope sends Eustace into England with a roll that fell from Heaven commanding Sunday observance under direful penalties - Miracles which followed - Sunday established in Scotland - Other Sunday laws down to the Reformation - Sunday always only a human ordinance.

The opening of the sixth century witnessed the development of the great apostasy to such an extent that the man of sin might be plainly seen sitting in the temple of God.¹ The western Roman Empire had been broken up into ten kingdoms, and the way was now prepared for the work of the little horn.² In the early part of this century, the bishop of Rome was made head over the entire church by the emperor of the east, Justinian.³ The dragon gave unto the beast his power, and his seat, and great authority. From this accession to supremacy by the Roman pontiff, date the "time, times, and dividing of time," or twelve hundred and sixty years of the prophecies of Daniel and John.⁴

The true people of God now retired for safety into places of obscurity and seclusion, as represented by the prophecy: "The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days."⁵ Leaving their history for the present, let us follow that of the Catholic church, and trace in its record the history of the Sunday festival through the period of the Dark ages. Of the fifth and sixth centuries, Heylyn bears the following testimony:

"The faithful being united better than before, became more uniform in matters of devotion; and in that uniformity did agree together to give the Lord's day all

the honors of an holy festival. Yet was not this done all at once, but by degrees; the fifth and sixth centuries being well-nigh spent before it came into that height which hath since continued. The emperors and the prelates in these times had the same affections; both [being] earnest to advance this day above all other; and to the edicts of the one and ecclesiastical constitutions of the other, it stands indebted for many of those privileges and exemptions which it still enjoyeth."⁶

But Sunday had not yet acquired the title of Sabbath. Thus Brerewood bears testimony:

"The name of the Sabbath remained appropriated to the old Sabbath; and was never attributed to the Lord's day, not of many hundred years after our Saviour's time."⁷

And Heylyn says of the term Sabbath in the ancient church:

"The Saturday is called amongst them by no other name than that which formerly it had, the Sabbath. So that whenever for a thousand years and upwards, we meet with Sabbatum in any writer of what name soever, it must be understood of no day but Saturday."⁸

Dr. Francis White, bishop of Ely, also testifies:

"When the ancient fathers distinguish and give proper names to the particular days of the week, they always style the Saturday, Sabbatum, the Sabbath, and the Sunday, or first day of the week, Dominicum, the Lord's day."⁹

It should be observed, however, that the earliest mention of Sunday as the Lord's day, is in the writings of Tertullian; Justin Martyr, some sixty years before, styling it "the day called Sunday;" while the authoritative application of that term to Sunday was by Sylvester, bishop of Rome, more than one hundred years after the time of Tertullian. The earliest mention of Sunday as Christian Sabbath is thus noted by Heylyn:

"The first who ever used it to denote the Lord's day (the first that I have met with in all this search) is one Petrus Alfonsus - he lived about the time that Rupertus did - [which was the beginning of the twelfth century] who calls the Lord's day by the name of Christian Sabbath."¹⁰

Of Sunday labor in the eastern church, Heylyn says:

"It was near nine hundred years from our Saviour's birth if not quite so much, before restraint of husbandry on this day had been first thought of in the east; and probably being thus restrained did find no more obedience there than it had done before in the western parts."¹¹

Of Sunday labor in the western church, Dr. Francis White thus testifies:

"The Catholic church for more than six hundred years after Christ, permitted labor, and gave license to many Christian people to work upon the Lord's day, at such hours as they were not commanded to be present at the public service by the precept of the church."¹²

But let us trace the several steps by which the festival of Sunday increased in strength until it attained its complete development. These will be found at present mostly in the edicts of emperors, and the decrees of councils. Morer tells us that,

"Under Clodoveus king of France met the bishops in the first council of Orleans [A.D. 507], where they obliged themselves and their successors, to be always at the church on the Lord's day, except in case of sickness or some great infirmity. And because they, with some other of the clergy in those days, took cognizance of judicial matters, therefore by a council at Arragon, about the year 518 in the reign of Theodorick, king of the Goths, it was decreed that 'No bishop or other person in holy orders should examine or pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Lord's day.'"¹³

This shows that civil courts were sometimes held on Sunday by the bishops in those days; otherwise such a prohibition would not have been put forth. Hengstenberg, in his notice of the third council of Orleans, gives us an insight into the then existing state of the Sunday festival:

"The third council of Orleans, A.D. 538, says in its twenty-ninth canon: 'The opinion is spreading amongst the people, that it is wrong to ride, or drive, or cook food, or do anything to the house, or the person on the Sunday. But since such opinions are more Jewish than Christian, that shall be lawful in future, which has been so to the present time. On the other hand agricultural labor ought to be laid aside, in order that the people may not be prevented from attending church.'"¹⁴

Observe the reason assigned. It is not lest they violate the law of the Sabbath, but it is that they may not be kept from church. Another authority states the case thus:

"Labor in the country [on Sunday] was not prohibited till the council of Orleans, A.D. 538. It was thus an institution of the church, as Dr. Paley has remarked. The earlier Christians met in the morning of that day for prayer and singing hymns in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, and then went about their usual duties."¹⁵

In A.D. 588, another council was holden, the occasion of which is thus stated:

"And because, notwithstanding all this care, the day was not duly observed, the bishops were again summoned to Mascon, a town in Burgundy, by King Gunthrum, and there they framed this canon: 'Notice is taken that Christian people, very much neglect and slight the Lord's day, giving themselves as on other days to common work, to redress which irreverence, for the future, we warn every Christian who bears not that name in vain, to give ear to our advice, knowing we have a concern on us for your good, and a power to hinder you to do evil. Keep then the Lord's day, the day of our new birth.'"¹⁶

Further legislation being necessary, we are told:

"About a year forward, there was a council at Narbon, which forbid all persons of what country or quality soever, to do any servile work on the Lord's day. But if any man presumed to disobey this canon he was to be fined if a freeman, and if a servant, severely lashed. Or as Surius represents the penalty in the edict of King Recaredus, which he put out, near the same time to strengthen the decrees of the council, 'Rich men were to be punished with the loss of a

moiety of their estates, and the poorer sort with perpetual banishment,' in the year of grace 590. Another synod was held at Auxerre a city in Champain, in the reign of Clotair king of France, where it was decreed. . . . 'that no man should be allowed to plow, nor cart, or do any such thing on the Lord's day.' "17

Such were some of the efforts made in the sixth century to advance the sacredness of the Sunday festival. And Morer tells us that,

"For fear the doctrine should not take without miracles to support it, Gregory of Tours [about A.D. 590] furnishes us with several to that purpose."18

Mr. Francis West, an English first-day writer, gravely adduces one of these miracles in support of first-day sacredness:

"Gregory of Tours reporteth, 'that a husbandman, who upon the Lord's day went to plough his field, as he cleaned his plough with an iron, the iron stuck so fast in his hand that for two years he could not be delivered from it, but carried it about continually to his exceeding great pain and shame.' "19

In the conclusion of the sixth century, Pope Gregory exhorted the people of Rome to "expiate on the day of our Lord's resurrection what was remissly done for the six days before."20 In the same epistle, this pope condemned a class of men at Rome who advocated the strict observance of both the Sabbath and the Sunday, styling them the preachers of Antichrist.21 This shows the intolerant feeling of the papacy toward the Sabbath, even when joined with the strict observance of Sunday. It also shows that there were Sabbath-keepers even in Rome itself as late as the seventh century; although so far bewildered by the prevailing darkness that they joined with its observance a strict abstinence from labor on Sunday.

In the early part of the seventh century arose another foe to the Bible Sabbath in the person of Mahomet. To distinguish his followers alike from those who observed the Sabbath and those who observed the festival of Sunday, he selected Friday, the sixth day of the week, as their religious festival. And thus "the Mahometans and the Romanists crucified the Sabbath, as the Jews and the Romans did the Lord of the Sabbath, between two thieves, the sixth and first day of the week."22 For Mahometanism and Romanism each suppressed the Sabbath over a wide extent of territory. About the middle of the seventh century, we have further canons of the church in behalf of Sunday:

"At Chalons, a city in Burgundy, about the year 654, there was a provincial synod which confirmed what had been done by the third council of Orleans, about the observation of the Lord's day, namely that 'none should plow or reap, or do any other thing belonging to husbandry, on pain of the censures of the church; which was the more minded, because backed with the secular power, and by an edict menacing such as offended herein; who if bondmen, were to be soundly beaten, but if free, had three admonitions, and then if faulty, lost the third part of their patrimony, and if still obstinate were made slaves for the future. And in the first year of Eringius, about the time of Pope Agatho there sat the twelfth council of Toledo in Spain, A.D. 681, where the Jews were forbid to keep their own festivals, but so far at least observe the Lord's day as to do no manner of work on it, whereby they might express their contempt of Christ or his worship.' "23

These were weighty reasons indeed for Sunday observance. Nor can it be thought strange that in the Dark Ages a constant succession of such things should eventuate in the universal observance of that day. Even the Jews were to be compelled to desist from Sabbath observance, and to honor Sunday by resting on that day from their labor. The earliest mention of Sunday in English statutes appears to be the following:

A.D. 692. "Ina, king of the west Saxons, by the advice of Cenred his father, and Heddes and Erkenwald his bishops, with all his aldermen and sages, in a great assembly of the servants of God, for the health of their souls, and common preservation of the kingdom, made several constitutions, of which this was the third: 'If a servant do any work on Sunday by his master's orders, he shall be free, and the master pay thirty shillings; but if he went to work on his own head, he shall be either beaten with stripes, or ransom himself with a price. A freeman, if he works on this day, shall lose his freedom or pay sixty shillings; if he be a priest, double.' "²⁴

The same year that this law was enacted in England, the sixth general council convened at Constantinople, which decreed that,

"If any bishop or other clergyman, or any of the laity, absented himself from the church three Sundays together, except in cases of very great necessity, if a clergyman, he was to be deposed; if a layman, debarred the holy communion."²⁵

In the year 747, a council of the English clergy was called under Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of Egbert, king of Kent, and this constitution made:

"It is ordered that the Lord's day be celebrated with due veneration, and wholly devoted to the worship of God. And that all abbots and priests, on this most holy day, remain in their respective monasteries and churches, and there do their duty according to their places."²⁶

Another ecclesiastical statute of the eighth century was enacted at Dingosolinum in Bavaria, where a synod met about 772, which decreed that,

"If any man shall work his cart on this day, or do any such common business, his team shall be presently forfeited to the public use, and if the party persists in his folly, let him be sold for a bondman."²⁷

The English were not behind their neighbors in the good work of establishing the sacredness of Sunday. Thus we read:

A.D. 784. "Egbert, archbishop of York, to show positively what was to be done on Sundays, and what the laws designed by prohibiting ordinary work to be done on such days, made this canon: 'Let nothing else, saith he, be done on the Lord's day, but to attend on God in hymns and psalms and spiritual songs. Whoever marries on Sunday, let him do penance for seven days.' "²⁸

In the conclusion of the eighth century further efforts were made in behalf of this favored day:

"Charles the Great summoned the bishops to Friuli, in Italy, where . . . they decreed [A.D. 791] that all people should, with due reverence and devotion, honor the Lord's day. . . . Under the same prince another council was called three years later at Frankford in Germany, and there the limits of the Lord's day were determined from Saturday evening to Sunday evening."²⁹

The five councils of Mentz, Rheims, Tours, Chalons, and Arles, were all called in the year 813 by Charlemagne. It would be irksome to the reader to dwell upon the several acts of these councils in behalf of Sunday. They are of the same character as those already quoted. The council of Chalons, however, is worthy of being noticed in that, according to Morer,

"They entreated the help of the secular power, and desired the emperor [Charlemagne] to provide for the stricter observation of it[Sunday]. Which he accordingly did, and left no stone unturned to secure the honor of the day. His care succeeded; and during his reign, the Lord's day bore a considerable figure. But after his day, it put on another face."³⁰

The pope lent a helping hand in checking the profanation of Sunday:

"And thereupon Pope Eugenius, in a synod held at Rome about 826, . . . gave directions that the parish priest should admonish such offenders and wish them to go to church and say their prayers, lest otherwise they might bring some great calamity on themselves and neighbors."³¹

All this, however, was not sufficient, and so another council was summoned. At this council was brought forward - perhaps for the first time - the famous first-day argument now so familiar to all, that Sunday is proved to be the true Sabbath because that men are struck by lightning who labor on that day. Thus we read:

"But these paternal admonitions turning to little account, a provincial council was held at Paris three years after . . . in 829, wherein the prelates complain that 'The Lord's day was not kept with reverence as became religion . . . which was the reason that God had sent several judgments on them, and in a very remarkable manner punished some people for slighting and abusing it. For, say they, many of us by our own knowledge, and some by hearsay know, that several countrymen following their husbandry on this day have been killed with lightning, others, being seized with convulsions in their joints, have miserably perished. Whereby it is apparent how high the displeasure of God was upon their neglect of this day.' And at last they conclude that 'in the first place the priests and ministers, then kings and princes, and all faithful people he beseeched to use their utmost endeavors and care that the day be restored to its honor, and for the credit of Christianity more devoutly observed for the time to come.'³²

Further legislation being necessary,

"It was decreed about seven years after in a council at Aken, under Lewis the Godly, that neither pleadings nor marriages should be allowed on the Lord's day."³³

But the law of Charlemagne, though backed with the authority of the church, as expressed in the canons of the councils already quoted, by the remissness of Lewis, his successor became very feeble. It is evident that canons and decrees of councils, though fortified with the mention of terrible judgments that had befallen transgressors, were not yet sufficient to enforce the sacred day. Another and more terrific statute than any yet issued was sought at the hands of the emperor. Thus we read:

"Thereupon an address was made to the emperors, Lewis and Lotharius, that they would be pleased to take some care in it, and send out some precept or

injunction more severe than what was hitherto extant, to strike terror into their subjects, and force them to forbear their ploughing, pleading, and marketing, then grown again into use; which was done about the year 853; and to that end a synod was called at Rome under the popedom of Leo IV. "³⁴

The advocates of the first-day Sabbath have in all ages sought for a law capable of striking terror into those who do not hallow that day. They still continue the vain endeavor. But if they would honor the day which God set apart for the Sabbath, they would find in that law of fire which proceeded from his right hand a statute which renders all human legislation entirely unnecessary.³⁵

At this synod the pope took the matter in hand in good earnest. Thus Heylyn testifies that under the emperors, Lewis and Lotharius, a synod was held at Rome A.D. 853, under pope Leo IV.,

"Where it was ordered more precisely than in former times that no man should from thenceforth dare to make any markets on the Lord's day, no, not for things that were to eat: neither to do any kind of work that belonged to husbandry. Which canon being made at Rome, confirmed at Compeigne, and afterwards incorporated as it was into the body of the canon law, became to be admitted, without further question, in most parts of Christendom; especially when the popes had attained their height, and brought all Christian princes to be at their devotion. For then the people, who before had most opposed it, might have justly said, 'Behold two kings stood not before him, how then shall we stand?' Out of which consternation all men presently obeyed, tradesmen of all sorts being brought to lay by their labors; and amongst those, the miller, though his work was easiest, and least of all required his presence."³⁶

This was a most effectual establishment of first-day sacredness. Five years after this we read as follows:

A.D. 858. "The Bulgarians sent some questions to Pope Nicholas, to which they desired answers. And that [answer] which concerned the Lord's day was that they should desist from all secular work, etc."³⁷

Morer informs us respecting the civil power, that,

"In this century the emperor [of Constantinople] Leo, surnamed the philosopher, restrained the works of husbandry, which, according to Constantine's toleration, were permitted in the east. The same care was taken in the west, by Theodorus, king of the Bavarians, who made this order, that 'If any person on the Lord's day yoked his oxen, or drove his wain, his right-side ox should be forthwith forfeited; or if he made hay and carried it in, he was to be twice admonished to desist, which if he did not, he was to receive no less than fifty stripes.' "³⁸

Of Sunday laws in England in this century, we read:

A.D. 876. "Alfred the Great, was the first who united the Saxon Heptarchy, and it was not the least part of his care to make a law that among other festivals this day more especially might be solemnly kept, because it was the day whereon our Saviour Christ overcame the devil; meaning Sunday, which is the weekly memorial of our Lord's resurrection, whereby he overcame death,

and him who had the power of death, that is the devil. And whereas before the single punishment for sacrilege committed on any other day, was to restore the value of the thing stolen, and withal lose one hand, he added that if any person was found guilty of this crime done on the Lord's day, he should be doubly punished."³⁹

Nineteen years later, the pope and his council still further strengthened the sacred day. The council of Friburgh in Germany, A.D. 895, under Pope Formosus, decreed that the Lord's day, men "were to spend in prayers, and devote wholly to the service of God, who otherwise might be provoked to anger."⁴⁰ The work of establishing Sunday sacredness in England was carried steadily forward:

"King Athelston, . . . in the year 928, made a law that there should be no marketing or civil pleadings on the Lord's day, under the penalty of forfeiting the commodity, besides a fine of thirty shillings for each offense."⁴¹

In a convocation of the English clergy about this time, it was decreed that all sorts of traffic and holding of courts, &c., on Sunday should cease. "And whoever transgressed in any of these instances, if a freeman, he was to pay twelve orae, if a servant, be severely whipt." We are further informed that,

"About the year 943, Otho, archbishop of Canterbury, had it decreed that above all things the Lord's day should be kept with all imaginable caution, according to the canon and ancient practice."⁴²

A.D. 967. King Edgar "commanded that the festival should be kept from three of the clock in the afternoon on Saturday, till day-break on Monday."⁴³

"King Ethelred the younger, son of Edgar, coming to the crown about the year 1009, called a general council of all the English clergy, under Elfeagus, archbishop of Canterbury, and Wolstan, archbishop of York. And there it was required that all persons in a more zealous manner should observe the Sunday, and what belonged to it."⁴⁴

Nor did the Sunday festival fail to gain a footing in Norway. Heylyn tells us of the piety of a Norwegian king by the name of Olaus, A.D. 1028.

"For being taken up one Sunday in some serious thoughts, and having in his hand a small walking stick, he took his knife and whittled it as men do sometimes, when their minds are troubled or intent on business. And when it had been told him as by way of jest how he had trespassed therein against the Sabbath, he gathered the small chips together, put them upon his hand, and set fire to them, that so, saith Crantzius, he might revenge that on himself what unawares he had committed against God's commandment."⁴⁵

In Spain also the work went forward. A council was held at Coy, in Spain, A.D. 1050, under Ferdinand, king of Castile, in the days of Pope Leo IX., where it was decreed that the Lord's day "was to be entirely consecrated to hearing of mass."⁴⁶

To strengthen the sacredness of this venerable day in the minds of the people, the doctors of the church were not wanting. Heylyn makes the following statement:

"It was delivered of the souls in purgatory by Petrus Damiani, who lived A.D. 1056, that every Lord's day they were manumitted from their pains and fluttered up and down the lake Avernus, in the shape of birds."⁴⁷

At the same time, another argument of a similar kind was brought forward to render the observance still more strict. Morer informs us respecting that class who in this age were most zealous advocates of Sunday observance:

"Yet still the others went on in their way; and to induce their proselytes to spend the day with greater exactness and care, they brought in the old argument of compassion and charity to the damned in hell, who during the day, have some respite from their torments, and the ease and liberty they have is more or less according to the zeal and degrees of keeping it well."⁴⁸

If therefore they would strictly observe this sacred festival, their friends in hell would reap the benefit, in a respite from their torments on that day! In a council at Rome, A.D. 1078, Pope Gregory VII decreed that as the Sabbath had been long regarded as a fast day, those who desired to be Christians should on that day abstain from eating meat.⁴⁹ In the eastern division of the Catholic church, in the eleventh century, the Sabbath was still regarded as a festival, equal in sacredness with Sunday. Heylyn contrasts with this the action of the western division of that church:

"But it was otherwise of old in the church of Rome, where they did labor and fast. . . . And this, with little opposition or interruption, save that which had been made in the city of Rome in the beginning of the seventh century, and was soon crushed by Gregory then bishop there, as before we noted. And howsoever Urban of that name the second, did consecrate it to the weekly service of the blessed virgin, and instituted in the council held at Clermont, A.D. 1095, that our lady's office should be said upon it, and that upon that day all Christian folks should worship her with their best devotion."⁵⁰

It would seem that this was a crowning indignity to the Most High. The memorial of the great Creator was set apart as a festival on which to worship Mary, under the title of mother of God! In the middle of the twelfth century, the king of England was admonished not to suffer men to work upon Sunday. Henry II. entered on the government about the year 1155.

"Of him it is reported that he had an apparition at Cardiff (. . . in South Wales) which from St. Peter charged him, that upon Sundays throughout his dominions, there should be no buying or selling, and no servile work done."⁵¹

The sacredness of Sunday was not yet sufficiently established, because a divine warrant for its observance was still unprovided. The manner in which this urgent necessity was met is related by Roger Hoveden, a historian of high repute who lived at the very time when this much-needed precept was furnished by the pope. Hoveden informs us that Eustace the abbot of Flaye in Normandy, came into England in the year 1200, to preach the word of the Lord, and that his preaching was attended by many wonderful miracles. He was very earnest in behalf of Sunday. Thus Hoveden says:

"At London also, and many other places throughout England, he effected by his preaching, that from that time forward people did not dare to hold market of things exposed for sale on the Lord's Day."⁵²

But Hoveden tells us that "the enemy of mankind raised against this man of God the ministers of iniquity," and it seems that having no commandment for Sunday he was in a strait place. The historian continues:

"However, the said abbot, on being censured by the ministers of Satan, was unwilling any longer to molest the prelates of England by his preaching, but returned to Normandy, unto his place whence he came."⁵³

But Eustace, though repulsed, had no thought of abandoning the contest. He had no commandment from the Lord when he came into England the first time. But one year's sojourn on the continent was sufficient to provide that which he lacked. Hoveden tells us how he returned the following year with the needed precept:

"In the same year [1201], Eustace, abbot of Flaye, returned to England, and preaching therein the word of the Lord from city to city, and from place to place, forbade any person to hold a market of goods on sale upon the Lord's day. For he said that the commandment under-written, as to the observance of the Lord's day, had come down from Heaven:

"THE HOLY COMMANDMENT AS TO THE LORD'S DAY,

"Which came from Heaven to Jerusalem, and was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, in Golgotha, where Christ was crucified for the sins of the world. The Lord sent down this epistle, which was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, and after looking upon which, three days and three nights, some men fell upon the earth, imploring mercy of God. And after the third hour, the patriarch arose, and Acharias, the archbishop, and they opened the scroll, and received the holy epistle from God. And when they had taken the same they found this writing therein:

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

" `And if any person shall do so, he shall with penance make amends for the same. And if you do not pay obedience to this command, verily, I say unto you, and I swear unto you, by my seat and by my throne, and by the cherubim who watch my holy seat, that I will give you my commands by no other epistle, but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and hot water, in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men.

" `This do I say unto you; for the Lord's holy day, you shall die the death, and for the other festivals of my saints which you have not kept: I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels,

and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away to the tombs of the dead, and to hide yourselves for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from before your eyes, and will send darkness upon you, that not seeing, you may slay one another, and that I may remove from you my face, and may not show mercy upon you. For I will burn the bodies and the hearts of you, and of all of those who do not keep as the holy day of the Lord.

" `Hear ye my voice, that so ye may not perish in the land, for the holy day of the Lord. Depart from evil, and show repentance for your sins. For, if you do not do so, even as Sodom and Gomorrah shall you perish. Now, know ye, that you are saved by the prayers of my most holy mother, Mary, and of my most holy angels, who pray for you daily. I have given unto you wheat and wine in abundance, and for the same ye have not obeyed me. For the widows and orphans cry unto you daily, and unto them you show no mercy. The pagans show mercy, but you show none at all. The trees which bear fruit, I will cause to be dried up for your sins; the rivers and the fountains shall not give water.

" `I gave unto you a law in Mount Sinai, which you have not kept. I gave you a law with mine own hands, which you have not observed. For you I was born into the world, and my festive day ye knew not. Being wicked men, ye have not kept the Lord's day of my resurrection. By my right hand I swear unto you, that if you do not observe the Lord's day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send unto you the pagan nations, that they may slay you. And still do you attend to the business of others, and take no consideration of this? For this will I send against you still worse beasts, who shall devour the breasts of your women. I will curse those who on the Lord's day have wrought evil.

" `Those who act unjustly towards their brethren, will I curse. Those who judge unrighteously the poor and the orphans upon the earth, will I curse. For me you forsake, and you follow the prince of this world. Give heed to my voice, and you shall have the blessing of mercy. But you cease not from your bad works, nor from the works of the devil. Because you are guilty of perjuries and adulteries, therefore the nations shall surround you, and shall, like beasts, devour you.' "⁵⁴

That such a document was actually brought into England at this time, and in the manner here described, is so amply attested as to leave no doubt.⁵⁵ Matthew Paris, like Hoveden, was actually a contemporary of Eustace. Hoveden properly belongs to the twelfth century, for he died shortly after the arrival of Eustace with his roll. But Matthew Paris belongs to the thirteenth, as he was but young at the time this roll (A.D. 1201) was brought into England. Both have a high reputation for truthfulness. In speaking of the writers of that century, Mosheim bears the following testimony to the credibility of Matthew Paris:

"Among the historians, the first place is due to Matthew Paris, a writer of the highest merit, both in point of knowledge and prudence."⁵⁶

And Dr. Murdock says of him:

"He is accounted the best historian of the Middle Ages, learned, independent, honest, and judicious."⁵⁷

Matthew Paris relates the return of the abbot Eustachius (as he spells the name) from Normandy, and gives us a copy of the roll which he brought, and an account of its fall from Heaven as related by the abbot himself. He also tells us how the abbot came by it, tracing the history of the roll from the point when the patriarch gathered courage to take it into his hands, till the time when our abbot was commissioned to bring it into England. Thus he says:

"But when the patriarch and clergy of all the holy land had diligently examined the contents of this epistle, it was decreed in a general deliberation that the epistle should be sent to the judgment of the Roman pontiff, seeing that whatever he decreed to be done, would please all. And when at length the epistle had come to the knowledge of the lord pope, immediately he ordained heralds, who being sent through different parts of the world, preached every where the doctrine of this epistle, the Lord working with them and confirming their words by signs following. Among whom the abbot of Flay, Eustachius by name, a devout and learned man, having entered the kingdom of England did there shine with many miracles."⁵⁸

Now we know what the abbot was about during the year that he was absent from England. He could not establish first-day sacredness by his first mission to England, for he had no divine warrant in its behalf. He therefore retired from the mission long enough to make known the necessities of the case to the "lord pope." But when he came the second time he brought the divine mandate for Sunday, and with the commission of the pope, authorizing him to proclaim that mandate to the people, and informing them that it was sent to His Holiness from Jerusalem by those who saw it fall from Heaven. Had Eustace framed this document himself, and then forged a commission from the pope, a few months would have discovered the imposture. But their genuineness was never questioned as shown by preservation of this roll by the best historians of that time. We therefore trace the responsibility for this roll by the best historians of that time. We therefore trace the responsibility for this roll directly to the pope of Rome. The statement of the pope that he received it from the hands of those who saw it fall from Heaven is the guaranty given by His Holiness to the people that the roll came from God. The historians then living, who record this transaction, were able to satisfy themselves that Eustace brought the roll from the pope; and they believed the pope's statement that he had received it from Heaven. It was Innocent III. who filled the office of pope at this time, of whom Bower speaks thus:

"Innocent was perfectly well qualified to raise the papal power and authority to the highest pitch, and we shall see him improving, with great address, every opportunity that offered to compass that end."⁵⁹

Another eminent authority makes this statement:

"The external circumstances of his time also furthered Innocent's views, and enabled him to make his pontificate the most marked in the annals of Rome; the culminating point of the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Roman See."⁶⁰

"His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman See."⁶¹

The dense darkness of the Dark Ages still covered the earth when that pontiff filled the papal throne who raised the papacy to its highest elevation. Two facts worthy of much thought should here be named in connection:

1. The first act of papal usurpation was by an edict in behalf of Sunday.⁶²
2. The utmost height of papal usurpation was marked by the pope's act of furnishing a divine precept for Sunday observance.

The mission of Eustace was attested by miracles which are worthy of perusal by those who believe in first-day sacredness because their fathers thus believed. Here they may learn what was done six centuries since, to fix these ideas in the minds of their fathers. Eustace came to York, in the north of England, and, meeting an honorable reception,

"Preached the word of the Lord, and on the breaking of the Lord's day and the other festivals, and imposed upon the people penance and gave absolution, upon condition that, in future they would pay due reverence to the Lord's day and the other festivals of the saints, doing therein no servile work."⁶³

"Upon this, the people who were dutiful to God at his preaching, vowed before God that, for the future, on the Lord's day, they would neither buy nor sell any thing, unless, perchance, victuals and drink of wayfarers."⁶⁴

The abbot also made provision for the collection of alms for the benefit of the poor, and forbade the use of the churches for the sale of goods, and for the pleading of causes. Upon this, the king interfered as follows:

"Accordingly, through these and other warnings of this holy man, the enemy of mankind being rendered envious, he put it into the heart of the king and of the princes of darkness to command that all who should observe the before stated doctrines, and more especially all those who had discountenanced the markets on the Lord's day, should be brought before the king's court of justice, to make satisfaction as to the observance of the Lord's day."⁶⁵

The markets of the Lord's day, it seems, were held in the churches, and Eustace was attempting to suppress these when he forbade the sale of goods in the churches. And now to confirm the authority of the roll, and to neutralize the opposition of the king, some very extraordinary prodigies were reported. The roll forbade labor "from the ninth hour (that is 3 P.M.) on Saturday until sunrise on Monday." Now read what happened to the disobedient:

"One Saturday, a certain carpenter of Beverly, who, after the ninth hour of the day was, contrary to the wholesome advice of his wife, making a wooden wedge, fell to the earth, being struck with paralysis. A woman also, a weaver, who, after the ninth hour, on Saturday, in her anxiety to finish a part of the web, persisted in so doing fell to the ground, struck with paralysis, and lost her voice. At Rafferton also, a vill belonging to Master Roger Arundel, a man made for himself a loaf and baked it under the ashes, after the ninth hour on Saturday, and ate thereof, and put part of it by till the morning, but when he broke it on the Lord's day blood started forth therefrom; and he who saw it bore witness, and his testimony is true.

"At Wakefield, also, one Saturday, while a miller was, after the ninth hour, attending to grinding his corn, there suddenly came forth, instead of flour, such a torrent of blood, that the vessel placed beneath was nearly filled with blood, and the mill wheel stood immovable, in spite of the strong rush of the water; and those who beheld it wondered thereat, saying, 'Spare us, O Lord, spare thy people!'"

"Also, in Lincolnshire a woman had prepared some dough, and taking it to the oven after the ninth hour on Saturday, she placed it in the oven, which was then at a very great heat; but when she took it out, she found it raw, on which she again put it into the oven, which was very hot; and, both on the next day, and on Monday, when she supposed that she should find the loaves baked, she found raw dough.

"In the same county also, when a certain woman had prepared her dough, intending to carry it to the oven, her husband said to her, 'It is Saturday, and it is now past the ninth hour, put it one side till Monday:' on which the woman, obeying her husband, did as he commanded; and so, having covered over the dough with a linen cloth, on coming the next day to look at the dough, to see whether it had not, in rising, through the yeast that was in it, gone over the sides of the vessel, she found there the loaves ready made by the divine will, and well baked, without any fire of the material of this world. This was a change wrought by the right hand of Him on high."⁶⁶

The historian laments that these miracles were lost upon the people, and that they feared the king more than they feared God, and so "like a dog to his vomit, returned to the holding of markets on the Lord's day."⁶⁷ Such was the first attempt in England after the apparition of St. Peter, A.D. 1155, to supply divine authority for Sunday observance. "It shows," as Morer quaintly observes, "how industrious men were in those times to have this great day solemnly observed."⁶⁸ And Gilfillan, who has occasion to mention the story of the roll from Heaven, has not one word of condemnation for the pious fraud in behalf of Sunday, but he simply speaks of our abbot as "This ardent person."⁶⁹

Two years after the arrival of Eustace in England with his roll, A.D. 1203, a council was held in Scotland concerning the introduction and establishment of the Lord's day in that kingdom.⁷⁰ The roll that had fallen from Heaven to supply the lack of scriptural testimony in behalf of this day, was admirably adapted to the business of this council, though Dr. Heylyn informs us that the Scotch were so ready to comply with the pope's wishes that the packet from the court of Heaven and the accompanying miracles were not needed.⁷¹ Yet Morer asserts that the packet was actually produced on this occasion:

"To that end it was again produced and read in a council of Scotland, held under [pope] Innocent III, . . . A.D. 1203, in the reign of King William, who . . . passed it into a law that Saturday from twelve at noon ought to be accounted holy, and that no man shall deal in such worldly business as on feast days were forbidden. As also that at the tolling of a bell, the people were to be employed in holy actions, going to sermons and the like, and to continue thus until Monday morning, a penalty being laid on those who did the contrary. About the year 1214, which was eleven years after, it was again enacted, in a parliament at Scone, by Alexander III., king of the Scots, that none should fish in any waters, from Saturday after evening prayer, till sunrising on Monday, which was afterward confirmed by King James I."⁷²

The sacredness of this papal Lord's day seems to have been more easily established by taking in with it a part of the ancient Sabbath. The work of establishing this institution was everywhere carried steadily forward. Of England we read:

"In the year 1237, Henry III. being king, and Edmund de Abendon archbishop of Canterbury, a constitution was made, requiring every minister to forbid his

parishners the frequenting of markets on the Lord's day, and leaving the church where they ought to meet and spend the day in prayer and hearing the word of God. And this on pain of excommunication."⁷³

Of France we are informed:

"The council of Lyons sat about the year 1244, and it restrained the people from their ordinary work on the Lord's day, and other festivals on pain of ecclesiastical censures."

A.D. 1282. The council of Angeirs in France "forbid millers by water or otherwise to grind their corn from Saturday evening till Sunday evening."⁷⁴

Nor were the Spaniards backward in this work:

A.D. 1322. This year "a synod was called at Valladolid in Castile, and then was ratified what was formerly required, that 'none should follow husbandry, or exercise himself in any mechanical employment on the Lord's day, or other holy days, but where it was a work of necessity or charity, of which the minister of the parish was to be judge.' "⁷⁵

The rulers of the church and realm of England were diligent in establishing the sacredness of this day. Yet the following statutes show that they were not aware of any Bible authority for enforcing its observance:

A.D. 1358. "Istippe, archbishop of Canterbury, with very great concern and zeal, expresses himself thus: 'We have it from the relation of very credible persons, that in divers places within our province, a very naughty, nay, damnable custom has prevailed, to hold fairs and markets on the Lord's day. . . . Wherefore by virtue of canonical obedience, we strictly charge and command your brotherhood, that if you find your people faulty in the premises, you forthwith admonish or cause them to be admonished to refrain going to markets or fairs on the Lord's day. . . . And as for such who are obstinate and speak or act against you in this particular, you must endeavor to restrain them by ecclesiastical censures and by all lawful means put a stop to these extravagances.'

"Nor was the civil power silent; for much about that time King Edward made an act that wool should not be shown at the staple on Sundays and other solemn feasts in the year. In the reign of King Henry VI., Dr. Stafford being archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1444, it was decreed that fairs and markets should no more be kept in churches and church-yards on the Lord's day, or other festivals, except in time of harvest."⁷⁶

Observe that fairs and markets were held in the churches in England on Sundays as late as 1444! And even later than this such fairs were allowed in harvest time. On the European continent the sacredness of Sunday was persistently urged. The council of Bourges urges its observance as follows:

A.D. 1532. "The Lord's day and other festivals were instituted for this purpose, that faithful Christians abstaining from external work, might more freely, and with greater piety devote themselves to God's worship."⁷⁷

They did not seem to be aware of the fact however that when the fear of God is taught by the precepts of men such worship is vain.⁷⁸ The council of Rheims, which sat the next year, made this decree:

A.D. 1533. "Let the people assemble at their parish churches on the Lord's day, and other holidays, and be present at mass, sermons and vespers. Let no man on these days give himself to plays or dances, especially during service." And the historian adds: "In the same year another synod at Tours, ordered the Lord's day and other holidays to be reverently observed under pain of excommunication"⁷⁹

A council which assembled the following year thus frankly confessed the divine origin of the Sabbath, and the human origin of that festival which has supplanted it:

A.D. 1584. "Let all Christians remember that the seventh day was consecrate by God, and hath been received and observed, not only by the Jews, but by all others who pretend to worship God; though we Christians have changed their Sabbath into the Lord's day. A day therefore to be kept, by forbearing all worldly business, suits, contracts, carriages, &c., and by sanctifying the rest of mind and body, in the contemplation of God and things divine, we are to do nothing but works of charity, say prayers, and sing psalms."⁸⁰

We have thus traced Sunday observance in the Catholic church down to a period subsequent to the Reformation. That it is an ordinance of man which has usurped the place of the Bible Sabbath is most distinctly confessed by the council last quoted. Yet they endeavor to make amends of their violation of the Sabbath by spending Sunday in charity, prayers, and psalms: a course too often adopted at the present time to excuse the violation of the fourth commandment. Who can read this long list of Sunday laws, not from the "one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy," but from popes, emperors, and councils, without adopting the sentiment of Neander: "The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance?"

1 2Thess.2.

2 Dan.7.

3 Shimeall's Bible Chronology, part ii. chap. ix. sect. 5, p. 175, 176; Croly on the Apocalypse, pp. 167-173.

4 Dan.7:8,24,25; Rev.13:1-5.

5 Rev.12.

6 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. iv. sect. 1.

7 Learned Treatise of the Sabbath, p. 73, ed. 1631.

8 Hist. Sab. part ii, chap. ii, sect. 12.

9 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 202.

10 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. v. sect. 13.

11 Id. part ii. chap. v. sect. 6.

12 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, pp. 217, 218.

13 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, pp. 263, 264.

14 The Lord's Day, p. 58.

15 Dictionary of Chronology p. 813, art. Sunday.

16 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 265.

17 Id. pp. 265, 266; Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. iv. sect 7.

18 Dialogues on the Lord's Day. p. 68.

19 Historical and Practical Discourse on the Lord's Day, p. 174.

20 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 282.

21 Fleury, Hist. Eccl. Tome viii. Livre xxxvi. Sect 22; Heylyn's Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. v. sect. 1. Dr. Twisse, however, asserts that the pope speaks of two classes. He gives Gregory's words as follows: "Relation is made unto me that certain men of a perverse spirit, have sowed among you some corrupt doctrines contrary to our holy faith; so as to forbid any work to be done on the Sabbath day: these men we may well call the preachers of Antichrist. . . . Another report was brought unto me; and what was that? That some perverse persons preach among you, that on the Lord's day none should be washed. This is clearly another point maintained by other persons, different from the former." - Morality of the Fourth Commandment, pp. 19, 20. If Dr. Twisse is right, the Sabbath-keepers in Rome about the year 600 were not chargeable with the Sunday observance above mentioned.

22 The idea is suggested by the language of an anonymous first-day writer of the seventeenth century, Irenaeus Philalethes, in a work entitled "Sabbato-Dominica," pref. p. 11, London, 1643.

23 Dialogues on the Lord's Day, p. 267.

24 Id. p. 283.

25 Dialogues, &c. p. 268.

26 Id. pp. 283, 284.

27 Id. p. 268.

28 Id. p. 284.

29 Dialogues, &c. p. 269.

30 Id. p. 270.

31 Id. p. 271.

32 Dialogue, &c. p. 271; Hist. Sab. part ii, chap. v. sect. 7.

33 Dialogues, &c. p. 272.

34 Dialogue, &c. p. 261.

35 Ex.20:8-11; Deut.33:2.

36 Hist. Sab. part ii, chap. v, sect. 7; Morer, p. 272.

37 Hist. Sab. part. ii, chap. v, sect. 7; Morer, p. 272.

38 Dialogues, &c. pp. 261, 262.

39 Id. pp. 284, 285.

40 Dialogues, &c. p. 274.

41 Id. p. 285.

42 Id. p. 286.

43 Ib. Ib.

44 Id. pp. 286, 287.

45 Hist. Sab. part ii, chap. v, sect. 2.

46 Dialogues, &c. p. 274.

47 Hist. Sab. part ii, chap. v, sect. 2.

48 Dialogues, &c. p. 68.

49 Binius, vol. iii, p. 1285, ed. 1606.

50 Hist. Sab. part. ii, chap. v, sect. 13.

51 Morer, p. 288; Heylyn, part 2, chap. vii, sect. 6.

52 Roger de Hoveden's Annals, Bohn's ed. vol. ii, p. 487.

53 Id. Ib.

54 Hoveden, vol. ii, pp. 526-528.

55 See Matthew Paris's *Historia Major*, pp. 200, 201. ed. 1640; Binius' *Councils*, ad ann. 1201, vol. iii, pp. 1448, 1449; Wilkins' *Concilia Magnae Britanniae, et Hibernae*, vol. i, pp. 510, 511, London, 1737; Sir David Dalrymple's *historical Memorials*, pp. 7, 8, ed. 1769; Heyln's *History of the Sabbath*, part ii, chap. vii, sect. 5; Morer's *Lord's Day*, pp. 288-290; Hessey's *Sunday* pp. 90, 321; Gilfillan's *Sabbath*, p. 399.

56 Maclaine's *Mosheim*, cent. xiii, part ii, chap. i, sect. 5.

57 Murdock's *Mosheim*, cent. xiii, part ii, chap. i, sect. 5, note 19.

58 Matthew Paris's *Historia Major*, p. 201. His words are: "Cum autem l'atriarcha et clerus omnis Terrae sanctae, hunc epistolae tenorem diligenter examinassent; communi omnium deliberatione dectretum est, ut epistola ad iudicium Romani Pontificis transmitteretur; quatenus, quicquid ipse agendum dectrevit, placet universis. Cumque tandem epistola ad domini Papae notitiam pervenisset, continuo praedicatotes ordinavit; qui per diversas mundi

partes profecti, praedicaverun ubique epistolaftenerem; Domino cooperante et sermonem eorum confirmante, sequentibus signis. Inter quos Abbos de Flai nomine Eustachius, vir religiosus et literali scientia eruditus, regnum Angliae agressus: multis ibidem miraculis corruscavit." - Library of Harvard College.

59 History of the Popes, vol. ii, p. 535.

60 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. iv, p. 590.

61 Id. vol. iv, p. 592.

62 See page 274 of this work.

63 Hoveden, vol. ii, p. 528.

64 Hoveden, vol. ii, p. 528.

65 Id. p. 529.

66 Hoveden, vol. ii. pp. 529, 530.

67 Id. Ib. Sabbath History.

68 Dialogues, &c. p. 290.

69 Gilfillan's Sabbath, p. 399.

70 Binius's Councils, vol. iii. p. 1448, 1449; Heylyn, part ii. chap. vii. sect. 7.

71 Heylyn, part ii. chap. vii. sect. 7.

72 Dialogues, &c. pp. 290, 291.

73 Id. p. 291.

74 Id. p. 275.

75 Id. Ib.

76 Id. pp. 293, 294 .

77 Id. p. 279.

78 Isa.29:13; Matt.15:9.

79 Morer, p. 280.

80 Id. pp. 281, 282.

CHAPTER 21

TRACES OF THE SABBATH DURING THE DARK AGES

The Dark Ages defined - Difficulty of tracing the people of God during this period - The Sabbath effectually suppressed in the Catholic church at the close of the fifth century - Sabbath-keepers in Rome about A.D. 600 - The Culdees of Great Britain - Columba probably a Sabbath-keeper - The Waldenses - Their antiquity - Their wide extent - Their peculiarities - Sabbatarian character of a part of this people - Important facts respecting the Waldenses and the Romanists - Other bodies of Sabbatarians - The Cathari - The Arnoldistae - The Passaginians - The Petrobruysians - Gregory VII. about A.D. 1074 condemns the Sabbath-keepers - The Sabbath in Constantinople in the eleventh century - A portion of the Anabaptists - Sabbatarians in Abyssinia and Ethiopia - The Armenians of the East Indies - The Sabbath retained through the Dark Ages by those who were not in the communion of the Romish church.

With the accession of the Roman bishop to supremacy began the Dark Ages;¹ and as he increased in strength, the gloom of darkness settled with increasing intensity upon the world. The highest elevation of the papal power marks the latest point in the Dark Ages before the first gray dawn of twilight.² That power was providentially weakened preparatory to the reformation of the sixteenth century, when the light of advancing day began to manifestly dissipate the gross darkness which covered the earth. The difficulty of tracing the true people of God through this period is well set forth in the following language of Benedict:

"As scarcely any fragment of their history remains, all we know of them is from accounts of their enemies, which were always uttered in the style of censure and complaint; and without which we should not have known that millions of them ever existed. It was the settled policy of Rome to obliterate every vestige of opposition to her doctrines and decrees; everything heretical, whether persons or writings, by which the faithful would be liable to be contaminated and led astray. In conformity to this their fixed determination, all books and records of their opposers were hunted up and committed to the flames. Before the art of printing was discovered in the fifteenth century, all books were made with the pen; the copies, of course, were so few that their concealment was much more difficult than it would be now; and if a few of them escaped the vigilance of the inquisitors, they would soon be worn out and gone.

None of them could be admitted and preserved in the public libraries of the Catholics, from the ravages of time and of the hands of barbarians with which all parts of Europe were at different periods overwhelmed."³

The first five centuries of the Christian era accomplished the suppression of the Sabbath in those churches which were under the special control of the Roman pontiff. Thenceforward we must look for the observers of the Sabbath outside the communion of the church of Rome. It was predicted that the Roman power should cast down the truth to the ground.⁴ The Scriptures set forth the law of God as his truth.⁵ The Dark Ages were the result of this work of the great

apostasy. So dense and all-pervading was the darkness, that God's pure truth was more or less obscured even with the true people of God in their places of retirement.

About the year 600, as we have seen, there was in the city of Rome itself a class of Sabbath-keeping Christians who were very strict in the observance of the fourth commandment. It has been said of them that they joined with this a strict abstinence from labor on Sunday. But Dr. Twisse, a learned first-day writer who has particularly examined the record respecting them, asserts that this Sunday observance pertained to "other persons, different from the former."⁶ These Sabbath-keepers were not Romanists, and the pope denounced them in strong language.

The Christians of Great Britain, before the mission of Augustine to that country, A.D. 596, were not in subjection to the bishop of Rome. They were in an eminent degree Bible Christians. They are thus described:

"The Scottish church, when it first meets the eye of civilization, is not Romish, nor even prelatical. When the monk Augustine, with his forty missionaries, in the time of the Saxon Heptarchy, came over to Britain under the auspices of Gregory, the bishop of Rome, to convert the barbarian Saxons, he found the northern part of the island already well-nigh filled with Christians and Christian institutions. These Christians were the Culdees, whose chief seat was the little island of Hi or Iona, on the western coast of Scotland. An Irish presbyter, Columba, feeling himself stirred with missionary zeal, and doubtless knowing the wretched condition of the savage Scots and Picts, in the year 565, took with him twelve other missionaries, and passed over to Scotland. They fixed their settlement on the little island just named, and from that point became the missionaries of all Scotland, and even penetrated into England."⁷

"The people in the south of England converted by Augustine and his assistants, and those in the north who had been won by Culdee labor, soon met, as Christian conquest advanced from both sides; and when they came together, it was soon seen that Roman and Culdee Christianity very decidedly differed in a great many respects.

The Culdees, for the most part, had a simple and primitive form of Christianity, while Rome presented a vast accumulation of superstitions, and was arrayed in her well-known pomp."⁸

"The Culdee went to Iona that in quiet, with meditation, study, and prayer, he might fit himself for going out into the world as a missionary. Indeed, Iona was a great mission institute, where preachers were trained who evangelized the rude tribes of Scotland in a very short time. To have done such a work as this in less than half a century implies apostolic activity, purity, and success."⁹

"After the success of Augustine and his monks in England, the Culdees had shut themselves up within the limits of Scotland, and had resisted for centuries all the efforts of Rome to win them over. At last, however, they were overthrown by their own rulers."¹⁰

There is strong incidental evidence that Columba, the leading minister of his time among the Culdees, was an observer of the ancient Sabbath of the Bible. On this point I quote two standard authors of the Roman Catholics. They certainly have no motive to put such words as I here quote, fraudulently into the mouth of Columba, for they claim him as a saint, and they are no friends of the Bible Sabbath. Nor can we see how Columba could have used these

words with satisfaction, as he evidently did, when dying had he all his life long been a violator of the ancient rest-day of the Lord. Here are the words of Dr. Alvan Butler:

"Having continued his labors in Scotland thirty-four years, he clearly and openly foretold his death, and on Saturday the ninth of June said to his disciple Diermit: 'This day is called the Sabbath, that is, the day of rest, and such will it truly be to me; for it will put an end to my labors.' "¹¹

Another distinguished Catholic author gives us his dying words thus:

"To-day is Saturday, the day which the Holy Scriptures call the Sabbath, or rest. And it will be truly my day of rest, for it shall be the last of my laborious life."¹²

These words show, 1. That Columba believed that Saturday was the true Bible Sabbath. 2. That he did not believe the Sabbath had been changed to Sunday. 3. That this confession of faith respecting the Bible Sabbath was made with evident satisfaction, though in view of immediate death. Did any first-day man ever recur with pleasure on his death-bed to the fact that Saturday is the Bible Sabbath?

But Gilfillan quotes these words of Columba as spoken in behalf of Sunday! In giving a list of eminent men who have asserted the change of the Sabbath, or who have called Sunday the Sabbath, and have taught that it should be observed as a day of sacred rest, he brings in Columba thus:

"The testimony of Columba is specially interesting, as it expresses the feelings of the heart at a moment which tests the sincerity of faith, and the value of a creed:

'This day,' he said to his servant, 'in the sacred volume is called the Sabbath, that is, rest; and will indeed be a Sabbath to me, for it is to me the last day of this toilsome life, the day on which I am to rest (sabbatize), after all my labors and troubles, for on this coming sacred night of the Lord (Dominica nocte), at the midnight hour, I shall, as the Scriptures speak, go the way of my fathers.'¹³

But this day which Columba said "will indeed be a Sabbath to me" was not Sunday but Saturday.

Among the dissenters from the Romish church in the period of the Dark Ages, the first place perhaps is due to the Waldenses, both for their antiquity and the wide extent of their influence and doctrine. Benedict quotes from their enemies respecting the antiquity of their origin:

"We have already observed from Claudius Seyssel, the popish archbishop, that one Leo was charged with originating the Waldensian heresy in the valleys, in the days of the Constantine the Great. When those severe measures emanated from the Emperor Honourius against re-baptizers, the Baptist left the seat of opulence and power, and sought retreats in the country, and in the valleys of Piedmont; which last place in particular became their retreat from imperial oppression."¹⁴

Dean Waddington quotes the following from Rainer Saccho, a popish writer, who had the best means of information respecting them:

"There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: first, it is the most ancient-some say as old as Sylvester [pope in Constantine's time], others as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated: there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Thirdly, while other sects are profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing respecting God which is not good."¹⁵

Mr. Jones gives Saccho's own opinion as follows:

"Their enemies confirm their great antiquity. Reinerius Saccho, an inquisitor, and one of their most cruel persecutors, who lived only eighty years after Waldo [A.D. 1160], admits that the Waldenses flourished five hundred years before that preacher. Gretser, the Jesuit, who also wrote against the Waldenses, and had examined the subject fully, not only admits their great antiquity, but declares his firm belief that the Toulousians and Albigenses condemned in the years 1177 and 1178, were no other than the Waldenses."¹⁶

Jortin dates their withdrawal into the wilderness of the Alps as follows:

"A.D. 601. In the seventh century, Christianity was propagated in China by the Nestorians; and the Valdenses, who abhorred the papal usurptions, are supposed to have settled themselves in the valleys of Piedmont. Monks flourished prodigiously, and the monks and popes were in the firmest union."¹⁷

President Edwards says:

"Some of the popish writers themselves own, that this people never submitted to the church of Rome. One of the popish writers, speaking of the Waldenses, says, The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world. It is supposed that they first betook themselves to this place among the mountains, to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions which existed before Constantine the Great. And thus the woman fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent. Rev.12:6, 14. 'And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.' The people being settled there, their posterity continued [there] from age to age; and being, as it were, by natural walls, as well as by God's grace, separated from the rest of the world, they never partook of the overflowing corruption."¹⁸

Benedict makes other quotations relative to their origin:

"Theodore Belvedre, a popish monk, says that the heresy had always been in the valleys. In the preface to the French Bible the translators say that they [the Waldenses] have always had the full enjoyment of the heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched with the same by the apostles; having in fair MSS. preserved the entire Bible in their native tongue from generation to generation."¹⁹

Of the extent to which they spread in the countries of Europe, Benedict thus speaks:

"In the thirteenth century, from the accounts of Catholic historians, all of whom speak of the Waldenses in terms of complaint and reproach, they had

founded individual churches, or were spread out in colonies in Italy, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Poland, Lithuania, Albania, Lombardy, Milan, Romagna, Vicenza, Florence, Veleponetine, Constantinople, Philadelphia, Sclavonia, Bulgaria, Diognitia, Livonia, Sarmatia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Briton and Piedmont."²⁰

And Dr. Edgar gives the words of an old historian as follows:

"The Waldensians, says Popliner, spread, not only through France, but also through nearly all the European coasts, and appeared in Gaul, Spain, England, Scotland, Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Saxony, Poland, and Lithuania."²¹

According to the testimony of their enemies, they were to some extent divided among themselves. Dr. Allix quotes an old Romish writer who says of that portion of them who were called Cathari:-

"They are also divided amongst themselves; so what some of them say is again denied by others."²²

And Crosby make a similar statement:

"There were several sects of Waldenses or Albigenses, like as there are of Dissenters in England. Some of these did deny all baptism, others only the baptism of infants. That many of them were of this latter opinion, is affirmed in several histories of this people, as well ancient as modern."²³

Some of their enemies affirm that they reject the Old Testament; but others, with much greater truthfulness, bear a very different testimony.²⁴ Thus a Romish inquisitor, as quoted by Allix, bears testimony concerning those in Bohemia:

"They can say a great part of the Old and New Testaments by heart. They despise the decretals, and the sayings and expositions of holy men, and only cleave to the text of Scripture. . . . [They say] that the doctrine of Christ and the apostles is sufficient to salvation, without any church statutes and ordinances. That the traditions of the church are no better than the traditions of the Pharisees; and that greater stress is laid on the observation of human traditions than on the keeping of the law of God. Why do you transgress the law of God by your traditions? . . . They condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs which they do not read of in the gospel, as the observation of Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the reconciliation of penitents, the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. They despise the feast of Easter, and all other festivals of Christ and the saints, because of their being multiplied to that vast number, and say that one day is as good as another, and work upon holy days, where they can do it without being taken notice of."²⁵

Dr. Allix quotes a Waldensian document of A.D. 1100, entitled the "Noble Lesson," and remarks:

"The author upon supposal that the world was drawing to an end, exhorts his brethren to prayer, to watchfulness, to a renouncing of all worldly goods. * * *

"He sets down all the judgments of God in the Old Testament as the effects of a just and good God; and in particular the decalogue as a law given by the Lord

of the whole world. He repeats the several articles of the law, not forgetting that which respects idols."²⁶

Their religious views are further stated by Allix:-

"They declare themselves to be the apostles' successors, to have apostolical authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. They hold the church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon, and that all that obey her are dammed, especially the clergy that are subject to her since the time of Pope Sylvester. . . . They hold that none of the ordinances of the church that have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed, as being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the church and the like, they utterly reject."²⁷

A considerable part of the people called Waldenses bore the significant designation of Sabbati, or Sabbatati, or Insabbatati. Mr. Jones alludes to this fact in the following words:

"Because they would not observe saints' days, they were falsely suppose to neglect the Sabbath also, and called Insabbatati or Insabbathists."²⁸

Mr. Benedict makes the following statement:

"We find that the Waldenses were sometimes called Insabbathos, that is, regardless of Sabbaths. Mr. Milner supposes this name was given to them because they observed not the Romish festivals, and rested from their ordinary occupations only on Sundays. A Sabbatarian would suppose that it was because they met for worship on the seventh day, and did regard not the first-day Sabbath."²⁹

Mr. Robinson gives the statements of three classes of writers respecting the meaning of these names, which were borne by the Waldenses. But he rejects them all, alleging that these persons were led to these conclusions by the apparent meaning of the words, and not by the facts.

Here are his words:

"Some of these Christians were called Sabbati, Sabbatati, Insabbatati, and more frequently Inzabbatati. Led astray by sound without attending to facts, one says they were so named from the Hebrew word Sabbath, because they kept the Saturday for the Lord's day. Another says they were so called because they rejected all the festivals or Sabbaths in the low Latin sense of the word, which the Catholic church religiously observed. A third says, and many with various alterations and additions have said after him, they were called so from sabot or zabot, a shoe, because they distinguished themselves from other people by wearing shoes marked on the upper part with some peculiarity. Is it likely that people who could not descend from their mountains without hazarding their lives through the furious zeal of the inquisitors, should tempt danger by affixing a visible mark on their shoes? Besides the shoe of the peasants happens to be famous in this country; it was of a different fashion, and was called abarca."³⁰

Mr. Robinson rejects these three statements, and then gives his own judgment that they were so called because they lived in the mountains.

These four views cover all that has been advanced relative to the meaning of these names.

But Robinson's own explanation is purely fanciful, and seems to have been adopted by no other writer. He offers, however, conclusive reasons for rejecting the statement that they took their name from their shoes. There remain, therefore, only the first and second of these four statements, which are that they were called by these names because they kept the Saturday for the Lord's day, and because they did not keep the sabbaths of the papists. These two statements do not conflict. In fact, if one of them be true, it almost certainly follows that the other one must be true also. There would be in such facts something worthy to give a distinguishing name to the true people of God, surrounded by the great apostasy; and the natural and obvious interpretation of the names would disclose the most striking characteristic of the people who bore them.

Jones and Benedict agree with Robinson in rejecting the idea that the Waldenses received these names from their shoes. Mr. Jones held, on the contrary, that they were given them because they did not keep the Romish festivals.³¹ Mr. Benedict favors the view that it was because they kept the seventh day.³² But let us now see who they are that make these statements respecting the observance of the Sabbath by the Waldenses, that Robinson alludes to in this place. He quotes out of Gretser the words of the historian Goldastus as follows:

"Insabbatati [they were called] not because they were circumcised, but because they kept the Jewish Sabbath."³³

Goldastus was "a learned historian and jurist, born near Bischofszell in Switzerland in 1576." He died in 1635.³⁴

He was a Calvinist writer of note.³⁵ He certainly had no motive to favor the cause of the seventh day. Gretser objects to his statement on the ground that the Waldenses exterminated every festival; but this was the most natural thing in the world for men who had God's own rest-day in their keeping. Gretser still further objects that the Waldenses denied the whole Old Testament; but this charge is an utter misrepresentation, as we have already shown in the present chapter.

Robinson also quotes on this point the testimony of Archbishop Usher. Though that prelate held that the Waldenses derived these names from their shoes, he frankly acknowledges that MANY understood that they were given to them because they worshiped on the Jewish Sabbath. This testimony is valuable in that it shows that many early writers asserted the observance of "the Saturday for the Lord's day" by the people who were called Sabbatati.³⁶

In consequence of the persecutions which they suffered, and because also of their own missionary zeal, the people called Waldenses were widely scattered over Europe. They bore, however, various names in different ages and in different countries. We have decisive testimony that some of these bodies observed the seventh day. Others observed Sunday. Eneas Sylvius says that those in Bohemia hold "that we are to cease from working on no day except the Lord's day."³⁷ This statement, let it be observed, relates only to Bohemia. But it has been asserted that the Waldenses were so distinct from the church of Rome they could not have received the Sunday Lord's day from thence, and must, therefore, have received it from the apostles! But a few words from D'Aubigne will suffice to show that this statement is founded in error. He describes an interview between CEcolampadius and two Waldensian pastors who had been sent by their brethren from the borders of France and Piedmont, to open communication with the reformers. It was at Basle, in 1530. Many things which they said pleased CEcolampadius, but some things he disapproved. D'Aubigne makes this statement:

"The barbes [the Waldensian pastors] were at first a little confused at seeing that the elders had to learn of their juniors; however, they were humble and sincere men, and the Basle doctor having questioned them on the sacraments, they confessed that through weakness and fear they had their children baptized by Romish priests, and that they even communicated with them and sometimes attended mass. This unexpected avowal startled the meek CEcolampadius."³⁸

When the deputation returned word to the Waldenses that the reformers demanded of them "a stricter reform," D'Aubigne says that it was "supported by some, and rejected by others." He also informs us that the demand that the Waldenses should "separate entirely from Rome" "caused divisions among them."³⁹

This is a very remarkable statement. The light of many of these ancient witnesses was almost ready to go out in darkness when God raised up the reformers. They had suffered that woman Jezebel to teach among them, and to seduce the servants of God. They had even come to practice infant baptism, and the priests of Rome administered the rite! And in addition to all this, they sometimes joined with them in the service of the mass! If a portion of the Waldenses in southern Europe at the time of the Reformation had exchanged believers' baptism for the baptism of children by Romish priests, it is not difficult to see how they could also accept the Sunday-Lord's day from the same source in place of the hallowed rest-day of the Lord. All had not done this, but some certainly had.

D'Aubigne makes a very interesting statement respecting the French Waldenses in the fifteenth century. His language implies that they had a different Sabbath from the Catholics. He tells us some of the stories which the priests circulated against the Waldenses. These are his words:

"Picardy in the north and Dauphiny in the south were the two provinces of France best prepared [at the opening of the Protestant Reformation] to receive the gospel. During the fifteenth century many Picardins, as the story ran, went to Vaudery. Seated round the fire during the long nights, simple Catholics used to tell one another how the Vaudois (Waldenses) met in horrible assembly in solitary places, where they found tables spread with numerous and dainty viands. These poor Christians loved indeed to meet together from districts often very remote. They went to the rendezvous by night and along by-roads. The most learned of them used to recite some passages of Scriptures, after which they conversed together and prayed. But such humble conventicles were ridiculously travestied. 'Do you know what they do to get there,' said the people, 'so that the officers may not stop them? The devil has given them a certain ointment, and when they want to go to Vaudery, they smear a little stick with it. As soon as they get astride it, they are carried up through the air, and arrive at their Sabbath without meeting anybody. In the midst of them sits a goat with a monkey's tail: this is Satan, who receives their adoration.' . . . These stupid stories were not peculiar to the people: they were circulated particularly by the monks. It was thus that the inquisitor Jean de Broussart spoke in 1460 from a pulpit erected in the great square at Arras. An immense multitude surrounded him; a scaffold was erected in front of the pulpit, and a number of men and women, kneeling and wearing caps with the figure of the devil painted on them, awaited their punishment. Perhaps the faith of these poor people was mingled with error. But be that as it may, they were all burnt alive after the sermon."⁴⁰

It seems that these Waldenses had a Sabbath peculiar to themselves. And D'Aubigne himself alludes to something peculiar in their faith which he cannot confess as the truth, and does not choose to denounce as error. He says, "Perhaps the faith of these poor people was mingled with error." To speak of the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord by New Testament Christians, subjects a conscientious first-day historian to this very dilemma. We have a further account of the Waldenses in France, just before the commencement of the Reformation of the sixteenth century:

"Louis XII., king of France, being informed by the enemies of the Waldenses inhabiting a part of the province of Provence, that several heinous crimes were laid to their account, sent the Master of Requests, and a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, who was confessor to his Majesty, to make inquiry into this matter. On their return, they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found there no images, nor signs of the ornaments belonging to the mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish church; much less could they discover any traces of those crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary, they kept the Sabbath day, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and the commandments of God. The king having heard the report of his commissioners, said with an oath that they were better men than himself or his people."⁴¹

We further read concerning the Vaudois, or Waldenses, as follows:

"The respectable French historian, De Thou, says that the Vaudois keep the commandments of the decalogue, and allow among them of no wickedness, detesting perjuries, imprecations, quarrels, seditions, &c."⁴²

It may be proper to add that in 1686 the Waldenses were all driven out of the valleys of Piedmont, and that those who returned and settled in those valleys three years afterward, and from whom the present race of Waldenses is descended, fought their way back, sword in hand, pursuing in all respects a course entirely different from that of the ancient Waldenses.⁴³

Another class of witnesses to the truth during the Dark Ages, bore the name of Cathari, that is, Puritans. Jones speaks of them as follows:

"They were a plain, unassuming, harmless, and industrious race of Christians, patiently bearing the cross after Christ, and, both in their doctrines and manners, condemning the whole system of idolatry and superstition which reigned in the church of Rome, placing true religion in the faith, hope and obedience of the gospel, maintaining a supreme regard to the authority of God in his word, and regulating their sentiments and practices by that divine standard. Even in the twelfth century their numbers abounded in the neighborhood of Cologne, in Flanders, the South of France, Savoy, and Milan. 'They were increased,' says Egbert, 'to great multitudes, throughout all countries.'"⁴⁴

That the Cathari did retain and observe the ancient Sabbath, is certified by their Romish adversaries. Dr. Allix quotes a Roman Catholic author of the twelfth century concerning three sorts of heretics, the Cathari, the Passagii, and the Arnoldistae. Allix says of the Romish writer that,

"He lays it down also as one of their opinions, `that the law of Moses is to be kept according to the letter, and that the keeping of the Sabbath, circumcision, and other legal observances, ought to take place. They hold also that Christ the Son of God is not equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three persons, are not one God and one substance; and as a surplus to these their errors, they judge and condemn all the doctors of the church, and universally the whole Roman Church. Now since they endeavor to defend this their error by testimonies drawn from the New Testament and prophets. I shall with [the] assistance of the grace of Christ stop their mouths, as David did Goliath's, with their own sword.' "45

Dr. Allix quotes another Romish author to the same effect:

"Alanus attributes to the Cathari almost the very same opinions [as those just enumerated] in his first book against heretics, which he wrote about the year 1192."46

Mr Elliott mentions an incident concerning the Cathari, which is in harmony with what these historians assert respecting their observance of the seventh day. He says:

"In this year [A.D. 1163] certain heretics of the sect of the Cathari, coming from the parts of Flanders to Cologne, took up their abode secretly in a barn near the city. But, as on the Lord's day they did not go to church, they were seized by the neighbors, and detected. On their being brought before the Catholic church, when, after long examination respecting their sect, they would be convinced by no evidence however convincing, but most pertinaciously persisted in their doctrine and resolution, they were cast out from the church, and delivered into the hands of laics. These, leading them without the city committed them to the flames: being four men and one little girl."47

These statements are made respecting three classes of Christian people who lived during the Dark Ages: The Cathari, or Puritans, the Arnoldistae, and the Passaginians. Their views are presented in the uncandid language of their enemies. But the testimony of ancient Catholic historians is decisive that they were observers of the seventh day. The charge that they observed circumcision also, will be noticed presently. Mr. Robinson understands that the Passaginians were that portion of the Waldenses who lived in the passes of the mountains. He says:

"It is very credible that the name Passageros or Passagini . . . was given to such of them as lived in or near the passes or passages of the mountains, and who subsisted in part by guiding travelers or by traveling themselves for trade."48

Mr. Elliott says of the name Passagini:-

"The explanation of the term as meaning Pilgrims, in both the spiritual and missionary sense of the word, would be but the translation of their recognized Greek appellation -----, and a title as distinctive as beautiful."49

Mosheim gives the following account of them:

"In Lombardy, which was the principal residence of the Italian heretics, there sprung up a singular sect, known, for what reason I cannot tell, by the

denomination of Passaginians, and also by that of the circumcised. Like the other sects already mentioned, they had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the church of Rome; but they were at the same time distinguished by two religious tenets which were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion that the observance of the law of Moses, in everything except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon Christians; in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic economy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. The second tenet that distinguished this sect was advanced in opposition to the doctrine of three persons in the divine nature."⁵⁰

Mr. Benedict speaks of them as follows:

"The account of their practicing circumcision is undoubtedly a slanderous story forged by their enemies, and probably arose in this way: because they observed the seventh day they were called by way of derision, Jews, as the Sabbatarians are frequently at this day; and if they were Jews, it followed of course that they either did, or ought to, circumcise their followers. This was probably the reasoning of their enemies; but that they actually practiced the bloody rite is altogether improbable."⁵¹

An eminent church historian, Michael Geddes, thus testifies:

"This [act] of fixing something that is justly abominable to all mankind upon her adversaries, has been the constant practice of the church of Rome."⁵²

Dr. Allix states the same fact, which needs to be kept in mind whenever we read of the people of God in the records of the Dark Ages:

"I must desire the reader to consider that it is no great sin with the church of Rome to spread lies concerning those that are enemies of that faith."⁵³

"There is nothing more common with the Romish party than to make use of the most horrid calumnies to blacken and expose those who have renounced her communion."⁵⁴

Of the origin of the Petrobrusians, we have the following account by Mr. Jones:

"But the Cathari or Puritans were not the only sect which, during the twelfth century, appeared in opposition to the superstition of the church of Rome. About the year 1110, in the south of France, in the provinces of Languedoc and Provence, appeared Peter de Bruys, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of Heaven, and exerting the most laudable efforts to reform the abuses and remove the superstition which disfigured the beautiful simplicity of the gospel worship. His labors were crowned with abundant success. He converted a great number of disciples to the faith of Christ, and after a most indefatigable ministry of twenty years' continuance, he was burned at St. Giles, a city of Languedoc in France A.D. 1130, by an enraged populace, instigated by the clergy, who apprehended their traffic to be in danger from this new and intrepid reformer."⁵⁵

That this body of French Christians, who, in the very midnight of the Dark Ages witnessed for the truth in opposition to the Romish church, were observers of the ancient Sabbath is

expressly certified by Dr. Francis White, lord bishop of Ely. He was appointed by the king of England to write against the Sabbath in opposition to Brabourne, who had appealed to the king in its behalf. To show that Sabbatic observance is contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic church - a weighty argument with an Episcopalian - he enumerates various classes of heretics who had been condemned by the Catholic church for keeping holy the seventh day. Among these heretics he places the Petrobrusians:-

"In St. Bernard's days it was condemned in the Petrobruysans."⁵⁶

We have seen that, according to Catholic writers, the Cathari held to the observance of the seventh day. Dr. Allix confirms the statement of Dr. White that the Petrobrusians observed the ancient Sabbath, by stating that the doctrines of these two bodies greatly resembled each other. These are his words:

"Petrus Cluniacensis has handled five questions against the Petrobrusians which bear a great resemblance with the belief of the Cathari of Italy."⁵⁷

The Sabbath-keepers in the eleventh century were of sufficient importance to call down upon themselves the anathema of the pope. Dr. Heylyn says that,

"Gregory, of that name the seventh [about A.D. 1074], condemned those who taught that it was not lawful to do work on the day of the Sabbath."⁵⁸

This act of the pope corroborates the testimonies we have adduced in proof of the existence of Sabbath-keepers in the Dark Ages. Gregory the Seventh was one of the greatest men that ever filled the papal chair. Whatever class he anathematized was of some consequence. Gregory wasted nothing on trifles.⁵⁹

In the eleventh century, there were Sabbath-keepers also in Constantinople and its vicinity. The pope, in A.D. 1054, sent three legates to the emperor of the East, and to the patriarch of Constantinople, for the purpose of re-uniting the Greek and the Latin churches. Cardinal Humbert was the head of this legation. The legates, on their arrival, set themselves to the work of refuting those doctrines which distinguish the church of Constantinople from that of Rome. After they had attended to the questions which separated the two churches, they found it also necessary to discuss the question of the Sabbath. For one of the most learned men of the East had put forth a treatise, in which he maintained that ministers should be allowed to marry; that the Sabbath should be kept holy; and that leavened bread should be used in the supper; all of which the church of Rome held to be deadly heresies. We quote from Mr. Bower a concise statement of the treatment which this Sabbatarian writer received:

"Humbert, likewise answered a piece that had been published by a monk of the monastery of Studium, [near Constantinople,] named Nicetas, who was deemed one of the most learned men at the time in the east. In that piece the monk undertook to prove, that leavened bread only should be used in the eucharist, that the Sabbath ought to be kept holy, and that priests should be allowed to marry. But the emperor, who wanted by all means to gain the pope, for the reasons mentioned above, was, or rather pretended to be, so fully convinced with the arguments of the legate, confuting those alleged by Nicetas, that he obliged the monk publicly to recant, and anathematize all who held the opinion that he had endeavored to establish, with respect to unleavened bread, the Sabbath, and the marriage of priests.

"At the same time Nicetas, in compliance with the command of the emperor, anathematized all who should question the primacy of the Roman church with respect to all other Christian churches, or should presume to censure her ever orthodox faith. The monk having thus retracted all he had written against the Holy See, his book was burnt by the emperor's order, and he absolved, by the legates, from the censures he had incurred."⁶⁰

This record shows that, in the dense darkness of the eleventh century, "one of the most learned men at that time in the east" wrote a book to prove that "the Sabbath ought to be kept holy," and in opposition to the papal doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy. It also shows how the church of Rome casts down the truth of God by means of the sword of emperors and kings. Though Nicetas retracted, under fear of the emperor and the pope, it appears that there were others who held the same opinions, for he was "obliged" to anathematize all such, and there is no evidence that any of these persons turned from the truth because of the fall of their leader. Indeed, if there had not been a considerable body of these Sabbatarians, the papal legate would never have deemed it worthy of his dignity to write a reply to Nicetas.

The Anabaptists are often referred to in the records of the Dark Ages. The term signifies rebaptizers, and was applied to them because they denied the validity of infant baptism. The designation is not accurate, however, because those persons whom they baptized, they considered as never having been baptized before, although they had been sprinkled or even immersed in infancy. This people have been overwhelmed in obloquy in consequence of the fanatical insurrection which broke out in their name in the time of Luther. Of those engaged in this insurrection, Buck says:

"The first insurgents groaned under severe oppressions, and took up arms in defense of their civil liberties; and of these commotions the Anabaptists seem rather to have availed themselves, than to have been the prime movers. That a great part were Anabaptists seems indisputable; at the same time it appears from history that a great part also were Roman Catholics, and a still greater part of those who had scarcely any religious principles at all."⁶¹

This matter is placed in the true light by Stebbing:-

"The overthrow of civil society, and fatal injuries to religion were threatened by those who called themselves Anabaptists. But large numbers appear to have disputed the validity of infant baptism who had nothing else in common with them, yet who for that one circumstance were overwhelmed with the obloquy, and the punishment richly due to a fanaticism equally fraudulent and licentious."⁶²

The ancient Sabbath was retained and observed by a portion of the Anabaptists, or, to use a more proper term, Baptists. Dr. Francis White thus testifies:

"They which maintain the Saturday Sabbath to be in force, comply with some Anabaptists."⁶³

In harmony with this statement of Dr. White, is the testimony of a French writer of the sixteenth century. He names all the classes of men who have borne the name of Anabaptists. Of one of these classes he writes thus:

"Some have endured great torments, because they would not keep Sundays and festival days, in despite of Antichrist: seeing they were days appointed by

Antichrist, they would not hold forth any thing which is like unto him. Others observe these days, but it is out of charity."⁶⁴

Thus it is seen that within the limits of the old Roman Empire, and in the midst of those countries that submitted to the rule of the pope, God reserved unto himself a people that did not bow the knee to Baal, and among these the Bible Sabbath was observed from age to age. We are now to search for the Sabbath among those who were never subjected to the Roman pontiff. In Central Africa, from the first part of the Christian era - possibly from the time of the conversion of the Ethiopian officer of great authority⁶⁵ but very certainly as early as A.D. 330⁶⁶ - have existed the churches of Abyssinia and Ethiopia. About the time of the accession of the Roman Bishop to supremacy, they were lost sight of by the nations of Europe. "Encompassed on all sides," says Gibbon, by the enemies of their religion, the Ethiopians slept near a thousand years, forgetful of the world, by whom they were forgotten."⁶⁷ In the latter part of the fifteenth century, they were again brought to the knowledge of the world by the discovery of Portuguese navigators. Undoubtedly they have been greatly affected by the dense darkness of pagan and Mahometan errors with which they are encompassed; and in many respects they have lost the pure and spiritual religion of our divine Redeemer. A modern traveler says of them: "They have divers errors and many ancient truths."⁶⁸ Michael Geddes says of them:

"The Abyssinians do hold the Scriptures to be the perfect rule of the Christian faith; insomuch that they deny it to be in the power of a general council to oblige people to believe anything as an article of faith without an express warrant from thence."⁶⁹

They practice circumcision, but for other reasons than that of a religious duty.⁷⁰ Geddes further states their views:

"Transubstantiation and the adoration of the consecrated bread in the sacrament, were what the Abyssinians abhorred. . . . They deny purgatory, and know nothing of confirmation and extreme unction; they condemn graven images; they keep both Saturday and Sunday."⁷¹

Their views of the Sabbath are stated by the ambassador of the king of Ethiopia, at the court of Lisbon, in the following words, explaining their abstinence from all labor on that day:

"Because God, after he had finished the creation of the world, rested thereon; which day, as God would have it called the holy of holies, so the not celebrating thereof with great honor and devotion, seems to be plainly contrary to God's will and precept, who will suffer heaven and earth to pass away sooner than his word; and that especially, since Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. It is not therefore in imitation of the Jews, but in obedience to Christ and his holy apostles, that we observe that day."⁷²

The ambassador states their reasons for first-day observance in these words:

"We do observe the Lord's day after the manner of all other Christians in memory or Christ's resurrection."⁷³

He had no scripture to offer in support of this festival, and evidently rested its observance upon tradition. This account was given by the ambassador in 1534. In the early part of the next century the emperor of Abyssinia was induced to submit to the pope in these words:- "I confess that the pope is the vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, and the sovereign of the

world. To him I swear true obedience, and at his feet I offer my person and kingdom."⁷⁴ No sooner had the Roman bishop thus brought the emperor to submit to him than that potentate was compelled to gratify the popish hatred of the Sabbath by an edict forbidding its further observance. In the words of Geddes, he "set forth a proclamation prohibiting all his subjects upon severe penalties to observe Saturday any longer."⁷⁵ Or as Gibbon expresses it, "The Abyssinians were enjoined to work and to play on the Sabbath." But the tyranny of the Romanists, after a terrible struggle, caused their overthrow and banishment, and the restoration of the ancient faith. The churches resounded with a song of triumph, "that the sheep of Ethiopia were now delivered from the hyenas of the West;" and the gates of that solitary realm were forever shut against the arts, the science, and the fanaticism of Europe."⁷⁶

We have proved in a former chapter that the Sabbath was extensively observed as late as the middle of the fifth century in the so-called Catholic church, especially in that portion most intimately connected with the Abyssinians; and that from various causes, Sunday obtained certain Sabbatic honors, in consequence of which the two days were called sisters. We have also shown in another chapter that the effectual suppression of the Sabbath in Europe is mainly due to papal influence. And so for a thousand years we have been tracing its history in the records of those men which the church of Rome has sought to kill.

These facts are strikingly corroborated by the case of the Abyssinians. In consequence of their location in the interior of Africa, the Abyssinians ceased to be known to the rest of Christendom about the fifth century. At this point, the Sabbath and the Sunday in the Catholic church were counted sisters. One thousand years later, these African churches are visited, and though surrounded by the thick darkness of pagan and Mahometan superstition, and somewhat affected thereby, they are found at the end of this period holding the Sabbath and first-day substantially as held by the Catholic church when they were lost sight of by it. The Catholics of Europe on the contrary had, in the meantime, trampled the ancient Sabbath in the dust. Why was this great contrast? Simply because the pope ruled in Europe, while central Africa, whatever else it may have suffered, was not cursed with his presence nor with his influence. But so soon as the pope learned of the existence of the Abyssinian churches, he sought to gain control of them, and when he had gained it, one of his first acts was to suppress the Sabbath! In the end, the Abyssinians regained their independence, and thenceforward till the present time have held fast the Sabbath of the Lord.

The Armenians of the East Indies are peculiarly worthy of our attention. J.W. Massie, M.R.I.A., says of the East Indian Christians:

"Remote from the busy haunts of commerce, or the populous seats of manufacturing industry, they may be regarded as the eastern Piedmontese, the Vallois of Hindoostan, the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth through revolving centuries, though indeed their bodies lay as dead in the streets of the city which they had once peopled."⁷⁷

Geddes says of those in Malabar:-

"The three great doctrines of popery, the pope's supremacy, transubstantiation, the adoration of images, were never believed nor practiced at any time in this ancient apostolical church. . . . I think one may venture to say that before the time of the late Reformation, there was no church that we know of, no, not that of the the Vaudois, . . . that had so few errors in doctrine as the church of Malabar." He adds concerning those churches "where never within the bounds

of the Roman Empire," "it is in those churches that we are to meet with the least of the leaven of popery."⁷⁸

Mr. Massie further describes these Christians:

"The creed with which these representatives of an ancient line of Christians cherished was not in conformity with papal decrees, and has with difficulty been squared with the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican episcopacy. Separated from the western world for a thousand years, they were naturally ignorant of many novelties introduced by the councils and decrees of the Lateran; and their conformity with the faith and practice of the first ages, laid them open to the unpardonable guilt of heresy and schism as estimated by the church of Rome. 'We are Christians and not idolators,' was their expressive reply when required to do homage to the image of the Virgin Mary. . . . La Croze states them at fifteen hundred churches, and as many towns and villages. They refused to recognize the pope, and declared they have never heard of him; they asserted the purity and primitive truth of their faith since they came, and their bishops had for thirteen hundred years been sent from the place where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians."⁷⁹

The Sabbatarian character of these Christians is hinted by Mr. Yeates. He says that Saturday "amongst them in a festival day, agreeable to the ancient practice of the church."⁸⁰

"The ancient practice of the church," as we have seen, was to hallow the seventh day in memory of the Creator's rest. This practice has been suppressed wherever the great apostasy has had power to do it. But the Christians of the East Indies, like those of Abyssinia, have lived sufficiently remote from Rome to be preserved in some degree from its blasting influence. The same fact is further hinted by the same writer in the following language:

"The inquisition was set up at Goa in the Indies, at the instance of Francis Xavierius [a famous Romish saint] who signified by letters to Pope John III., Nov. 10, 1545, 'That the JEWISH WICKEDNESS spread every day more and more in the parts of the East Indies subject to the kingdom of Portugal, and therefore he earnestly besought the said king, that to cure so great an evil he would take care to send the office of the inquisition into those countries.'"⁸¹

"The Jewish wickedness" was doubtless the observance of Saturday as "a festival day agreeable to the ancient practice of the church" of which this author has just spoken. The history of the past, as we have seen, shows the hatred of the papal church toward the Sabbath. And the struggle of that church to suppress the Sabbath in Abyssinia, and to subject that people to the pope which at this very point of time was just commencing, shows that the Jesuits would not willingly tolerate Sabbatic observance in the East Indies, even though united with the observance of Sunday also.

It appears therefore that this Jesuit missionary desired the pope and the king of Portugal to establish the inquisition in that part of the Indies subject to Portugal, in order to root out the Sabbath from those ancient churches. The inquisition was established in answer to this prayer, and Xavier was subsequently canonized as a saint! Nothing can more clearly show the malignity of the Roman pontiff toward the Sabbath of the Lord; and nothing more clearly illustrates the kind of men that he canonizes as saints.

Since the time of Xavier, the East Indies have fallen under British rule. A distinguished clergyman of the church of England some years since visited the British Empire in India, for the purpose of acquainting himself with these churches. He gave the following deeply interesting sketch of these ancient Christians, and in it particularly marks their Sabbatarian character:

"The history of the Armenian church is very interesting. Of all the Christians in Central Asia, they have preserved themselves most free from Mahometan and papal corruptions. The pope assailed them for a time with great violence, but with little effect. The churches in lesser Armenia indeed consented to an union, which did not long continue; but those in Persian Armenia maintained their independence; and they retain their ancient Scriptures, doctrines, and worship, to this day. 'It is marvelous,' says an intelligent traveler who was much among them, 'how the Armenian Christians have preserved their faith, equally against the vexatious oppression of the Mahometans, their sovereigns, and against the persuasions of the Romish church which for more than two centuries has endeavored, by missionaries, priests and monks, to attach them to her communion. It is impossible to describe the artifices and expenses of the court of Rome to effect this object, but all in vain.'

"The Bible was translated into the Armenian language in the fifth century, under very auspicious circumstances, the history of which has come down to us. It has been allowed by competent judges of the language, to be a most faithful translation. La Cruze calls it the 'Queen of Versions.' This Bible has ever remained in the possession of the Armenian people; and many illustrious instances of genuine and enlightened piety occur in their history. . . .

"The Armenians in Hindoostan are our own subjects. They acknowledge our government in India, as they do that of the Sophi in Persia; and they are entitled to our regard. They have preserved the Bible in its purity; and their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship throughout our empire, ON THE SEVENTH DAY, and they have as many spires pointing to heaven among the Hindoos as we ourselves. Are such a people then entitled to no acknowledgment on our part, as fellow Christians? Are they forever to be ranked by us with Jews, Mahometans, and Hindoos?"⁸²

It has been said, however, that Buchanan might have intended Sunday by the term "seventh day." This is a very unreasonable interpretation of his words. Episcopalian clergymen are not accustomed to call Sunday the seventh day. We have, however, testimony which cannot with candor be explained away. It is that of Purchas, written in the seventeenth century. The author speaks of several sects of the eastern Christian "continuing from ancient times," as Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Maronites, and Armenians. Of the Syrians, or Surians, as he variously spells the name, who, from his relation, appear to be identical with the Armenians, he says:

"They keep Saturday holy, nor esteem Saturday fast lawful but on Easter even. They have solemn service on Saturdays, eat flesh, and feast it bravely like the Jews."⁸³

This author speaks of these Christians disrespectfully, but he uses the uncandid statements of their adversaries, which, indeed, are no worse than those often made in these days concerning those who hallow the Bible Sabbath. These facts clearly attest the continued observance of the

Sabbath during the whole period of the Dark Ages. The church of Rome was indeed able to exterminate the Sabbath from its own communion, but it was retained by the true people of God, who were measurably hidden from the papacy in the wilds of Central Europe; while those African and East Indian churches, that were never within the limits of the pope's dominion, have steadfastly retained the Sabbath to the present day.

1 Mr. Croly says: "With the title of 'Universal Bishop,' the power of the papacy, and the Dark Ages, alike began." - Croly on the Apocalypse, p. 173.

2 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. iv. p. 591.

3 History of the Baptist Denomination, p. 50, ed. 1849.

4 Dan.8:12.

5 Ps.119:142,151.

6 See chap. xx. of this work.

7 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. ii. pp. 600, 601; D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, book xvii.

8 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. ii. p. 601.

9 Id.Ib.

10 Id.Ib.

11 Butler's Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and principal Saints, article, St. Columba, A.D. 597.

12 The Monks of the West, vol. ii. p. 104.

13 Gilfillan's Sabbath, p. 389.

14 Id. pp. 32, 33.

15 Waddington's History of the Church, part iv. chap. xviii.

16 Jones's History of the Church, vol. ii. chap. v. sect. 1.

17 Jortin's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. sect. 38.

18 Edward's Hist. of Redemption, period iii. part iv. sect. 2.

19 Hist. Bapt. Denom. p. 32-33.

20 Id. p. 31.

21 Variations of Popery, p. 52.

22 Eccl. Hist. of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, p. 167.

23 History of the English Baptists, vol. i. pref. p. 35.

24 Mr Jones, in his "Church History," vol. i. chap. iii., note at the end of the chapter, explains this charge as follows: "But this calumny is easily accounted for. The advocates of popery, to

support their usurpations and innovations in the kingdom of Christ, were driven to the Old Testament for authority, adducing the kingdom of David for their example. And when their adversaries rebutted the argument, insisting that the parallel did not hold, for that the kingdom of Christ, which is not of this world, is a very different state of things from the kingdom of David, their opponents accused them of giving up the divine authority of the Old Testament."

25 Eccl. Hist. Ancient Churches of Piedmont, pp. 231, 236, 237.

26 Id. pp. 175-177.

27 Id. p. 209.

28 Hist. Church, chap. v. sect. 1.

29 Gen. Hist. Bapt. Denom. vol. ii. p. 413, ed. 1813.

30 Ecclesiastical Researches, chap. x. pp. 303, 304.

31 Jones's Hist. Church, vol. ii. chap. v. sect. 1.

32 General Hist. Baptist Denom. vol. ii. p. 413.

33 Circumcisi forsan illi fuerint, qui aliis Insabbatati, non quod circumciderentur, inquit Calvinista [Goldastus] sed quod in Sabbato judaizarent. - Eccl. Researches, chap. x. p. 303.

34 Thomas' Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, article Goldast.

35 D'Aubigne's Reformation in the time of Calvin, vol. iii. p. 456.

36 Nec quod in Sabbato colendo Judaizarent, ut MULTI PUTABANT, sed a zapata. - Eccl. Researches, chap. x. p. 304; Usher's De Christianar. Eccl. success et stat. cap. 7.

37 Jones's Church History, vol. ii. chap. v. sect. 2.

38 Reformation in the time of Calvin, vol. iii. p. 249.

39 Id. pp. 250, 251.

40 Reformation in the time of Calvin, vol. i. p. 349; D'Aubigne cites as his authority, "Histoire des Protestants de l'icardie" by L. Rossier, p. 2.

41 Jones's Church History, vol. ii. chap. v. sect. 4.

42 History of the Vaudois by Bresse. p. 126.

43 Benedict's Hist. Bapt. p. 41.

44 Hist. Church, chap. iv. sect. 3.

45 Eccl. Hist. of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, pp. 168, 169, Boston. Pub. Lib. The author. Rev. Peter Allix. D.D., was a French Protestant, born in 1641, and was distinguished for piety and erudition. - Lempriers's Universal Biography.

46 Id. p. 170.

47 Horae Apocalypticae, vol. ii. p. 291.

- 48 Eccl. Researches, chap. x. pp. 305, 306.
- 49 Horae Apocalypticae, vol. ii. p. 342.
- 50 Eccl. Hist. cent. xii. part. ii. chap. v. sect. 14.
- 51 General Hist. Bapt. Denom. vol. ii. p. 414, ed. 1813.
- 52 Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper, p. 158, London 1694.
- 53 Eccl. Hist. of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, p. 224.
- 54 Id. p. 225.
- 55 Hist. of the Church, chap. iv. sect. 3.
- 56 Treatise of the Sabbath day, p. 8.
- 57 Eccl. Hist. of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, p. 162.
- 58 History of the Sabbath, part. ii. chap. v. sect. 1.
- 59 Bower says of Gregory; "He was a man of most extraordinary parts, of an unbounded ambition, of a haughty and imperious temper, of resolution and courage incapable of yielding to the greatest difficulties, perfectly acquainted with the state of the western churches, as well as with the different interests of the Christian princes." - History of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 378.
- 60 History of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 358.
- 61 Theological Dict. art. Anabaptists.
- 62 Hist. Church, vol. i. pp. 183, 184.
- 63 Treatise of the Sabbath day, p. 132. He cites Hist. Anabapt. lib. 6, p. 153.
- 64 The Rise, Spring. and Foundation of the Anabaptists or Rebaptized of our Times. By Guy de Brez, A.D. 1565.
- 65 Acts 8:26-40.
- 66 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, vol. i. p. 40.
- 67 Dec. and Fall, chap. xlvii.
- 68 Maxson's Hist. Sab. p. 33, ed. 1844.
- 69 Church Hist. of Ethiopia. p. 31.
- 70 Id. p. 96; Gibbon, chap. xv. note 25; chap. xlvii. note 160. M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia. vol. i. p. 40.
- 71 Church Hist. Ethiopia, pp. 34, 35; Purchas's Pilgrimage, book ii. chap. v.
- 72 Ch. Hist. Eth. pp. 87, 88.
- 73 Id. Ib.

74 Gibbon, chap. xlvii.

75 Ch. Hist. Eth. pp. 311, 312; Gobat's Abyssinia, pp. 88, 93.

76 Gibbon, chap. xlvii

77 Continental India, vol. ii. p. 120.

78 Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper, preface.

79 Continental India, vol. ii. pp. 116, 117.

80 East Indies Church History. pp. 133, 134.

81 Id. pp. 139, 140.

82 Buchanan's Christian Researches in Asia, pp. 159, 160.

83 Purchas His Pilgrimes, part ii. book viii. chap. vi. sect. 5., p.1269, London, 1625. The "Encyclopedia Britannica," vol. viii. p. 695, eighth ed., speaks of Purchas as "an Englishman admirably skilled in language and human and divine arts, a very great philosopher, historian, and theologian.

CHAPTER 22

POSITION OF THE REFORMERS CONCERNING THE SABBATH AND FIRST DAY

The Reformation arose in the Catholic church - The Sabbath had been crushed out of that church, and innumerable festivals established in its stead - Sunday as observed by Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Beza, Bucer, Cranmer, and Tyndale - The position of Calvin stated at length and illustrated - Knox agreed with Calvin - Sunday in Scotland A.D. 1601 - How we should view the Reformers.

The great Reformation of the sixteenth century arose from the bosom of the Catholic church itself. From that church the Sabbath had long been extirpated; and instead of that merciful institution ordained by the divine Lawgiver for the rest and refreshment of mankind, and that man might acknowledge God as his Creator, the papacy had ordained innumerable festivals, which, as a terrible burden, crushed the people to the earth. These festivals are thus enumerated by Dr. Heylyn:

"These holy days as they were named particularly in Pope Gregory's decretal, so was a perfect list made of them in the Synod of Lyons, A.D. 1244, which being celebrated with a great concourse of people from all parts of Christendom, the canons and decrees thereof began forthwith to find a general admittance. The holy days allowed of there, were these that follow; viz., the feast of Christ's nativity, St. Stephen, St. John the evangelist, the Innocents, St. Sylvester, the circumcision of our Lord, the Epiphany, Easter, together with the week precedent, and the week succeeding, the three days in rogation week, the day of Christ's ascension, Whitsunday, with the two days after, St. John the Baptist, the feasts of all the twelve apostles, all the festivities of our Lady, St. Lawrence, ALL THE LORD'S DAYS IN THE YEAR, St. Michael the Archangel, All Saints, St. Martin's, the wakes, or dedication of particular churches, together with the feasts of such topical or local saints which some particular people had been pleased to honor with a day particular amongst themselves. On these and every one of them, the people were restrained as before was said from many several kinds of work, on pain of ecclesiastical censures to be laid on them which did offend, unless on some emergent causes, either of charity or necessity they were dispensed with for so doing. . . . Peter de Aliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, in a discourse by him exhibited to the council of Constance [A.D. 1416] made public suit unto the fathers there assembled, that there might [be] a stop in that kind hereafter; as also that excepting Sundays and the greater festivals it might be lawful for the people, after the end of divine service to attend their business; the poor especially, as having little time enough on the working days to get their living. But these were only the expressions of well-wishing men. The popes were otherwise resolved, and did not only keep the holy days which they found established, in the same state in which they found them, but added others daily as they saw occasion. . . . Thus stood it as before I said, both for the doctrine and the practice, till men began to look into the errors and abuses in the Roman church with a more serious eye than before they did."¹

Such was the state of things when the reformers began their labors. That they should give up these festivals and return to the observance of the ancient Sabbath, would be expecting too much of men educated in the bosom of the Romish church. Indeed, it ought not to surprise us that, while they were constrained to strike down the authority of these festivals, they should nevertheless retain the most important of them in their observance. The reformers spoke on this matter as follows:- The Confession of the Swiss churches declares that,

"The observance of the Lord's day is founded not on any commandment of God, but on the authority of the church; and, That the church may alter the day at pleasure."²

We further learn that,

"In the Augsburg Confession which was drawn up by Melancthon [and approved by Luther], to the question, 'What ought we to think of the Lord's day?' it is answered that the Lord's day, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other such holy days, ought to be kept because they are appointed by the church, that all things may be done in order; but that the observance of them is not to be thought necessary to salvation, nor the violation of them, if it be done without offense to others, to be regarded as a sin."³

Zwingle declared "that it was lawful on the Lord's day, after divine service, for any man to pursue his labors."⁴ Beza taught that "no cessation of work on the Lord's day is required of Christians."⁵ Bucer goes further yet, "and doth not only call it a superstition, but an apostasy from Christ to think that working on the Lord's day, in itself considered, is a sinful thing."⁶ And Cranmer, in his Catechism, published in 1548, says:

"We now keep no more the Sabbath on Saturday as the Jews do; but we observe the Sunday, and certain other days as the magistrates do judge convenient, whom in this thing we ought to obey."⁷

Tyndale said:

"As for the Sabbath, we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or into any other day as we see need, or may make every tenth day holy day only if we see cause why."⁸

It is plain that both Cranmer and Tyndale believed that the ancient Sabbath was abolished, and that Sunday was only a human ordinance which it was in the power of the magistrates and the church lawfully to change whenever they saw cause for so doing. And Dr. Hessey gives the opinion of Zwingle respecting the present power of each individual church to transfer the so-called Lord's day to another day, whenever necessity urges, as, for example, in harvest time. Thus Zwingle says:

"If we would have the Lord's day so bound to time that it shall be wickedness to transfer it to another time, in which resting from our labors equally as in that, we may hear the word of God, if necessity haply shall so require, this day so solicitously observed, would obtrude on us as a ceremony. For we are no way bound to time, but time ought so to serve us, that it is lawful, and permitted to each church, when necessity urges (as is usual to be done in harvest time), to transfer the solemnity and rest of the Lord's day, or Sabbath to some other day."⁹

Zwingle could not, therefore, have considered Sunday as a divinely appointed memorial of the resurrection, or indeed, as anything but a church festival.

John Calvin said, respecting the origin of the Sunday festival:

"However, the ancients have not without sufficient reason substituted what we call the Lord's day in the room of the Sabbath. For since the resurrection of the Lord is the end and consummation of that true rest, which was adumbrated by the ancient Sabbath; the same day which put an end to the shadows, admonishes Christians not to adhere to a shadowy ceremony. Yet I do not lay so much stress on the septenary number that I would oblige the church to an invariable adherence to it; nor will I condemn those churches, which have other solemn days for their assemblies, provided they keep at a distance from superstition."¹⁰

It is worthy of notice that Calvin does not assign to Christ and his disciples the establishment of Sunday in the place of the Sabbath. He says this was done by the "ancients,"¹¹ or as another translates it, "the old fathers." Nor does he say "the day which John called the Lord's day," but "the day which we call the Lord's day." And what is worthy of particular notice he did not insist that the day which should be appropriated to worship should be one day in every seven; for he was not tied to "the septenary number." The day might come once in six days, or once in eight. And this proves conclusively that he did not regard Sunday as a divine institution in the proper sense of the word; for if he had, he would most assuredly have felt that the festival must be septenary, that is, weekly, and that he must urge "the church to an invariable adherence to it." But Calvin does not leave the matter here. He condemns as "FALSE PROPHETS" those who attempt to enforce the Sunday festival by means of the fourth commandment; and who to do this say that the ceremonial part, which requires the observance of the definite seventh day, is abolished, while the moral part, which simply commands the observance of one day in seven, still remains in force. Here are his words:

"Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who in past ages have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part of the commandment, which according to them is the appointment of the seventh day, has been abrogated, but that the moral part of it, that is the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day."¹²

Yet these very "dreams of false prophets." to use the words of Calvin, constitute the foundation of the modern doctrine of the change of the Sabbath. For whatever may be said of first-day sacredness in the New Testament, the fourth commandment can only be made to recognize that day by means of this very doctrine of one day in seven which Calvin so sharply denounces. Now I state another important fact. Calvin's commentaries on the New Testament cover all the books from which quotations are made in behalf of Sunday except the book of Revelation. What does Calvin say concerning the change of the Sabbath in the record of Christ's resurrection?¹³ Not one word. He does not even hint at any sacredness in the day, nor any commemoration of the day. Does he say that the meeting "after eight days" was upon Sunday? He does not say what day it was.¹⁴ What does he say of Sunday in treating of the day of Pentecost?¹⁵ Nothing. He does not so much as say that this festival was on the first day of the week. What does he say of the breaking of bread at Troas? He thinks it took place upon the ancient Sabbath! He says:

"Either he doth mean the first day of the week, which was next after the Sabbath, or else some certain Sabbath. Which latter thing may seem to me more probable; for this cause, because that day was more fit for an assembly, according to custom."¹⁶

He says, however, that this place might "very well" be translated "the morrow after the Sabbath." But he adheres to his own translation, "one day of the Sabbaths," and not "first day of the week." He says further:

"For to what end is there mentioned of the Sabbath, save only that he may note the opportunity and choice of the time? Also, it is a likely matter that Paul waited for the Sabbath, that the day before his departure he might the more easily gather all the disciples into one place."¹⁷

"Therefore, I think thus, that they had appointed a solemn day for the celebrating of the holy supper of the Lord among themselves, which might be commodious for them all."¹⁸

This shows conclusively that Calvin believed the Sabbath, and not the first day of the week, to have been the day for meetings in the apostolic church. But what does he say of the laying by in store on the first day of the week? He says that Paul's precept relates, not to the first day of the week, but to the Sabbath! And he marks the Sabbath as the day on which the sacred assemblies were held, and the communion celebrated, and says that on account of these things this was the most convenient day for collecting their contribution. Thus he writes:

"On one of the Sabbaths. The end is this - that they may have their alms ready in time. He therefore exhorts them not to wait till he came, as any thing that is done suddenly, and in a bustle, is not done well, but to contribute on the Sabbath what might seem good, and according as every one's ability might enable - that is on the day on which they held their sacred assemblies."¹⁹

"For he has an eye, first of all, to convenience, and farther, that the sacred assembly, in which the communion of saints is celebrated, might be an additional spur to them. Nor am I inclined to admit the view taken by Chrysostom - that the term Sabbath is employed here to mean the Lord's day (Rev.1:10), for the probability is, that the apostles, at the beginning, retained the day that was already in use, but that afterwards, constrained by the superstition of the Jews, they set aside that day, and substituted another. Now the Lord's day was made choice of chiefly because our Lord's resurrection put an end to the shadows of the law. Hence the day itself puts us in mind of our Christian liberty."²⁰

These words are very remarkable. They show first, that by the Sabbath day Calvin means, not the first day, but the seventh; second, that in his judgment as late as the time of this epistle, and of the meeting at Troas [A.D. 60], the Sabbath was the day for the sacred assemblies of the Christians, and for the celebration of the communion; third, "but that AFTERWARDS, constrained by THE SUPERSTITION OF THE JEWS, they set aside that day, and substituted another."

Calvin did not therefore believe that Christ changed the Sabbath to Sunday to commemorate his resurrection; for he says that the resurrection abolished the Sabbath,²¹ and yet he believes that the Sabbath was the sacred day of the Christians to the entire exclusion of Sunday as late

as the year 60. Nor could he believe that the apostles set apart Sunday to commemorate the resurrection of Christ, for he thinks that they did not make choice of that day till after the year 60, and even then they did it merely because constrained so to do by the superstition of the Jews!

Dr. Hessey illustrates Calvin's ideas of Sunday observance by the following incident:

"Knox was the intimate friend of Calvin - visited Calvin, and, it is said, on one occasion found him enjoying the recreation of bowls on Sunday."²²

Without doubt Calvin was acting in exact harmony with his ideas of the nature of the Sunday festival. But the famous case of Michael Servetus furnishes us a still more pointed illustration of his views of the sacredness of that day. Servetus was arrested in Geneva on the personal application of John Calvin to the magistrates of that city. Such is the statement of Theodore Beza, the life-long friend of Calvin.²³ Beza's translator adds to this fact the following remarkable statement:

"Promptness induced him to have this heresiarch arrested on a Sunday."²⁴

The same fact is stated by Robinson:

"While he waited for a boat to cross the lake in his way to Zurich, by some means Calvin got intelligence of his arrival; and although it was on a Sunday, yet he prevailed upon the chief syndic to arrest and imprison him. On that day by the laws of Geneva no person could be arrested except for a capital crime; but this difficulty was easily removed, for John Calvin pretended that Servetus was a heretic, and that heresy was a capital crime."²⁵

"The doctor was arrested and imprisoned on Sunday the thirteenth of August [A.D. 1553]. That very day he was brought into court."²⁶

Calvin's own words respecting the arrest are these:

"I will not deny but that he was made prisoner upon my application."²⁷

The warmest friends of first-day sacredness will not deny that the least sinful part of this transaction was that it occurred on Sunday. Nevertheless the fact that Calvin caused the arrest of Servetus on that day shows that he had no conviction that the day possessed any inherent sacredness.

John Barclay,²⁸ a learned man of Scotch descent, and a moderate Roman Catholic, who was born soon after the death of Calvin, and whose early life was spent in eastern France, not very remote from Geneva, published the statement that Calvin and his friends at Geneva

"Debated whether the reformed, for the purpose of estranging themselves more completely from the Romish church, should not adopt Thursday as the Christian Sabbath."

Another reason assigned by Calvin for this proposed change was,

"That it would be a proper instance of Christian liberty."²⁹

This statement has been credited by many learned Protestants,³⁰ some of whom must be acknowledged as men of candor and judgment. But Dr. Twisse³¹ discredits Barclay because

he did not name the individuals with whom Calvin consulted, and produce them as witnesses; and because that King James I. of England at one time suspected Barclay of treachery toward him. But no such crime was ever proved, nor does it appear that the king continued always to hold him in that light.³² His veracity has never been impeached. The statement of Barclay may possibly be incorrect, but it is not inconsistent with Calvin's doctrine that the church is not tied to a festival that should come once in seven days, even as Tyndale said that they could change the Sabbath into Monday or could "make every tenth day holy day, only if we see cause why," and it is in perfect harmony with Calvin's idea of Sunday sacredness as shown in his acts already noticed. Like the other reformers, Calvin is not always consistent with himself in his statements. Nevertheless, we have his judgment concerning the several texts which are used to prove the change of the Sabbath, and also respecting the theory that the commandment may be used to enforce, not the seventh day, but one day in seven, and it is fatal to the modern first-day doctrine.

John Knox, the great Scottish reformer, was the intimate friend of Calvin, with whom he lived at Geneva during a portion of his exile from Scotland. Though the foundation of the Presbyterian church of Scotland was laid by Knox, or rather by Calvin, for Knox carried out Calvin's system, and though that church is now very strict in the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, yet Knox himself was of Calvin's mind as to the obligation of that day. The original Confession of Faith of that church was drawn up by Knox in A.D. 1560.³³ In that document Knox states the duties of the first table of the law as follows:

"To have one God, to worship and honor him; to call upon him in all our troubles; to reverence his holy name; to hear his word; to believe the same; to communicate with his holy sacraments, are the works of the first table."³⁴

It is plain that Knox believed the Sabbath commandment to have been stricken out of the first table. Dr. Hessey, after speaking of certain references to Sunday in a subsequent work of his, makes this statement respecting the present doctrine of the Sabbath in the Presbyterian church:

"On the whole, whatever the language held at present in Scotland may be, it is certainly not owing to the great man whom the Scotch regard as the apostle of the Reformation in their country."³⁵

That church now holds Sunday to be the divinely authorized memorial of the resurrection of Christ, enforced by the authority of the fourth commandment. But not thus was it held by Calvin and Knox. A British writer states the condition of things with respect to Sunday in Scotland about the year 1601:

"At the commencement of the seventeenth century, tailors, shoemakers, and bakers in Aberdeen were accustomed to work till eight or nine every Sunday morning. While violation of the prescribed ritual observances was punished by fine, the exclusive consecration of the Sunday which subsequently prevailed was then unknown. Indeed, there were regular 'play Sundays' in Scotland till the end of the sixteenth century."³⁶

But the Presbyterian church, after Knox's time, effected an entire change with respect to Sunday observance. The same writer says:

"The Presbyterian Kirk introduced into Scotland the Judaical observance of the Sabbath [Sunday], retaining with some inconsistency the Sunday festival of the

Catholic church, while rejecting all the other feasts which its authority had consecrated."³⁷

Dr. Hessey shows the method of doing this. He says:

"Of course some difficulties had to be got over. The Sabbath was the seventh day, Sunday was the first day of the week. But an ingenious theory that one day in seven was the essence of the fourth commandment speedily reconciled them to this."³⁸

The circumstances under which this new doctrine was framed, the name of its author, and the date of its publication, will be given in their place. That the body of the reformers should have failed to recognize the authority of the fourth commandment, and that they did not turn men from the Romish festivals to the Sabbath of the Lord, is a matter of regret rather than of surprise. The impropriety of making them the standard of divine truth is forcibly set forth in the following language:

"Luther and Calvin reformed many abuses, especially in the discipline of the church, and also some gross corruptions in doctrine; but they left other things of far greater moment just as they found them. . . . It was great merit in them to go as far as they did, and it is not they but we who are to blame if their authority induce us to go no further. We should rather imitate them in the boldness and spirit with which they called in question and rectified so many long-established errors; and availing ourselves of their labors, make further progress than they were able to do. Little reason have we to allege their name, authority, and example, when they did a great deal and we do nothing at all. In this we are not imitating them, but those who opposed and counteracted them, willing to keep things as they were."³⁹

1 Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. vi. sects. 3, 5.

2 Cox's Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 287.

3 Id.Ib.

4 Cox's Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 287.

5 Id. p. 286.

6 Id.Ib.

7 Id. p. 289.

8 Tyndale's Answer to More, book i, chap. xxv.

9 Hessey, p. 352.

10 Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, book ii. chap. viii. sect. 34. translated by John Allen.

11 Quanquam non sine delectu Dominicum quem vocamus diem veteres in locum Sabbati subrogarunt.

12 Calvin's Institutes, book ii. chap. viii. sect. 34.

- 13 Calvin's Harmony of the Evangelists on Matt.28; Mark 16; Luke 24.
- 14 Calvin's Commentary on John 20.
- 15 Calvin's Commentary on Acts 2:1.
- 16 Calvin's Commentary on Acts 20:7.
- 17 Id.Ib.
- 18 Calvin's Commentary on Acts 20:7.
- 19 Calvin's Commentary on 1Cor.16:2.
- 20 Id.Ib.
- 21 Calvin's Institutes, book ii. chap. viii. sect. 34.
- 22 Hessey's Bampton Lectures on Sunday, p. 201, ed. 1866. In the notes appended, p. 366, he says: "At Geneva a tradition exists, that when John Knox visited Calvin on a Sunday, he found his austere coadjutor bowling on a green." Dr. Hessey evidently credited this tradition.
- 23 Beza's Life of Calvin, Sibson's Translation, p. 55, ed. 1836.
- 24 Id. p. 115.
- 25 Eccl. Researches, chap. x. p. 338.
- 26 Id. p. 339.
- 27 Beza's Life of Calvin, p. 168.
- 28 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. i. p. 663.
- 29 Hessey, p. 341, gives a clue to the title of Barclay's work. It was *Paraenesis ad Sectarios hujus temporis*, lib. 1, cap. 13. p. 160, Rome, 1617.
- 30 See Heylyn's Hist. of the Sabbath, part ii. chapter vi. sect 8; Morer's Lord's Day, pp. 216, 217, 228; An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions, p. 55; The Modern Sabbath Examined, p. 26, Whitaker, Treacher, and Arnot, London, 1832; Cox's Sabbath Literature, vol. i. pp. 165, 166; Hessey, pp. 141, 142, 198, 341, and the authors there cited.
- 31 Morality of the Fourth Commandment, pp. 32, 36, 39, 40.
- 32 In fact, the story told by Twisse that Barclay is not to be believed in what he says of Calvin because he was treacherous toward King James I., who for that reason would not promote him at his court, appears to be wholly unfounded. The Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. iv., p. 439, eighth edition, assigns a very different reason. It says: "In those days a pension bestowed upon a Scottish papist would have been numbered among the national grievances." That is to say, public opinion would not then tolerate the promotion of a Romanist. But this writer believes that the king secretly favored Barclay. Thus on page 440 he adds: "Although it does not appear that he obtained any regular provision from the king, we may perhaps suppose that he at least received occasional gratuities." This writer knew nothing of Barclay as a detected spy at the king's court. Of his standing as a man, he says on p. 441: "If there had been any remarkable blemish in the morals of Barclay, some of his numerous adversaries would have pointed it out." M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. 1, p. 663, says that he "would

doubtless have succeeded at court had he not been a Romanist." See also Knight's Cyclopedia of Biography, article Barclay.

33 Cox's Sabbath Laws, &c. p. 123; M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. v. pp. 137-140.

34 Quoted in Hessey's Bampton Lectures, p. 200.

35 Id. p. 201.

36 Westminster Review, July, 1858, p. 37.

37 Westminster Review, July, 1858, p. 37.

38 Hessey p. 203.

39 Dr. Priestly, as quoted in Cox's "Sabbath Laws," p. 260.

CHAPTER 23

LUTHER AND CARLSTADT

The case of Carlstadt worthy of notice - His difficulty with Luther respecting the Epistle of James - His boldness in standing with Luther against the pope - What Carlstadt did during Luther's captivity - How far he came under fanaticism - Who acted with Carlstadt in the removal of images from the churches, the suppression of masses, and the abolition of the law of celibacy - Luther on returning restored the mass and suppressed the simple ordinance of the supper - Carlstadt submitted to Luther's correction - After two years, Carlstadt felt constrained to oppose Luther respecting the supper - The grounds of their difference respecting the Reformation - Luther said Christ's flesh and blood were literally present IN the bread and wine - Carlstadt said they were simply represented by them - The controversy which followed - Carlstadt refuted by banishment - His cruel treatment in exile - He was not connected with the disorderly conduct of the Anabaptists - Why Carlstadt has been so harshly judged - D'Aubigne's estimate of this controversy - Carlstadt's labors in Switzerland - Luther writes against him - Luther and Carlstadt reconciled - D'Aubigne's estimate of Carlstadt as a scholar and a Christian - Carlstadt a Sabbatarian - Wherein Luther benefited Carlstadt - Wherein Luther might have been benefited by Carlstadt.

It is worthy of notice that at least one of the reformers of considerable prominence - Carlstadt - was a Sabbatarian. It is impossible to read the records of the Reformation without the conviction that Carlstadt was desirous of a more thorough work of reformation than was Luther. And that while Luther was disposed to tolerate certain abuses lest the Reformation should be endangered, Carlstadt was at all hazards for a complete return to the Holy Scriptures.

The Sabbatarian principles of Carlstadt, his intimate connection with Luther, his prominence in the early history of the Reformation, and the important bearing of Luther's decision concerning the Sabbath upon the entire history of the Protestant church, render the former worthy of notice in the history of the Sabbath. We shall give his record in the exact words of the best historians, none of whom were in sympathy with his observance of the seventh day. The manner in which they state his faults shows that they were not partial toward him. Shortly after Luther began to preach against the merit of good works, his deep interest in the work of delivering men from popish thralldom led him to deny the inspiration of some portion of those scriptures which were quoted against him. Dr. Sears thus states the case:

"Luther was so zealous to maintain the doctrine of justification by faith, that he was prepared even to call in question the authority of some portions of Scripture, which seemed to him not to be reconcilable with it. To the Epistle of James, especially, his expressions indicate the strongest repugnance."¹

Before Luther's captivity in the castle of Wartburg, a dispute had arisen between himself and Carlstadt on this very subject. It is recorded of Carlstadt that in the year 1520,

"He published a treatise 'Concerning the Canon of Scripture,' which, although defaced by bitter attacks on Luther, was nevertheless an able work, setting

forth the great principle of Protestantism viz., the paramount authority of Scripture. He also at this time contended for the authority of the Epistle of St. James, against Luther. On the publication of the bull of Leo X. against the reformers, Carlstadt showed a real and honest courage in standing firm with Luther. His work on 'Papal Sanctity' (1520) attacks the infallibility of the pope on the basis of the Bible."²

Luther, as is well known, while returning from the Diet of Worms, was seized by the agents of the Elector of Saxony, and hidden from his enemies in Wartburg Castle. We read of Carlstadt at this time as follows:

"In 1521, during Luther's confinement in the Wartburg, Carlstadt had almost sole control of the reform movement at Wittenberg, and was supreme in the university. He attacked monachism and celibacy in a treatise 'Concerning Celibacy, Monachism, and Widowhood.' His next point of assault was the Mass, and a riot of students and young citizens against the Mass soon followed. On Christmas, 1521, he gave the sacrament in both kinds to the laity, and in German; and in January 1522, he married. His headlong zeal led him to do whatever he came to believe right, at once and arbitrarily. But he soon outran Luther, and one of his great mistakes was in putting the Old Testament on the same footing as the New. On Jan. 24, 1522, Carlstadt obtained the adoption of a new church constitution at Wittenberg, which is of interest only as the first Protestant organization of the Reformation."³

There were present at this time in Wittenberg certain fanatical teachers, who, from the town whence they came, were called "the prophets of Zwickau." They brought Carlstadt for a time so far under their influence, that he concluded academical degrees to be sinful, and that, as the inspiration of the Spirit was sufficient, there was no need of human learning. He therefore advised the students of the university to return to their homes.⁴ That institution was in danger of dissolution. Such was Carlstadt's course in Luther's absence. With the exception of this last movement, his acts were in themselves right.

The changes made at Wittenberg during Luther's absence, whether timely or not, are generally set down to Carlstadt's account, and said to have been made by him on his individual responsibility, and in a fanatical manner. But this was quite otherwise. Dr. Maclaine thus states the case:

"The reader may perhaps imagine, from Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter, that Carlstadt introduced these changes merely by his own authority; but this was far from being the case; the suppression of private masses, the removal of images out of the churches, the abolition of the law which imposed celibacy upon the clergy; which are the changes hinted at by our historian as rash and perilous, were effected by Carlstadt, in conjunction with Bugenhagius, Melancthon, Jonas Amsdorf, and others, and were confirmed by the authority of the Elector of Saxony; so that there is some reason to apprehend that one of the principal causes of Luther's displeasure at these changes, was their being introduced in his absence; unless we suppose that he had not so far shaken off the fetters of superstition, as to be sensible of the absurdity and the pernicious consequences of the use of images."⁵

Carlstadt had given the cup to the laity of which they had long been deprived by Rome. He had set aside the worship of the consecrated bread. Dr. Sears rehearses this work of Carlstadt, and then tells us what Luther did concerning it on his return. These are his words:

"He [Carlstadt] had so far restored the sacrament of the Lord's supper as to distribute the wine as well as the bread to the laity. Luther, 'in order not to offend weak consciences,' insisted on distributing the bread only, and prevailed. He [Carlstadt] rejected the practice of elevating and adoring the host. Luther allowed it, and introduced it again."⁶

The position of Carlstadt was at this time very trying. He had not received "many things taught by the new teachers" from Zwickau. But he had publicly taught some of their fanatical ideas relative to the influence of the Spirit of God superseding the necessity of study. But in the suppression of the idolatrous services of the Romanists, he was essentially right. He had the pain to see much of this set up again. Moreover the elector would not allow him either to preach or write upon the points wherein he differed from Luther. D'Aubigne states his course thus:

"Nevertheless, he sacrificed his self-love for the sake of peace, restrained his desire to vindicate his doctrine, was reconciled, at least in appearance, to his colleague [Luther], and soon after resumed his studies in the university."⁷

As Luther taught some doctrines which Carlstadt could not approve, he felt at last that he must speak. Dr. Sears thus writes:

"After Carlstadt had been compelled to keep silence, from 1522 to 1524, and to submit to the superior power and authority of Luther, he could contain himself no longer. He, therefore, left Wittenberg, and established a press at Jena, through which he could, in a series of publications, give vent to his convictions, so long pent up."⁸

The principles at the foundation of their ideas of the Reformation were these: Carlstadt insisted on rejecting everything in the Catholic church not authorized in the Bible; Luther was determined to retain everything not expressly forbidden. Dr. Sears thus states their primary differences:

"Carlstadt maintained, that 'we should not, in things pertaining to God, regard what the multitude say or think, but look simply to the word of God. Others,' he adds, 'say that, on account of the weak, we should not hasten to keep the commands of God; but wait till they become wise and strong.' In regard to the ceremonies introduced into the church, he judged as the Swiss reformers did, that all were to be rejected which had not a warrant in the Bible. 'It is sufficiently against the Scriptures if you can find no ground for it in them.'

"Luther asserted, on the contrary, 'Whatever is not against the Scriptures is for the Scriptures, and the Scriptures for it. Though Christ hath not commanded adoring of the host, so neither hath he forbidden it.' 'Not so,' said Carlstadt, 'we are bound to the Bible, and no one may decide after the thoughts of his own heart.' "⁹

It is of interest to know what was the subject which caused the controversy between them, and what was the position of each. Dr. Maclaine thus states the occasion of the conflict which now arose:

"This difference of opinion between Carlstadt and Luther concerning the eucharist, was the true cause of the violent rupture between those two eminent men, and it tended very little to the honor of the latter; for, however the

explication, which the former gave of the words of the institution of the Lord's supper, may appear forced, yet the sentiments he entertained of that ordinance as a commemoration of Christ's death, and not as a celebration of his bodily presence, in consequence of a consubstantiation with the bread and wine, are infinitely more rational than the doctrine of Luther, which is loaded with some of the most palpable absurdities of transubstantiation; and if it be supposed that Carlstadt strained the rule of interpretation too far, when he alleged, that Christ pronounced the pronoun this (in the words This is my body) pointing to his body, and not to the bread, what shall we think of Luther's explaining the nonsensical doctrine of consubstantiation by the similitude of a red-hot iron, in which two elements are united, as the body of Christ is with the bread of the eucharist?"¹⁰

Dr. Sears also states the occasion of this conflict in 1524:

"The most important difference between him and Luther, and that which most embittered the latter against him, related to the Lord's supper. He opposed not only transubstantiation, but consubstantiation, the real presence, and the elevation and adoration of the host. Luther rejected the first, asserted the second and third, and allowed the other two. In regard to the real presence, he says: 'In the sacrament is the real body of Christ and the real blood of Christ, so that even the unworthy and ungodly partake of it; and "partake of it corporally" too, and not spiritually as Carlstadt will have it.' "¹¹

That Luther was the one chiefly in error in this controversy will be acknowledged by nearly every one at the present day. D'Aubigne cannot refrain from censuring him:

"When once the question of the supper was raised, Luther threw away the proper element of the Reformation, and took his stand for himself and his church in an exclusive Lutheranism."¹²

The controversy is thus characterized by Dr. Sears:

"A furious controversy ensued. Both parties exceeded the bounds of Christian propriety and moderation. Carlstadt was now in the vicinity of the Anabaptist tumults, excited by Muntzer. He sympathized with them in some things, but disapproved of their disorders. Luther made the most of this."¹³

It is evident that in this contest Luther did not gain any decisive advantage, even in the estimation of his friends. The Elector of Saxony interfered and banished Carlstadt! D'Aubigne thus states the case:

"He issued orders to deprive Carlstadt of his appointments, and banished him, not only from Orlamund, but from the States of the electorate."¹⁴

"Luther had nothing to do with this sternness on the part of the prince: it was foreign to his disposition, - and this he afterward proved."¹⁵

Carlstadt, for maintaining the doctrine now held by almost all Protestants, concerning the supper, and for denying Luther's doctrine that Christ is personally present in the bread, was rendered a homeless wanderer for years. His banishment was in 1524. What followed is thus described:

"From this date until 1534 he wandered through Germany, pursued by the persecuting opinions of both Lutherans and Papists, and at times reduced to great straits by indigence and unpopularity. But, although he always found sympathy and hospitality among the Anabaptists, yet he is evidently clear of the charge of complicity with Muntzer's rebellion. Yet he was forbidden to write, his life was sometimes in danger, and he exhibits the melancholy spectacle of a man great and right in many respects, but whose rashness, ambition, and insincere zeal, together with many fanatical opinions, had put him under the well-founded but immoderate censure of both friends and foes."¹⁶

Such language seems quite unwarranted by the facts. There was no justice in this persecution of Carlstadt. He did for a brief time hold some fanatical ideas, but these he did not afterward maintain. The same writer speaks further in the same strain:

"It cannot be denied that in many respects he was apparently in advance of Luther, but his error lay in his haste to subvert and abolish the external forms and pomps before the hearts of the people, and doubtless his own, were prepared by an internal change. Biographies of him are numerous, and the Reformation no doubt owes him much of good for which he has not the credit, as it was overshadowed by the mischief he produced."¹⁷

Important truth relative to the services of Carlstadt is here stated, but it is connected with intimations of evil which have no sufficient foundation in fact. Dr. Sears speaks thus of the bitter language concerning him:

"For three centuries, Carlstadt's moral character has been treated somewhat as Luther's would have been, if only Catholic testimony had been heard. The party interested has been both witness and judge. What if we were to judge of Zwingle's Christian character by Luther's representations? The truth is, Carlstadt hardly showed a worse spirit, or employed more abusive terms toward Luther, than Luther did toward him. Carlstadt knew that in many things the truth was on his side; and yet, in these, no less than in others, he was crushed by the civil power, which was on the side of Luther."¹⁸

D'Aubigne speaks thus of the contest between these two men:

"Each turns against the error which, to his mind, seems most noxious, and in assailing it, goes - it may be --beyond the truth. But this being admitted, it is still true that both are right in the prevailing turn of their thoughts, and though ranking in different hosts, the two great teachers are nevertheless found under the same standard - that of Jesus Christ, who alone is TRUTH in the full import of that word."¹⁹

D'Aubigne says of them after Carlstadt had been banished:

"It is impossible not to feel a pain at contemplating these two men, once friends, and both worthy of our esteem, thus angrily opposed."²⁰

Sometime after Carlstadt's banishment from Saxony he visited Switzerland. D'Aubigne speaks of the result of his labors in that country, and what Luther did toward him:

"His instructions soon attracted an attention nearly equal to that which had been excited by the earliest theses put forth by Luther. Switzerland seemed almost gained over to his doctrine. Bucer and Capito also appeared to adopt his views.

"Then it was that Luther's indignation rose to its height; and he put forth one of the most powerful but also most OUTRAGEOUS of his controversial writings, - his book 'Against the Celestial Prophets.' "21

Dr. Sears also mentions the labors of Carlstadt in Switzerland, and speaks of Luther's uncandid book:

"The work which he wrote against him, he entitled 'The book against the Celestial Prophets.' This was uncandid; for the controversy related chiefly to the sacrament of the supper. In the south of Germany and in Switzerland, Carlstadt found more adherents than Luther. Banished as an Anabaptist, he was received as a Zwinglian."22

Dr. Maclaine tells something which followed, which is worthy of the better nature of these two illustrious men:

"Carlstadt, after his banishment from Saxony, composed a treatise against enthusiasm in general, and against the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the Anabaptists in particular. This treatise was even addressed to Luther, who was so affected by it, that, repenting of his unworthy treatment of Carlstadt, he pleaded his cause, and obtained from the elector a permission for him to return into Saxony."23

"After this reconciliation with Luther, he composed a treatise on the eucharist, which breathes the most amiable spirit of moderation and humility; and having perused the writings of Zwingli, where he saw his own sentiments on that subject maintained with the greatest perspicuity and force of evidence, he repaired the second time to Zurich, and thence to Basil, where he was admitted to the offices of pastor and professor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and constant practice of every Christian virtue, he died, amidst the warmest effusions of piety and resignation, on the 25th of December, 1541."24

Of Carlstadt's scholarship, and of his conscientiousness, D'Aubigne speaks thus:

" 'He was well acquainted,' says Dr. Scheur, 'with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew;' and Luther acknowledged him to be his superior in learning. Endowed with great powers of mind, he sacrificed to his convictions fame, station, country, and even his bread."25

His Sabbatarian character is attested by Dr. White, lord bishop of Ely:

"The same [the observance of the seventh day] likewise being revived in Luther's time by Carolastadius, Sternebergius, and by some sectaries among the Anabaptists hath both then and ever since been censured as Jewish and heretical."26

Dr. Sears alludes to Carlstadt's observance of the seventh day, but as is quite usual with first-day historians in such cases, does it in such a manner as to leave the fact sufficiently obscure to be passed over without notice by the general reader. He writes thus:

"Carlstadt differed essentially from Luther in regard to the use to be made of the Old Testament. With him, the law of Moses was still binding. Luther, on the contrary, had a strong aversion to what he calls a legal and Judaizing religion. Carlstadt held to the divine authority of the Sabbath from the Old Testament; Luther believed Christians were free to observe any day as a Sabbath, provided they be uniform in observing it."²⁷

We have, however, Luther's own statement respecting Carlstadt's views of the Sabbath. It is from his book "Against the Celestial Prophets:"

"Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath - that is to say, Saturday - must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised: for that is true, and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as the law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all."²⁸

The various historians who treat of the difficulty between Luther and Carlstadt, speak freely of the motives of each. But of such matters it is best to speak little; the day of Judgment will show the hearts of men, and we must wait till then. We may, however, freely speak of their acts, and may with propriety name the things wherein each would have benefited the other. Carlstadt's errors at Wittemberg were not because he rejected Luther's help, but because he was deprived of it by Luther's captivity. Luther's error in those things wherein Carlstadt was right were because he saw it best to reject Carlstadt's doctrine.

1. Carlstadt's error in the removal of the images, the suppression of masses, the abolition of monastic vows, or vows of celibacy, and in giving the wine as well as the bread in the supper, and in performing the service in German instead of Latin, if it was an error, was one of time rather than of doctrine. Had Luther been with him, probably all would have been deferred for some months or perhaps some years.

2. Carlstadt would probably have been saved by Luther's presence from coming under the influence of the Zwickau prophets. As it was, he did for a brief season accept, not their teaching in general, but their doctrine that the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in believers renders human learning vain and worthless. But in both these things Carlstadt submitted to Luther's correction. Had Luther regarded Carlstadt, he would have been benefited in the following particulars:

1. In his zeal for the doctrine of justification by faith, he would have been saved from the denial of the inspiration of the epistle of James, and would not have called it a "strawy or chaffy epistle."²⁹

2. Instead of exchanging transubstantiation, which is the Romish doctrine that the bread and wine of the supper become Christ's literal flesh and blood, for consubstantiation, the doctrine which he fastened upon the Lutheran church that Christ's flesh and blood are actually present in the bread and wine, he would have given to that church the doctrine that the bread and wine simply represent the body and blood of Christ, and are used in commemoration of his sacrifice for our sins.

3. Instead of holding fast every thing in the Romish church not expressly forbidden in the Bible, he would have laid all aside which had not the actual sanction of that holy book.

4. Instead of the Catholic festival of Sunday, he would have observed and transmitted to the Protestant church the ancient Sabbath of the Lord.

3 Carlstadt needed Luther's help, and he accepted it. Did not Luther also need that of Carlstadt? Is it not time that Carlstadt should be vindicated from the great obloquy thrown upon him by the prevailing party? And would not this have been done long since had not Carlstadt been a decided Sabbatarian?

1 Life of Luther by Barnas Sears, D. D., lar er ed. pp. 400, 401.

2 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. ii. p. 123.

3 Id.Ib.

4 D'Aubigne's Hist. of the Ref. book ix.

5 Mosheim's Church Hist. book iv. cent. xvi. sect. 3, part ii. paragraph 22, note.

6 Life of Luther, p. 401.

7 D'Aubigne's Hist. Ref. book ix. p. 282. I use the excellent one-volume edition of Porter and Coates.

8 Life of Luther, pp. 402, 403.

9 Id. pp. 401, 402.

10 Mosheim's Hist. of the Church, book iv, cent. xvi. sect. 3, part ii. paragraph 22, note.

11 Life of Luther, p. 402.

12 D'Aubigne's Hist. of Ref. book x. p. 312.

13 Life of Luther, p. 403.

14 D'Aubigne's Hist. Ref. book x. pp. 314, 315.

15 Id.Ib.

16 M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. ii. p. 123.

17 Id.Ib.

18 Life of Luther, p. 400.

19 D'Aubigne's Hist. Ref. book x. p. 312.

20 Id. book x. p. 315.

21 Hist. Ref. book x. p. 315

22 Life of Luther p. 403.

Chapter Twenty Three – Luther and Carlstadt

23 Mosheim's Church Hist. book iv. cent. 16, sect. 3, part ii. paragraph 22, note.

24 Id.Ib. Very nearly the same statement is made by du Pin, tome l3, chap. ii. section 20, p. 103, A.D. 1703.

25 Hist. Ref. book x. p. 315.

26 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 8.

27 Life of Luther, p. 402.

28 Quoted in the Life of Martin Luther in Pictures, p. 147, Philadelphia, J.W. Moore, 195 Chestnut Street.

29 M'Clintock and Strong, vol. ii. p. 123; Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary, preface to James.

CHAPTER 24

SABBATH-KEEPERS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The judgment of the martyr Frith - The Reformation brings Sabbath-keepers to light in various countries - In Transylvania - In Bohemia - In Russia - In Germany - In Holland - In France - In England.

John Frith, an English reformer of considerable note and a martyr, was converted by the labors of Tyndale about 1525, and assisted him in the translation of the Bible. He was burned at Smithfield, July 4, 1533. He is spoken of in the highest terms by the historians of the English Reformation.¹ His views respecting the Sabbath, and first-day are thus stated by himself:

"The Jews have the word of God for their Saturday, sith [since] it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemn. And we have not the word of God for us, but rather against us; for we keep not the seventh day, as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God's law."²

When the Reformation had lifted the vail of darkness that covered the nations of Europe, Sabbath-keepers were found in Transylvania, Bohemia, Russia, Germany, Holland, France, and England. It was not the Reformation which gave existence to these Sabbatarians, for the leaders of the Reformation, as a body, were not friendly to such views. On the contrary, these observers of the Sabbath appear to be remnants of the ancient Sabbath-keeping churches that had witnessed for the truth during the Dark Ages.

Transylvania, a country which now constitutes one of the eastern divisions of the Austrian Empire, was, in the sixteenth century, an independent principality. About the middle of that century, the country was under the rule of Sigismund. The historian of the Baptists, Robinson, gives the following interesting record of events in that age and country:

"The prince received his first religious impressions under his chaplain, Alexius, who was a Lutheran. On his removal he chose Francis Davidis to succeed him, and by him was further informed of the principles of the Reformation. Davidis was a native of that extremely populous and well-fortified town which is called Coloswar by the natives, Clausenberg by the Germans, and by others, Claudiopolis. He was a man of learning, address, and piety, and reasoned in this part of his life more justly on the principles of the Reformation than many of his contemporaries. In 1563 his highness invited several learned foreigners to come into Transylvania for the purpose of helping forward the Reformation."³

"Several other foreigners, who had been persecuted elsewhere, sought refuge in this country, where persecution for religion was unknown. These refugees were Unitarian Baptists, and through their indefatigable industry and address, the prince, the greatest part of the senate, a great number of ministers, and a multitude of the people went heartily into their plan of Reformation."⁴

"In the end the Baptists became by far the most numerous party, and were put in possession of a printing office and an academy, and the cathedral was given to them for a place of worship. They obtained these without any violence, and while they formed their own churches according to the convictions of their members, they persecuted nobody, but allowed the same liberty to others, and great numbers of Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists resided in perfect freedom."⁵

Mr. Robinson further informs us that Davidis took extreme Unitarian ground with respect to the worship of Christ, which seems to have been the only serious error that can be laid to his charge. Davidis was a Unitarian Baptist minister, intrusted by his brethren with the superintendency of the churches in Transylvania. His influence in that country at one period was very great. His views of the Sabbath are thus stated:

"He supposed the Jewish Sabbath not abrogated, and he therefore kept holy the seventh day. He believed also the doctrine of the millennium, and like an honest man, what he believed he taught. He was considered by the Transylvanian churches as an apostle, and had grown gray in their service; but the Catholics, the Lutherans, and the Calvinists, thought him a Turk, a blasphemer, and an atheist, and his Polish Baptist brethren said he was half a Jew. Had he been a whole Jew he ought not to have been imprisoned for his speculations."⁶

"By what means the Supreme Searcher of hearts only knows, but by some methods till then unknown in Transylvania, the old man was arrested, and by the senate condemned to die. He was imprisoned in the castle, and providence by putting a period to his life there, saved his persecutors from the disgrace of a public execution."⁷

Mr. Robinson says that "many have been blamed" for the death of Davidis, "but perhaps the secret springs of this event may never be known till the Judge of the world maketh inquisition for blood." There were many Sabbatarians in Transylvania at this time, for Mr. Robinson enumerates many persons of distinction who were of the same views with Davidis. The ambassador Bequessius, general of the army; the princess, sister of prince John; the privy counselor, Chaquius, and the two Quendi; general Andrassi, and many others of high rank; Somer, the rector of the academy at Claudiopolis; Matthias Glirius, Adam Neusner, and Christian Francken, a professor in the academy at Claudiopolis.

"These," says Robinson, "were all of the same sentiments as Davidis, as were many more of different ranks, who after his death in prison, defended his opinion against Socinus. Palaeologus was of the same mind; he had fled into Moravia, but was caught by the emperor, at the request of Pope Gregory XIV., and carried to Rome, where he was burnt for a heretic. He was an old man, and was terrified at first into a recantation, but he recollected himself and submitted to his fate like a Christian."⁸

These persons must have been Sabbatarians. Moshien, after saying that Davidis "left behind him disciples and friends, who strenuously maintained his sentiments," adds:

"The most eminent of these were Jacob Palaeologus, of the isle of Chio, who was burned at Rome in 1585; Christian Francken, who had disputed in person with Socinus; and John Somer, who was master of the academy of

Clausenberg. This little sect is branded by the Socinian writers, with the ignominious appellation of SEMI-JUDAIZERS."⁹

We have a further record of Sabbatarians in Transylvania to the effect that in the time of Davidis,

"John Gerendi [was] head of the Sabbatarians, a people who did not keep Sunday but Saturday, and whose disciples took the name of Genoldists."¹⁰

Sabbath-keepers, also, were found in Bohemia, a country of Central Europe, at the time of the Reformation. We are dependent upon those who despised their faith and practice for a knowledge of their existence. Erasmus speaks of them as follows:

"Now we hear that among the Bohemians a new kind of Jews has arisen called Sabbatarians, who observe the Sabbath with so much superstition, that if on that day anything falls into their eyes they will not remove it; as if the Lord's day would not suffice for them instead of the Sabbath, which to the apostles also was sacred; or as if Christ had not sufficiently expressed how much should be allowed upon the Sabbath."¹¹

We need say nothing relative to the alleged superstition of these Sabbath-keepers. The statement sufficiently refutes itself, and indicates the bitter prejudice of those who speak of them thus. But that Sabbath-keepers were found at this time in Bohemia admits of no doubt. They were of some importance, and they must also have published their views to the world; for Cox tells us that,

"Hospinian of Zurich, in his treatise 'Concerning the Feasts of the Jews and of the Gentiles,' chapter iii. (Tiguri, 1592) replies to the arguments of these Sabbatarians."¹²

The existence of this body of Sabbatarians in Bohemia at the time of the Reformation is strong presumptive proof that the Waldenses of Bohemia, noticed in the preceding chapter, though claimed as observers of Sunday, were actually observers of the ancient Sabbath.

In Russia, the observers of the seventh day are numerous at the present time. Their existence can be traced back nearly to the year 1400. They are, therefore, at least one hundred years older than the work of Luther. The first writer that I quote speaks of them as "having left the Christian faith." But even in our time, it is very common for people to speak of those who turn from the first day to the seventh that they have renounced Christ for Moses.¹³ He also speaks of them as holding to circumcision. Even Carlstadt was charged with this by Luther as a necessary deduction from the fact that he observed the day enjoined in the fourth commandment. Such being a common method of characterizing Sabbath-keepers in our time, and such also having been the case in past ages - for when men lack argument, they use opprobrious terms - the historian, who makes up his record of these people from the statements of the popular party, will certainly represent them as rejecting Christ and the gospel, and accepting instead Moses and the ceremonial law. I give the statements of the historians as they are, and the reader must judge. Robert Pinkerton gives the following account of them:

"Seleznevtshini. This sect are, in modern time, precisely what the Strigolniks originally were. They are Jews in principle; maintain the divine obligation of circumcision; observe the Jewish Sabbath, and the ceremonial law. There are many of them about Tula, on the river Kuma, and in other provinces, and they

are very numerous in Poland and Turkey, where, having left the Christian faith, they have joined the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, in rejecting the Messiah and the gospel.¹⁴

The ancient Russian name of this people was Strigolniks. Dr. Murdock gives the following account of them:

"It is common to date the origin of sectarians in the Russian church, about the middle of the seventeenth century in the time of the patriarch Nikon. But according to the Russian annals, there existed schismatics in the Russian church two hundred years before the days of Nikon; and the disturbances which took place in his time, only proved the means of augmenting their numbers, and of bringing them forward into public view. The earliest of these schismatics first appeared in Novogorod, early in the fifteenth century, under the name of Strigolniks.

"A Jew named Horie preached a mixture of Judaism and Christianity; and proselyted two priests, Denis and Alexie, who gained a vast number of followers. This sect was so numerous, that a national council was called, towards the close of the fifteenth century, to oppose it. Soon afterwards, one Karp, an excommunicated deacon, joined the Strigolniks; and accused the higher clergy of selling the office of priesthood, and of so far corrupting the church, that the Holy Ghost was withdrawn from it. He was a very successful propagator of this sect."¹⁵

It is very customary with historians to speak of Sabbath-keeping Christians in one of the following ways: 1. To name their observance of the seventh day distinctly, but to represent them as turning from Christ to Moses and the ceremonial law; or, 2. To speak of their Sabbatarian principles in so vague a manner that the reader will not be likely to suspect them of being Sabbath-keepers. Pinkerton speaks of these Russian Sabbath-keepers after the first of these methods; Murdock, after the second. It is plain that Murdock did not regard these people as rejecting Christ, and it is certain from Pinkerton that the two writers are speaking of the same people.

What was the origin of these Russian Sabbath-keepers? Certainly it was not from the Reformation of the sixteenth century; for they were in existence at least one century before that event. We have seen that the Waldenses, during the Dark Ages, were dispersed through many of the countries of Europe. And so also were the people called Cathari, if, indeed, the two were not one people. In particular, we note the fact that they were scattered through Poland, Lithuania, Sclavonia, Bulgaria, Livonia, Albania, and Sarmatia.¹⁶ These countries are now parts of the Russian Empire. Sabbath-keepers were numerous in Russia before the time of Luther. The Sabbath of the Lord was certainly retained by many of the ancient Waldenses and Cathari, as we have seen. In fact, the very things said of the Russian Sabbath-keepers, that they held to circumcision and the ceremonial law, were also said of the Cathari, and of that branch of the Waldenses called Passaginians.¹⁷ Is there any reasonable doubt that in these ancient Christians we have the ancestors of the Russian Sabbath-keepers of the fifteenth century?

Mr. Maxson makes the following statement:

"We find that Sabbath-keepers appear in Germany late in the fifteenth or early in the sixteenth century according to 'Ross's Picture of All Religions.' By this

we are to understand that their numbers were such as to lead to organization, and attract attention. A number of these formed a church, and emigrated to America, in the early settlement of this country."¹⁸

Mr. Utter makes the following statement respecting Sabbath-keepers in Germany and in Holland:

"Early in the sixteenth century there are traces of Sabbath-keepers in Germany. The Old Dutch Martyrology gives an account of a Baptist minister named Stephen Benedict, somewhat famous for baptizing during a severe persecution in Holland, who is supposed by good authorities to have kept the seventh day as the Sabbath. One of the persons baptized by him was Barbary von Thiers, wife of Hans Borzen, who was executed on the 16th of September, 1529. At her trial she declared her rejection of the idolatrous sacrament of the priest, and also the Mass."¹⁹

We give her declaration of faith respecting Sundays and holy days:

"God has commanded us to rest on the seventh day. Beyond this she did not go: but with the help and grace of God she would persevere therein, and in death abide thereby; for it is the true faith, and the right way in Christ."²⁰

Another martyr, Christina Tolingerin, is mentioned thus:

"Concerning holy days and Sundays, she said: 'In six days the Lord made the world, on the seventh day he rested. The other holy days have been instituted by popes, cardinals, and archbishops.'"²¹

There were at this time Sabbath-keepers in France:

"In France also there were Christians of this class, among whom were M. de la Roque, who wrote in defense of the Sabbath against Bossuet, Catholic bishop of Meaux."²²

M. de la Roque is referred to by Dr. Wall in his famous history of infant baptism "as a learned man in other points," but in great error for asserting that "the primitive church did not baptize infants."²³ It is worthy of notice that Sabbath-keepers are always observers of scriptural baptism - the burial of penitent believers in the watery grave. No people retaining infant baptism, or the sprinkling of believers, have observed the seventh day.²⁴

The origin of the Sabbatarians of England cannot now be definitely ascertained. Their observance of believers' baptism and the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord, strongly attest their descent from the persecuted heretics of the Dark Ages, rather than from the reformers of the sixteenth century, who retained infant baptism and the festival of Sunday. That these heretics had long been numerous in England, is thus certified by Crosby:

"For in the time of William the Conqueror [A.D. 1070] and his son William Rufus, it appears that the Waldenses and their disciples out of France, Germany, and Holland, had their frequent recourse, and did abound in England. . . . The Beringarian, or Waldensian heresy, as the chronologer calls it, had, about A.D. 1080, generally corrupted all France, Italy, and England."²⁵

Mr. Maxson says of the English Sabbatarians:

"In England we find Sabbath-keepers very early. Dr. Chambers says: 'They arose in England in the sixteenth century,' from which we understand that they then became a distinct denomination in that kingdom."²⁶

Mr. Benedict speaks thus of the origin of English Sabbatarians:

"At what time the Seventh-day Baptists began to form churches in this kingdom does not appear; but probably it was at an early period; and although their churches have never been numerous, yet there have been among them almost for two hundred years past, some very eminent men."²⁷

1 M'Clintock and Strong, vol. iii. p. 679; D'Aubigne's Hist. Ref book xviii. pp. 672, 689, 706, 707; book xx. pp. 765, 766; Fox's Acts and Monuments, book viii. pp. 524-527.

2 Frith's works, p. 69, quoted in Hessey, p. 198.

3 Eccl. Researches, chap. xvi. p. 630.

4 Id.Ib.

5 Id. p. 631.

6 Eccl. Researches, chap. xvi. p. 636.

7 Id. pp. 636, 637.

8 Eccl. Researches, chap. xvi. p. 640.

9 Mosheim's Hist. Church, book iv. cent. 16. sect. 3. part ii. chap. iv. par. 23.

10 Lamy's History of Socinianiam p. 60.

11 "Nune audimus apud Bohemos exoriri novum Judaeorum genus Sabbatarios appellant, qui tanta superstitione servant Sabbatum, ut si quid eo die inciderit in oculum, nolint eximere: quasi non sufficiat eis pro Sabbato Dies Dominicus, qui Apostolis etiam erat sacer, aut quasi Christus non satis expresserit quantum tribuen dum sit Sabbato." De Atnabili Ecclesiae Concordia; Opera, tome 5, p. 506, Lugd. Bat. 1704; quoted in Cox's Sabbath Literature, vol. ii. pp. 201, 202; Hessey, p. 374.

12 Cox, vol. ii. p. 202.

13 Such statements respecting the observers of the seventh day are very common. Even those who first commenced to keep the Sabbath in Newport were said to "have left Christ and gone to Moses in the observation of days, and times, and seasons, and such like." - Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, vol. i. p. 32. The pastor of the first-day Baptist church of Newport said to them: "I do judge you have and still do deny Christ." - Id. p. 37.

14 The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia, Appendix. p. 273, New York, 1815.

15 Murdock's Mosheim, book iv. cent. xvii. sect. 2, part i. chap. ii. note 12.

16 See the twenty-first chapter of this work.

17 Id.Ib.

18 Maxson's Hist. Sab. p. 41.

19 Manual of the Seventh-day Baptists, p. 16.

20 Martyrology of the Churches of Christ, commonly called Baptists, during the era of the Reformation. From the Dutch of T. J. van Braght, London, 1850, vol. i. pp. 113, 114.

21 Id. p. 113.

22 Manual of the S.D. Baptists, p. 16.

23 Wall's History of Infant Baptism, vol. ii. p. 379, Oxford, 1835.

24 I know of no exception to this statement. If there be any it must be found in the cases of those observing both seventh and first days. Even here, there is certainly no such thing as sprinkling for baptism, but possibly there may be the baptism of young children.

25 Hist. English Baptists, vol. pref. pp. 43, 44.

26 Maxson's Hist. Sab. p. 42.

27 Gen. Hist. Bapt. Denom. vol. ii. p. 414, ed. 1813.

CHAPTER 25

HOW AND WHEN SUNDAY APPROPRIATED THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT

The light of the Reformation destroyed many of the best Sunday arguments of the preceding Dark Ages - The controversy between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians of England brings Sunday sacredness to the test - The former discover the means of enforcing the observance of Sunday by the fourth commandment - How this can be done - Effects of this extraordinary discovery - History of the Sunday festival concluded.

The light of the Reformation necessarily dissipated into thin air many of the most substantial arguments by which the Sunday festival had been built up during the Dark Ages. The roll that fell from Heaven - the apparition of St. Peter - the relief of souls in purgatory, and even of the damned in hell - and many prodigies of fearful portent - none of these, nor all of them combined, were likely longer to sustain the sacredness of the venerable day. True it was that when these were swept away there remained to sustain the festival of Sunday, the canons of councils, the edicts of kings and emperors, the decrees of the holy doctors of the church, and, greatest of all, the imperious mandates of the Roman pontiff. Yet these could be adduced also in behalf of the innumerable festivals ordained by the same great apostate church. Such authority would answer for the Episcopalian, who devoutly accepts of all these festivals, because commanded so to do by the church; but for those who acknowledge the Bible as the only rule of faith, the case was different. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, the Presbyterians and Episcopalians of England were involved in such a controversy as brought this matter to an issue. The Episcopalians required men to observe all the festivals of the church; the Presbyterians observed Sunday, and rejected all the rest. The Episcopalians showed the inconsistency of this discrimination, inasmuch as the same church authority had ordained them all. As the Presbyterians rejected the authority of the church, they would not keep Sunday upon that ground, especially as it would involve the observance also of all the other festivals. They had to choose therefore between the giving up of Sunday entirely, and the defense of its observance by the Bible. There was indeed another and a nobler choice that they might have made, viz., to adopt the Sabbath of the Lord, but it was too humiliating for them to unite with those who retained that ancient and sacred institution. The issue of this struggle is thus related by a distinguished German theologian, Hengstenberg:-

"The opinion that the Sabbath was transferred to the Sunday was first broached in its perfect form, and with all its consequences, in the controversy which was carried on in England between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The Presbyterians, who carried to extremes the principle, that every institution of the church must have its foundation in the Scripture, and would not allow that God had given, in this respect, greater liberty to the church of the New Testament, which his Spirit had brought to maturity, than to that of the Old, charged the Episcopalians with popish leaven, and superstition, and subjection to the ordinances of men, because they retained the Christian feasts. The Episcopalians, on the other hand, as a proof that greater liberty was granted to the New Testament church in such matters as these, appealed to the fact that even the observance of the Sunday was only an arrangement of the church. The Presbyterians were now in a position which compelled them either to give up

the observance of Sunday, or to maintain that a divine appointment from God separated it from the other festivals. The first day could not do, for their Christian experience was too deep for them not to know how greatly the weakness of human nature stands in need of regularly returning periods, devoted to the service of God. They therefore decided upon the latter."¹

Thus much for the occasion of that wonderful discovery by which the Scriptures are made to sustain the divine appointment of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. The date of the discovery, the name of the discoverer, and the manner in which he contrived to enforce the first day of the week by the authority of the fourth commandment, are thus set forth by a candid first-day historian, Lyman Coleman:

"The true doctrine of the Christian Sabbath was first promulgated by an English dissenter, the Rev. Nicholas Bound, D. D., of Norton, in the county of Suffolk. About the year 1595, he published a famous book, entitled, 'Sabbathum Veteris et Novi Testamenti,' or the True Doctrine of the Sabbath. In this book he maintained 'that the seventh part of our time ought to be devoted to God - that Christians are bound to rest on the Lord's day as much as the Jews were on the Mosaic Sabbath, the commandment about rest being moral and perpetual; and that it was not lawful for persons to follow their studies or worldly business on that day, nor to use such pleasures and recreations as are permitted on other days. This book spread with wonderful rapidity. The doctrine which it propounded called forth from many hearts a ready response, and the result was a most pleasing reformation in many parts of the kingdom. 'It is almost incredible,' says Fuller, 'how taking this doctrine was, partly because of its own purity, and partly for the eminent piety of such persons as maintained it; so that the Lord's day, especially in corporations, began to be precisely kept; people becoming a law unto themselves, forbearing such sports as yet by statute permitted; yea, many rejoicing at their own restraint herein.' The law of the Sabbath was indeed a religious principle, after which the Christian church had, for centuries, been darkly groping. Pious men of every age had felt the necessity of divine authority for sanctifying the day. Their conscience had been in advance of their reason. Practically they had kept the Sabbath better than their principles required.

"Public sentiment, however, was still unsettled in regard to this new doctrine respecting the Sabbath, though a few at first violently opposed it. 'Learned men were much divided in their judgments about these Sabbatarian doctrines; some embraced them as ancient truths consonant to Scripture, long disused and neglected, now seasonably revived for the increase of piety. Others conceived them grounded on a wrong bottom; but because they tended to the manifest advance of religion, it was a pity to oppose them; seeing none have just reason to complain, being deceived unto their own good. But a third sort flatly fell out with these propositions, as galling men's necks with a Jewish yoke against the liberty of Christians; that Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, had removed the rigor thereof, and allowed men lawful recreations; that this doctrine put an unequal lustre on the Sunday, on set purpose to eclipse all other holy days, to the derogation of the authority of the church; that this strict observance was set up out of faction, to be a character of difference to brand all for libertines who did not entertain it.' No open opposition, however, was at first manifested against

the sentiments of Dr. Bound. No reply was attempted for several years, and 'not so much as a feather of a quill in print did wag against him.'

"His work was soon followed by several other treatises in defense of the same sentiments. 'All the Puritans fell in with this doctrine, and distinguished themselves by spending that part of sacred time in public, family, and private devotion.' Even Dr. Heylyn certified the triumphant spread of those puritanical sentiments respecting the Sabbath. . . .

" 'This doctrine,' he says, 'carrying such a fair show of piety, at least in the opinion of the common people, and such as did not examine the true grounds of it, induced many to embrace and defend it; and in a very little time it became the most bewitching error and the most popular infatuation that ever was embraced by the people of England.' "²

Dr. Bound was not absolutely the inventor of the seventh-part-of-time theory; but he may be said rather to have gathered up and combined the scattered hints of his predecessors, and to have added to these something of his own production. His grounds for asserting Sunday to be the Sabbath of the fourth commandment are these:

"That which is natural, namely, that every seventh day should be kept holy unto the Lord, that still remaineth: that which is positive, namely, that day which was the seventh day from the creation, should be the Sabbath, or day of rest, that is now changed in the church of God."³

He says that the meaning of the declaration, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," is this:

"There must be one [day] of seven and not [one] of eight."⁴

But the special key to the whole theory is in the statement that the seventh day in the commandment was "genus," that is to say, it was a kind of seventh day which comprehended several species of seventh days, at least two. Thus he says:

"So he maketh the seventh day to be genus in this commandment, and to be perpetual: and in it by virtue of the commandment to comprehend these two species or kinds: the Sabbath of the Jews and of the Gentiles, of the law and of the gospel: so that both of them were comprehended in the commandment, even as genus comprehendeth both his species."⁵

He enforces the first day by the fourth commandment, as follows:

"So that we have not in the gospel a new commandment for the Sabbath, diverse from that that was in the law; but there is a diverse time appointed; namely, not the seventh day from the creation, but the day of Christ's resurrection, and the seventh from that: both of them at several times being comprehended in the fourth commandment."⁶

He means to say that the fourth commandment enforces the seventh day from the creation to the resurrection of Christ, and since that enforces a different seventh day, namely, the seventh from Christ's resurrection. Such is the perverse ingenuity by which men can evade the law of God and yet make it appear that they are faithfully observing it.

Such was the origin of the seventh-part-of-time theory, by which the seventh day is dropped out of the fourth commandment, and one day in seven slipped into its place; a doctrine most opportunely framed at the very period when nothing else could save the venerable day of the sun. With the aid of this theory, the Sunday of "Pope and Pagan" was able coolly to wrap itself in the fourth commandment, and then in the character of a divine institution, to challenge obedience from all Bible Christians. It could now cast away the other frauds on which its very existence had depended, and support its authority by this one alone. In the time of Constantine it ascended the throne of the Roman Empire, and during the whole period of the Dark Ages it maintained its supremacy from the chair of St. Peter; but now it had ascended the throne of the Most High. And thus a day which God "commanded not nor spake it, neither came it into" his "mind," was enjoined upon mankind with all the authority of his holy law. The immediate effect of Dr. Bound's work upon the existing controversy is thus described by an Episcopalian eye-witness, Dr. Heylyn:

"For by inculcating to the people these new Sabbath speculations [concerning Sunday], teaching that that day only 'was of God's appointment, and all the rest observed in the church of England, a remnant of the will-worship in the church of Rome;' the other holy days in this church established, were so shrewdly shaken that till this day they are not well recovered of the blow them given. Nor came this on the by or besides their purpose, but as a thing that specially was intended from the first beginning."⁷

In a former chapter, we called attention to the fact that Sunday can be maintained as a divine institution only by adopting the rule of faith acknowledged in the church of Rome, which is, the Bible with the traditions of the church added thereto. We have seen that in the sixteenth century the Presbyterians of England were brought to decide between giving up Sunday as a church festival and maintaining it as a divine institution by the Bible. They chose the latter course. Yet while apparently avoiding the charge of observing a Catholic festival, by claiming to prove the Sunday institution out of the Bible, the utterly unsatisfactory nature of the several inferences adduced from the Scriptures in support of that day, compelled them to resort to the traditions of the church, and to add these to their so-called biblical evidences in its behalf. It would be no worse to keep Sunday while frankly acknowledging it to be a festival of the Catholic church, not commanded in the Bible, than it is to profess that you observe it as a biblical institution, and then prove it to be such by adopting the rule of faith of the Romanists. Joaunes Peronne, an eminent Italian Catholic theologian, in an important doctrinal work, entitled, "Theological Lessons," makes a very impressive statement respecting the acknowledgment of tradition by Protestant Sunday-keepers. In his chapter "Concerning the Necessity and Existence of Tradition," he lays down the proposition that it is necessary to admit doctrines which we can prove only from tradition, and cannot sustain from the Holy Scriptures. Then he says:

"It is not possible, indeed, if traditions of such character are rejected, that several doctrines, which the Protestants held with us since they withdrew from the Catholic church, could, in any possible manner, be established. The fact is placed beyond a venture of a doubt, for they themselves hold with us the validity of baptism administered by heretics or infidels, the validity also of infant baptism, the true form of baptism [sprinkling]; they held, too, that the law of abstaining from blood and anything strangled is not in force; also concerning the substitution of the Lord's day for the Sabbath; besides those things which I have mentioned before, and not a few others."⁸

Dr. Bound's theory of the seventh part of time has found general acceptance in all those churches which sprung from the church of Rome. Most forcibly did old Cotton Mather observe:

"The reforming churches, flying from Rome, carried, some of them more, some of them less, all of them something, of Rome with them."⁹

One sacred treasure which they all drew from the venerable mother of harlots is the ancient festival of the sun. She had crushed out of her communion the Sabbath of the lord, and having adopted the venerable day of the sun, had transformed it into the Lord's day of the Christian church. The reformed, flying from her communion, and carrying with them this ancient festival, now found themselves able to justify its observance as being indeed the veritable Sabbath of the Lord! As the seamless coat of Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath, was torn from him before he was nailed to the cross, so has the fourth commandment been torn from the rest-day of the lord, around which it was placed by the great Law-giver, and given to this papal Lord's day; and this Barabbas the robber, thus arrayed in the stolen fourth commandment, has from that time to the present day, and with astonishing success, challenged the obedience of the world as the divinely appointed Sabbath of the most high God. Here we close the history of the Sunday festival, now fully transformed into the Christian Sabbath. A rapid survey of the history of English and American Sabbath-keepers will conclude this work.

1 Hengstenberg's Lord's Day, p. 66.

2 Coleman's Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. xxvi. sect. 2; Heylyn's Hist. Sab. part ii. chap. viii. sect. 7; Neal's Hist. Puritans, part. i. chap. viii.

3 Sabbathum Veteris et Novi Testamenti; or, the True Doctrine of the Sabbath, by Nicholas Bound, D. D., sec. ed. London, 1606, p. 51.

4 Id. p. 66.

5 True Doc. of the Sab. p. 71.

6 Id. p. 72.

7 Hist. Sab. Part ii. Chap. viii. sect. 8.

8 Praelectiones Theologicae, vol. i. part ii. sect. 2, cap. i. p. 194. Propositio. Praeter sacram Scripturam admitti necessario debent Traditiones divinae dogmaticae ab illa prorsus distincte." "Non posse praeterea, rejectis ejusmodi traditionibus, plura dogmata, quae nobiscum retinuerunt protestantes cum ab Ecclesia catholica recesserunt, ullo modo adstruis, res est citra comnis dubitationis aleam posita. Etenim ipsi nobiscum retinuerunt valorem baptismi ab haereticis aut intidelibus administrati, valorem item paedobaptismi, germanam baptismi formam, cessationem legis de abstinence a sanguine et suffocato, de die dominico Sabbatis suffecto, praeter ea quae superius commemoravimus aliaque haud pauca."

9 Backus Hist. of the Baptists in New England, p. 63, ed. 1777.

CHAPTER 26

ENGLISH SABBATH-KEEPERS

English Sabbatarians in the sixteenth century - Their doctrines - John Trask for these doctrines pilloried, whipt, and imprisoned - He recants - Character of Mrs. Trask - Her crime - Her indomitable courage - She suffers fifteen year's imprisonment, and dies in the prison - Principles of the Traskites - Brabourne writes in behalf of the seventh day - Appeals to King Charles I. to restore the ancient Sabbath - The king employs Dr. White to write against Brabourne, and Dr. Heylyn to write the History of the Sabbath - The king intimidates Brabourne and he recants - He returns again to the Sabbath - Philip Tandy - James Ockford writes "The Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment" - His book burned - Edward Stennett - Wm. Sellers - Cruel Treatment of Francis Bampfield - Thomas Bampfield - Martyrdom of John James - How the Sabbath cause was prostrated in England.

Chambers speaks thus of Sabbath-keepers in the sixteenth century:

"In the reign of Elizabeth, it occurred to many conscientious and independent thinkers (as it had previously done to some Protestants in Bohemia), that the fourth commandment required of them the observance, not of the first, but of the specified seventh day of the week, and a strict bodily rest, as a service then due to God; while others, though convinced that the day had been altered by divine authority, took up the same opinion as to the scriptural obligation to refrain from work. The former class became numerous enough to make a considerable figure for more than a century in England, under the title of 'Sabbatarians' - a word now exchanged for the less ambiguous appellation of 'Seventh-day Baptists.' "¹

Gilfillan quotes an English writer of the year 1584, John Stockwood, who says that there were then

"A great diversity of opinion among the vulgar people and simple sort, concerning the Sabbath day, and the right use of the same."

And Gilfillan states one of the grounds of controversy thus:

"Some maintaining the unchanged and unchangeable obligation of the seventh-day Sabbath."²

In 1607, an English first-day writer, John Sprint, gave the views of the Sabbath-keepers of that time, which in truth have been substantially the same in all ages:

"They allege reasons drawn, 1. From the precedence of the Sabbath before the law, and before the fall; the laws of which nature are immutable. 2. From the perpetuity of the moral law. 3. And from the large extent thereof appertaining to [the Sabbath above] all [the other precepts]. 4. . . . And of the cause of [this precept of] the law which maketh it perpetual, which is the memorial and

meditation of the works of God; which belong unto the Christians as well as to the Jews."³

John Trask began to speak and write in favor of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord, about the time that King James I., and the archbishop of Canterbury, published the famous "Book of Sports for Sunday," in 1618. His field of labor was London, and being a very zealous man, he was soon called to account by the persecuting authority of the church of England. He took high ground as to the sufficiency of the Scriptures to direct in all religious services, and that the civil authorities ought not to constrain men's consciences in matters of religion. He was brought before the infamous Star Chamber, where a long discussion was held respecting the Sabbath. It was on this occasion that Bishop Andrews first brought forward that now famous first-day argument, that the early martyrs were tested by the question, "Hast thou kept the Lord's day?"⁴

Gilfillan, quoting the words of contemporary writers, says of Trask's trial that,

"For 'making of conventicles and factions, by that means which may tend to sedition and commotion, and for scandalizing the king, the bishops, and the clergy,' 'he was censured in the Star Chamber to be set upon the pillory at Westminster, and from thence to be whipt to the fleet, there to remain a prisoner.' "⁵

This cruel sentence was carried into execution, and finally broke his spirit. After enduring the misery of his prison for one year, he recanted his doctrine.⁶ The case of his wife is worthy of particular mention. Pagitt gives her character thus:

"She was a woman endued with many particular virtues, well worthy the imitation of all good Christians, had not error in other things, especially a spirit of strange unparalleled opinionativeness and obstinacy in her private conceits, spoiled her."⁷

Pagitt says that she was a school teacher of superior excellence. She was particularly careful in her dealings with the poor. He gives her reasons thus:

"This she professed to do out of conscience, as believing she must one day come to be judged for all things done in the flesh. Therefore she resolved to go by the safest rule, rather against than for her private interests."⁸

Pagitt gives her crime in the following words:

"At last for teaching only five days in the week, and resting upon Saturday, it being known upon what account she did it, she was carried to the new prison in Maiden lane, a place then appointed for the restraint of several other persons of different opinions from the church of England."⁹

Observe the crime: it was not what she did, for a first-day person might have done the same, but because she did it to obey the fourth commandment. Her motive exposed her to the vengeance of the authorities. She was a woman of indomitable courage, and would not purchase her liberty by renouncing the Lord's Sabbath. During her long imprisonment, Pagitt says that some one wrote her thus:

"Your constant suffering would be praiseworthy, were it for truth; but being for error, your recantation will be both more acceptable to God, and laudable before men."¹⁰

But her faith and patience held out till she was released by death.

"Mrs. Trask lay fifteen or sixteen years a prisoner for her opinion about the Saturday Sabbath; in all which time she would receive no relief from anybody, notwithstanding she wanted much: alleging that it was written, 'It is more blessed . . . to give than to receive.' Neither would she borrow, because it was written, 'Thou shalt lend to many nations, and shall not borrow.' So she deemed it a dishonor to her head, Christ, either to beg or borrow. Her diet for the most part during her imprisonment, that is, till a little before her death, was bread and water, roots and herbs; no flesh, nor wine, nor brewed drink. All her means was an annuity of forty shillings a year; what she lacked more to live upon she had of such prisoners as did employ her sometimes to do business for them."¹¹

Pagitt, who was the contemporary of Trask, thus states the principles of the Sabbatarians of that time, whom he calls Traskites:

"The positions concerning the Sabbath by them maintained were these:

"1. That the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy' [Ex. 20], is a divine precept, simply and entirely moral, containing nothing legally ceremonial in whole or in part, and therefore the weekly observation thereof ought to be perpetual, and to continue in force and virtue to the world's end.

"2. That the Saturday, or seventh day in every week, ought to be an everlasting holy day in the Christian church, and the religious observation of this day obligeth Christians under the gospel, as it did the Jews before the coming of Christ.

3. That the Sunday, or Lord's day, is an ordinary working day, and it is superstition and will-worship to make the same the Sabbath of the fourth commandment."¹²

It was for this noble confession of faith that Mrs. Trask was shut up in prison till the day of her death. For the same, Mr. Trask was compelled to stand in the pillory, and was whipped from thence to the fleet, and then shut up in a wretched prison, from which he escaped by recantation after enduring the miseries of more than a year.¹³

Mr. Utter mentions the next Sabbatarian minister as follows:

"Theophilus Brabourne, a learned minister of the gospel in the established church, wrote a book, which was printed at London in 1628, wherein he argued 'that the Lord's day is not the Sabbath day by divine institution,' but 'that the seventh-day Sabbath is now in force.' Mr. Brabourne published another book in 1632, entitled, 'A Defense of that most Ancient and Sacred Ordinance of God's, the Sabbath Day.'"¹⁴

Brabourne dedicated his book to King Charles I., requesting him to use his royal authority for the restoration of the ancient Sabbath. But those who put their trust in princes are sure to be disappointed. Dr. F. White, bishop of Ely, thus states the occasion of his own work against the Sabbath:

"Now because this Brabourne's treatise of the Sabbath was dedicated to his Royal Majesty, and the principles upon which he grounded all his arguments (being commonly preached, printed, and believed throughout the kingdom), might have poisoned and infected many people either with this Sabbatarian error, or with some other of like quality; it was the king, our gracious master, his will and pleasure, that a treatise should be set forth, to prevent further mischief, and to settle his good subjects (who have long time been distracted about Sabbatarian questions) in the old and good way of the ancient and orthodoxal Catholic

church. Now that which his sacred Majesty commanded, I have by your Grace's direction [Archbishop Laud] obediently performed."¹⁵

The king not only wished by this appointment to overthrow those who kept the day enjoined in the commandment, but also those who by means of Dr. Bound's new theory pretended that Sunday was that day. He therefore joined Dr. Heylyn with Bishop White in this work:

"Which burden being held of too great weight for any one to undergo, and the necessity of the work requiring a quick dispatch, it was held fit to divide the employment betwixt two. The argumentative and scholastical part was referred to the right learned Dr. White, then bishop of Ely, who had given good proof of his ability in polemical matters in several books and disputations against the papists. The practical and historical [was to be written], by Heylyn of Westminster, who had gained some reputation for his studies in the ancient writers."¹⁶

The works of White and Heylyn were published simultaneously in 1635. Dr. White, in addressing himself to those who enforce Sunday observance by the fourth commandment, speaks thus of Brabourne's arguments, that not Sunday, but the ancient seventh day, is there enjoined:

"Maintaining your own principles that the fourth commandment is purely and simply moral and of the law of nature, it will be impossible for you either in English or in Latin, to solve Theophilus Brabourne's objections."¹⁷

But the king had something besides argument for Brabourne. He was brought before Archbishop Laud and the court of High Commission, and, moved by the fate of Mrs. Trask, he submitted for the time to the authority of the church of England, but sometime afterward wrote other books in behalf of the seventh day.¹⁸ Dr. White's book has this pithy notice of the indefinite-time theory:

"Because an indefinite time must either bind to all moments of time, as a debt, when the day of payment is not expressly dated, is liable to payment every moment; or else it binds to no time at all."¹⁹

Mr. Utter, after the statement of Brabourne's case, continues thus:

"About this time Philip Tandy began to promulgate in the northern part of England the same doctrine concerning the Sabbath. He was educated in the established church, of which he became a minister. Having changed his views respecting the mode of baptism and the day of the Sabbath, he abandoned that church and 'became a mark for many shots.' He held several public disputes about his peculiar sentiments, and did much to propagate them. James Ockford was another early advocate in England of the claims of the seventh day as the Sabbath. He appears to have been well acquainted with the discussions in which Trask and Brabourne had been engaged. Being dissatisfied with the pretended conviction of Brabourne, he wrote a book in defense of Sabbatarian views, entitled, 'The Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment.' This book, published about the year 1642, was burnt by order of the authorities in the established church."²⁰

The famous Stennett family furnished, for four generations, a succession of able Sabbatarian ministers. Mr. Edward Stennett, the first of these, was born about the beginning of the seventeenth century. His work entitled, "The Royal Law Contended For," was first published at London in 1658. "He was an able and devoted minister, but dissenting from the established church, he was deprived of the means of support." "He suffered much of the persecution which the Dissenters were exposed to at that time, and more especially for his faithful

adherence to the cause of the Sabbath. For this truth he experienced tribulation, not only from those in power, by whom he was kept a long time in prison, but also much distress from unfriendly, dissenting brethren, who strove to destroy his influence, and ruin his cause." In 1664, he published a work entitled, "The Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the Lord."²¹ In 1671, Wm. Sellers wrote a work in behalf of the seventh day in reply to Dr. Owen. Cox states its object thus:

"In opposition to the opinion that some one day in seven is all that the fourth commandment requires to be set apart, the writer maintains the obligation of the Saturday Sabbath on the ground that 'God himself directly in the letter of the text calls the seventh day the Sabbath day, giving both the names to one and the self-same day, as all men know that ever read the commandments.' "²²

One of the most eminent Sabbatarian ministers of the last half of the seventeenth century was Francis Bampfield. He was originally a clergyman of the Church of England. The Baptist historian, Crosby, speaks of him thus:

"But being utterly unsatisfied in his conscience with the conditions of conformity, he took his leave of his sorrowful and weeping congregation in . . . 1662, and was quickly after imprisoned for worshiping God in his own family. So soon was his unshaken loyalty to the king forgotten, . . . that he was more frequently imprisoned and exposed to greater hardships for his nonconformity, than most other dissenters."²³

Of his imprisonment, Neale says:

"After the act of uniformity, he continued preaching as he had opportunity in private, till he was imprisoned for five days and nights, with twenty-five of his hearers in one room . . . where they spent their time in religious exercises, but after some time he was released. Soon after, he was apprehended again and lay nine years in Dorchester jail, though he was a person of unshaken loyalty to the king."²⁴

During his imprisonment, he preached almost every day, and gathered a church even under his confinement. And when he was at liberty, he ceased not to preach in the name of Jesus. After his release, he went to London, where he preached with much success.²⁵ Neale says of his labors in that city:

"When he resided in London he formed a church on the principles of the Sabbatarian Baptist, at Pinner's hall, of which principles he was a zealous asserter. He was a celebrated preacher, and a man of serious piety."²⁶

On Feb. 17, 1682, he was arrested while preaching, and on March 28, was sentenced to forfeit all his goods and to be imprisoned in Newgate for life. In consequence of the hardships which he suffered in that prison, he died, Feb. 16, 1683.²⁷ "Bampfield," says Wood, "dying in the said prison of Newgate . . . aged seventy years, his body was . . . followed with a very great company of factious and schismatical people to his grave."²⁸ Crosby says of him:

"All that knew him will acknowledge that he was a man of great piety. And he would in all probability have preserved the same character, with respect to his learning and judgment, had it not been for his opinion in two points, viz., that infants ought not to be baptized, and that the Jewish Sabbath ought still to be kept."²⁹

Mr. Bampfield published two works in behalf of the seventh day as the Sabbath, one in 1672, the other in 1677. In the first of these he thus sets forth the doctrine of the Sabbath:

"The law of the seventh-day Sabbath was given before the law was proclaimed at Sinai, even from the creation, given to Adam, . . . and in him to all the world.³⁰ . . . The Lord Christ's obedience unto this fourth word in observing in his lifetime the seventh day as a weekly Sabbath day, . . . and no other day of the week as such, is a part of that perfect righteousness which every sound believer doth apply to himself in order to his being justified in the sight of God; and every such person is to conform unto Christ in all the acts of his obedience to the ten words."³¹

His brother, Mr. Thomas Bampfield, who had been speaker in one of Cromwell's parliaments, wrote also in behalf of seventh-day observance, and was imprisoned for his religious principles in Ilchester jail.³² About the time of Mr. Bampfield's first imprisonment, severe persecution arose against the Sabbath-keepers in London. Crosby thus bears testimony:

"It was about this time [A.D. 1661], that a congregation of Baptists holding the seventh day as a Sabbath, being assembled at their meeting-house in Bull-stake alley, the doors being open, about three o'clock P.M. [Oct. 19], whilst Mr. John James was preaching, one Justice Chard, with Mr. Wood, an headborough, came into the meeting-place. Wood commanded him in the king's name to be silent and come down, having spoken treason against the king. But Mr. James, taking little or no notice thereof, proceeded in his work. The headborough came nearer to him in the middle of the meeting-place and commanded him again in the king's name to come down or else he would pull him down; whereupon the disturbance grew so great that he could not proceed."³³

The officer having pulled him down from the pulpit, led him away to the court under a strong guard. Mr. Utter continues this narrative as follows:

"Mr. James was himself examined and committed to Newgate, on the testimony of several profligate witnesses, who accused him of speaking treasonable words against the king. His trial took place about a month afterward, at which he conducted himself in such a manner as to create much sympathy. He was, however, sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered.³⁴ This awful sentence did not dismay him in the least. He calmly said, 'Blessed be God; whom man condemneth, God justifieth.' While he lay in prison, under sentence of death, many persons of distinction visited him, who were greatly affected by his piety and resignation, and offered to exert themselves to secure his pardon. But he seems to have had little hope of their success. Mrs. James, by advice of her friends, twice presented petitions to the king [Charles II.], setting forth the innocence of her husband, the character of the witnesses against him, and entreating His Majesty to grant a pardon. In both instances she was repulsed with scoffs and ridicule. At the scaffold, on the day of his execution, Mr. James addressed the assembly in a very noble and affecting manner. Having finished his address, and kneeling down, he thanked God for covenant mercies, and for conscious innocence; he prayed for the witnesses against him, for the executioner, for the people of God, for the removal of divisions, for the coming of Christ, for the spectators, and for himself, that he might enjoy a sense of God's favor and presence, and an entrance into glory. When he had ended, the executioner said, 'The Lord receive your soul;' to which Mr. James replied, 'I thank thee.' A friend observing to him, 'This is a happy day,' he answered, 'I bless God it is.' Then having thanked the sheriff for his courtesy, he said, 'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit.' . . . After he was dead his heart was taken out and burned, his quarters were affixed to the gates of the city, and his head was set up in White chapel on a pole opposite to the alley in which his meeting-house stood."³⁵

Such was the experience of English Sabbath-keepers in the seventeenth century. It cost something to obey the fourth commandment in such times as those. The laws of England

during that century were very oppressive to all Dissenters, and bore exceedingly hard upon the Sabbath-keepers. But God raised up able men, eminent for piety, to defend his truth during those troublous times, and, if need be, to seal their testimony with their blood. In the seventeenth century, eleven churches of Sabbatarians flourished in England, while many scattered Sabbath-keepers were to be found in various parts of that kingdom. Now, but three of these churches are in existence! And only remnants, even of these, remain!

To what cause shall we assign this painful fact? It is not because their adversaries were able to confute their doctrine; for the controversial works on both sides still remain, and speak for themselves. It is not that they lacked men of piety and of learning; for God gave them these, especially in the seventeenth century. Nor is it that fanaticism sprang up and disgraced the cause; for there is no record of anything of this kind. They were cruelly persecuted, but the period of their persecution was that of their greatest prosperity. Like Moses' bush, they stood unconsumed in the burning fire. The prostration of the Sabbath cause in England is due to none of these things.

The Sabbath was wounded in the house of its own friends. They took upon themselves the responsibility, after a time, of making the Sabbath of no practical importance, and of treating its violation as no very serious transgression of the law of God. Doubtless they hoped to win men to Christ and his truth by this course; but, instead of this, they simply lowered the standard of divine truth into the dust. The Sabbath-keeping ministers assumed the pastoral care of first-day churches, in some cases as their sole charge, in others, they did this in connection with the oversight of Sabbatarian churches. The result need surprise no one; as these Sabbath-keeping ministers and churches said to all men, in thus acting, that the fourth commandment might be broken with impunity, the people took them at their word. Mr. Crosby, a first-day historian, sets this matter in a clear light:

"If the seventh day ought to be observed as the Christian Sabbath, then all congregations that observe the first day as such must be Sabbath-breakers. . . . I must leave those gentlemen on the contrary side to their own sentiments; and to vindicate the practice of becoming pastors to a people whom in their conscience they must believe to be breakers of the Sabbath."³⁶

Doubtless there have been noble exceptions to this course; but the body of English Sabbatarians for many years have failed to faithfully discharge the high trust committed to them.

1 Chambers' Cyclopedia, article, Sabbath, vol. viii. p. 402, London, 1867.

2 Gilfillan's Sabbath, p. 60.

3 Observation of the Christian Sabbath, p. 2.

4 See the fifteenth chapter of this work.

5 Gilfillan's Sabbath, p. 88.

6 Id.Ib.

7 Pagitt's Heresiography, p. 209, London, 1661.

8 Pagitt's Heresiography, p. 209.

9 Id. p. 210.

10 Id. p. 164.

11 Pagitt's Heresiography, pp. 196, 197.

12 Id. p. 161.

13 Manual of the Seventh-day Baptists, pp. 17, 18; Heylyn's Hist. of the Sab. part ii. chap. viii. sect. 10; Gilfillan's Sabbath, pp. 88, 89; Cox's Sabbath Literature, vol. i. pp. 152, 153.

14 Manual of the S.D. Baptists, p. 18.

15 Dr. Francis White's Treatise of the Sabbath Day, quoted in Cox's Sab. Lit. vol. i. p. 167.

16 Heylyn's Cyprianus Anglicus, quoted in Cox, vol. i. p. 173.

17 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 110.

18 Hessey's Bampton Lectures, pp. 373, 374; Cox's Sab. Lit. vol. ii. p. 6; A.H. Lewis's Sabbath and Sunday, pp. 197-184. This work contains much valuable information respecting English and American Sabbatarians.

19 Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 73.

20 Manual of the S.D. Baptists, pp. 19, 20.

21 Cox, vol. i. p. 268; vol. ii. p. 10.

22 Id. vol. ii. p. 35.

23 Hist. English Baptists, vol. i. pp. 365, 366.

24 Hist. Puritans, part 2. chap. x.

25 Crosby's Hist. Eng. Baptists, vol. i. pp. 366, 367.

26 Hist. Puritans, part 2, chap. x.

27 Calamy's Ejected Ministers, vol. ii. pp. 258, 259; Lewis' Sabbath and Sunday, pp. 188-193.

28 Wood's Athenae Oxonienses, vol. iv. p. 123.

29 Crosby, vol. i. p. 367.

30 Ex.16:23; Gen.2:3.

31 Judgment for the Observation of the Jewish or Seventh-day Sabbath, pp. 6-8, 1672.

32 Calamy, vol. 2, p. 260.

33 Crosby, vol. 2. pp. 165-171.

34 When asked what he had to say why sentence should not be pronounced, he said he would leave with them these scriptures: Jer.26:14,15; Ps.116:15.

35 Manual, &c. pp. 21-23.

36 Crosby's Hist. Eng. Bapt. vol. iii. pp. 138, 139.

CHAPTER 27

THE SABBATH IN AMERICA

The first Sabbath-keeping church in America - Names of its members - Origin of the second - Organization of the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference - Statistics of the Denomination at that time - Nature of its organization - Present Statistics - Educational facilities - Missionary work - The American Sabbath Tract Society - Responsibility for the light of the Sabbath - The German S.D. Baptists of Pennsylvania - Reference to Sabbath-keepers in Hungary - In Siberia - The Seventh-day Adventists - Their origin - Labors of Joseph Bates - Of James White - The Publishing Association - Systematic Benevolence - The work of the preachers mainly in new fields - Organization of the S.D. Adventists - Statistics - Peculiarities of their faith - Their object - The S.D. Adventists of Switzerland - Why the Sabbath is of priceless value to mankind - The nations of the saved observe the Sabbath in the new earth.

The first Sabbatarian church in America originated at Newport, R.I. The first Sabbath-keeper in America was Stephen Mumford, who left London three years after the martyrdom of John James, and forty-four years after the landing of the pilgrim fathers at Plymouth. Mr. Mumford, it appears, came as a missionary from the English Sabbath-keepers.¹ Mr. Isaac Backus, the historian of the early New England Baptists, makes the following record:

"Stephen Mumford came over from London in 1664, and brought the opinion with him that the whole of the ten commandments, as they were delivered from Mount Sinai, were moral and immutable; and that it was the Antichristian power which thought to change times and laws, that changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Several members of the first church in Newport embraced this sentiment, and yet continued with the church for some years, until two men and their wives who had so done, turned back to the keeping of the first day again."²

Mr. Mumford, on his arrival, went earnestly to work to convert men to the observance of the fourth commandment, as we infer from the following record:

"Stephen Mumford, the first Sabbath-keeper in America, came from London in 1664. Tacy Hubbard commenced keeping the Sabbath, March 11, 1665. Samuel Hubbard commenced April 1, 1665. Rachel Langworthy, January 15, 1666. Roger Baxter, April 15, 1666, and William Hiscox, April 28, 1666. These were the first Sabbath-keepers in America. a controversy, lasting several years, sprung up between them and members of the church. They desired to retain their connection with the church, but were, at last, compelled to withdraw, that they might peaceably enjoy and keep God's holy day."³ [Baxter is Baster in the S.D.B. Memorial.]

Though Mr. Mumford faithfully taught the truth, he seems to have cherished the ideas of the English Sabbatarians, that it was possible for first-day and seventh-day observers to walk together in church fellowship. Had the first-day people been of the same mind, the light of the Sabbath would have been extinguished within a few years, as the history of English Sabbath-keepers clearly proves. But, in the providence of God, the danger was averted by the opposition which these commandment-keepers had to encounter.

Besides the persons above enumerated, four others embraced the Sabbath in 1666, but in 1668 they renounced it. These four were also members of the first-day Baptist church of Newport. Though the Sabbath-keepers who retained their integrity thought that they might lawfully commune with the members of the church who were fully persuaded to observe the first day, yet they felt otherwise with respect to these who had clearly seen the Sabbath, and had for a time observed it, and then apostatized from it. These persons "both wrote and spoke against it, which so grieved them that they could not sit down at the table of the Lord with them, nor with the church because of them." But as they were members of a first-day church, and had "no power to deal with them as of themselves without the help of the church," they "found themselves barred as to proceeding with them, as being but private brethren. So they concluded not to bring the case to the church to judge of the fact, viz., in turning from the observation of the seventh day, being contrary-minded as to that." They therefore sent to the London Sabbath-keepers for advice, and in the mean time refrained from communing with the church.

Dr. Edward Stennet wrote them in behalf of the London Sabbath-keepers: "If the church will hold communion with these apostates from the truth, you ought then to desire to be fairly dismissed from the church; which if the church refuse, you ought to withdraw yourselves."⁴ They decided, however, not to leave the church. But they told "the church publicly that they could not have comfortable communion with those four persons that had sinned." "And thus for several months they walked with little or no offense from the church; after which the leading or ministering brethren began to declare themselves concerning the ten precepts." Mr. Tory "declared the law to be done away." Mr. Luker and Mr. Clarke "made it their work to preach the non-observation of the law, day after day." But the Sabbath-keepers replied "that the ten precepts were still as holy, just, good, and spiritual, as ever." Mr. Tory "with some unpleasant words said 'that their tune was only the fourth precept,' to which they answered, 'that the whole ten precepts were of equal force with them, and that they did not plead for one without the other.' And they for several years, went on with the church in a halvish kind of fellowship."⁵

Mr. Bailey thus states the result:

"At the time of their change of sentiment and practice, [respecting the Bible Sabbath], they had no intention of establishing a church with this distinctive feature. God, evidently, had a different mission for them, and brought them to it, through the severe trial of persecution. They were forced to leave the fellowship of the Baptist church, or abandon the Sabbath of the Lord their God."⁶

"These left the Baptist church on December 7, 1671."⁷

"On the 23d of December, just sixteen days after withdrawing from the Baptist church, they covenanted together in a church organization."⁸

Such was the origin of the first Sabbath-keeping church in America.⁹ The second of these churches owes its origin to this circumstance: About the year 1700, Edmund Dunham of Piscataway, N.J., reproved a person for labor on Sunday. He was asked for his authority from the Scriptures. On searching for this, he became satisfied that the seventh day is the only weekly Sabbath in the Bible, and began to observe it.

"Soon after, others followed his example, and in 1707 a Seventh-day Baptist church was organized, with seventeen members. Edmund Dunham was chosen pastor and sent to Rhode Island to receive ordination."¹⁰

The S.D. Baptist General Conference was organized in 1802. At its first annual session, it included in its organization eight churches, nine ordained ministers, and 1130 members.¹¹ The Conference was organized with only advisory powers, the individual churches retaining the matters of discipline and church government in their own hands.¹² The Conference now embraces some eighty churches, and about 8000 members. These churches are found in most of the northern and western States, and are divided into five associations, which, however, have no legislative nor disciplinary power over the churches which compose them. There are, belonging to the denomination, five academies, one college, "and a university with academic, collegiate, mechanical, and theological departments in operation."¹³ The S.D. Baptist missionary society sustains several home missionaries who labor principally on the western and southern borders of the denomination. They have within a few years past met with a good degree of success in this work. It has also a missionary station at Shanghai, China, and a small church there of faithful Christians.

The American Sabbath Tract Society is the publishing agency of the denomination. Its headquarters are at Alfred Center, N.Y. It publishes the Sabbath Recorder, the organ of the S.D. Baptists, and it also publishes a series of valuable works relating to the Sabbath and the law of God.

During the two hundred years which have elapsed since the organization of the first Sabbatarian church in America, God has raised up among this people men of eminent talent and moral worth. He has also in providential ways called attention to the sacred trust which he so long since confided to the S.D. Baptists, and which they have been slow to realize in its immense importance.

Among those converted to the Sabbath through the agency of this people, the name of J.W. Morton is particularly worthy of honorable mention. He was sent in 1847 a missionary to the island of Haiti by the Reformed Presbyterians. Here he came in contact with Sabbatarian publications, and after a serious examination became satisfied that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. As an honest man, what he saw to be truth he immediately obeyed, and returning home to be tried for his heresy, was summarily expelled from the Reformed Presbyterian church without being suffered to state the reasons which had governed his conduct. He has given to the world a valuable work, entitled, "Vindication of the True Sabbath," in which his experience is related, and his reasons for observing the seventh day set forth with great force and clearness.

The S.D. Baptists do not lack men of education and of talent, and they have ample means in their possession with which to sustain the cause of God. If in time past they have not fully realized that they were debtors to all mankind because of the great truth which God committed to their trust, there is reason to believe that they are now to some extent awakening to this vast indebtedness.¹⁴

There is also in the State of Pennsylvania a small body of German S.D. Baptist found in the counties of Lancaster, York, Franklin, and Bedford, and in the central and western parts of the State. They originated in 1728 from the teaching of Conrad Beissel, a native of Germany. They practice trine immersion, and the washing of feet, and observe open communion. They encourage celibacy, but make it obligatory upon none. Even those who have chosen this manner of life are at liberty to marry if at any time they choose so to do. They established and successfully maintained a Sabbath-school at Ephrata, their head-quarters, forty years before Robert Raikes had introduced the system of Sunday-schools. This people have suffered much persecution because of their observance of the seventh day, the laws of Pennsylvania being

particularly oppressive toward Sabbatarians.¹⁵ The German S.D. Baptists do not belong to the S.D. Baptist General Conference.

We have already noticed the fact that Sabbath-keepers are numerous in Russia, in Poland, and in Turkey. We find the following statement respecting Sabbath-keepers in Hungary:

"A Congregation of seventh-day Christians in Hungary, being refused tolerance by the laws, has embraced Judaism, in order to be allowed to exist in connection with one of the 'received religions.' "¹⁶

The probability is that as the laws of the Austrian Empire bear very heavily upon all religious bodies not belonging to some one of the tolerated sects or orders, these "Seventh-day Christians" on "being refused tolerance" in their own name, secured the privilege of observing the seventh day by allowing their doctrine to be classed by the civil authorities under the head of Judaism, and so bringing themselves under the tolerance accorded to the "received religions." We do not say that this was right, even as a technicality, but it is evidently the extent of what they did. There is no reason to believe that they abjured Christ. We also learn that there are Sabbath-keepers in the north of Asia:

"There is a sect of Greek Christians in Siberia who keep the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday). Such sects already exist in the United States, in Germany, and we believe in England."¹⁷

The Sabbath was first introduced to the attention of the Advent people at Washington, N.H. A faithful Seventh-day Baptist sister, Mrs. Rachel D. Preston, from the State of New York, having removed to this place, brought with her the Sabbath of the Lord. Here she became interested in the doctrine of the glorious advent of the Saviour at hand. Being instructed in this subject by the Advent people, she in turn instructed them in the commandments of God, and as early as 1844, nearly the entire church in that place, consisting of about forty persons, became observers of the Sabbath of the Lord.¹⁸ The oldest body of Sabbath-keepers among the Seventh-day Adventists is therefore at Washington, N.H. Its present number is small, for it has been thinned by emigration and by the ravages of death; but there still remains a small company to bear witness to this ancient truth of the Bible.

From this place, several Advent ministers received the Sabbath truth during the year 1844. One of these was Eld. T.M. Preble, who has the honor of first bringing this great truth before the Adventists through the medium of the press. His essay was dated Feb. 13, 1845. He presented briefly the claims of the Bible Sabbath, and showed that it was not changed by the Saviour, but was changed by the great apostasy. He then said:

"Thus we see Dan. 7:25, fulfilled, the little horn changing 'times and laws.' Therefore it appears to me that all who keep the first day for the Sabbath, are Pope's Sunday-keepers, and God's Sabbath breakers."¹⁹

Within a few months many persons began to observe the Sabbath as the result of the light thus shed on their pathway. Eld. J.B. Cook, a man of decided talent as a preacher and a writer, was one of these early converts to the Sabbath. Elders Preble and Cook were at this time in full vigor of their mental powers, and were possessed of talent and a reputation for piety, which gave them great influence among the Adventists in behalf of the Sabbath. These men were called in the providence of God to fill an important place in the work of Sabbath reform.

But both of them, while preaching and writing in its behalf, committed the fatal error of making it of no practical importance. They had apparently the same fellowship for those who rejected the Sabbath that they had for those who observed it. Such a course of action produced

its natural result. After two or three years of this kind of Sabbath observance, each of these men apostatized from it, and thenceforward used what influence they possessed in warring against the fourth commandment. The larger part of those who embraced the Sabbath from their labors were not sufficiently impressed with its importance to become settled and grounded in its weighty evidences, and, after a brief period, they turned back from its observance. But enough had been done to excite bitter opposition toward the Sabbath on the part of many Adventists, and to bring out the ingenious and plausible arguments by which men attempt to prove that God has abolished his own sacred law.

Such was the fruit of their course, and such the condition of things at the time of their defection. But the result of their plan of action taught the Advent Sabbath-keepers a lesson of value, which they have never forgotten. They learned that the fourth commandment must be treated as a part of the moral law, if men are ever to be led to its sacred observance.

Eld. Preble's first article in behalf of the Sabbath was the means of calling the attention of our venerable brother, Joseph Bates, to this divine institution. He soon became convinced of its obligation, and at once began to observe it. He had acted quite a prominent part in the Advent movement of 1843-4, and now, with self-sacrificing zeal, he took hold of the despised Sabbath truth to set it before this fellow-men. He did not do it in the half-way manner of Elders Preble and Cook, but as a man thoroughly in earnest and fully alive to the importance of his subject.

The subject of the heavenly Sanctuary began about this time to interest many Adventists, and especially Eld. Bates. He was one of the first to see that the central object of that Sanctuary is the ark of God. He also called attention to the proclamation of the third angel relative to God's commandments. He girded on the armor to lay it down only when his work should be accomplished. He has been instrumental in leading many to the observance of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and few who have received the Sabbath from his teaching have apostatized from it.²⁰

It was but a few months after Eld. Bates, that our esteemed and efficient brother, Eld. James White, also embraced the Sabbath. He had labored with much success in the great Advent movement, and he now entered heartily into the work of Sabbath reform. Uniting with Eld. Bates in the proclamation of the doctrine of the advent and the Sabbath as connected together in the Sanctuary and the message of the third angel, he has, with the blessing of God, accomplished great results in behalf of the Sabbath.

The publishing interests of the Seventh-day Adventists originated through his instrumentality. He began the work of publishing in 1849, without resources, and with very few friends, but with much toil, self-sacrifice, and anxious care; and with the blessing of God upon his efforts, he has been the means of establishing an efficient office of publication, and of disseminating many important works throughout our country, and, to some extent, to other nations also. The publication of the *Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath*, the organ of the Seventh-day Adventists, was commenced by him in 1850. For most of the years of its existence, he has served as one of its editors; and for all its earlier years, he was both publisher and sole editor. During this time, he has also labored with energy as a minister of the gospel of Christ.

The wants of the cause demanding an enlargement of capital and more extensive operations, to this end an Association was incorporated in the city of Battle Creek, Michigan, May 3, 1861, under the name of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association. This Association owns three commodious publishing houses, with engine, power presses, and all the fixtures necessary for doing an extensive business. There are about fifty persons constantly employed

in this work of publication. The Association has a capital of about \$70,000. Under God, it owes its prosperity to the prudent management and untiring energy of Eld. James White.

The Advent Review has at the present time (Nov., 1873) a circulation of about 5000 copies. The Youth's Instructor, a monthly paper designed for the children of Sabbath-keeping Adventists, began to be issued in 1852, and has now attained a circulation of nearly 5000 copies.

The Advent Tidende, a Danish monthly with a circulation of 800, is published for the benefit of those who speak the Danish and Norwegian tongues, of whom a considerable number have embraced the Sabbath.

The S.D. Adventists have taken a strong interest in the subject of hygiene and the laws of health, and have established a Health Institute at Battle Creek, Mich., which publishes the Health Reformer, a monthly journal, magazine form, having a circulation of nearly 5000 copies.

Numerous publications on Prophecy, the Signs of the Times, the Coming of Christ, the Sabbath, the Law of God, the Sanctuary, &c., &c., have been issued within the past twenty years, and have had an extensive circulation, amounting, in the aggregate, to many millions of pages.

The ordinary financial wants of the cause are sustained by a method of collecting means known as Systematic Benevolence. By this system, it is designed that each friend of the cause shall pay a certain sum weekly proportioned to the property which he possesses. But there is no compulsion in this matter. In this manner the burden is borne by all, so that it rests heavily upon none; and the means needed for the work flows with a steady stream into the treasury of the several churches, and finally into that of the State Conferences. A settlement is instituted each year at the State Conferences, in which the labors, receipts, and expenditures, of each minister are carefully considered. Thus none are allowed to waste means, and none who are recognized as called of God to the ministry are allowed to suffer.

The churches sustain their meetings for the most part without the aid of preaching. They raise means to sustain the servants of Christ, but bid them mainly devote their time and strength to save those who have not the light of these important truths shining upon their pathway. So they go out everywhere preaching the word of God, as his providence guides their feet. During the summer months, the work in new fields is carried forward principally by means of large tents, which enable the preacher to provide a suitable place of worship, wherever he may think it desirable to labor.

The Seventh-day Adventists have thirteen State Conferences, which assemble annually in their respective States. These bear the names of Maine, Vermont, New England, New York and Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri and Kansas, and California. These Conferences are designed to meet the local wants of the cause. There is also a General Conference, which assembles yearly, composed of delegates from the State Conferences. This Conference takes the general oversight of the work in all the State Conferences, supplying the more destitute with laborers as far as possible, and uniting the whole strength of the body for the accomplishment of the work. It also takes the charge of missionary labor in those States which have no organized Conferences.

There are about fifty ministers who devote their whole time to the work of the gospel. There is also a considerable number who preach a portion of the time and devote the remainder to

secular labor. There are about 6000 members in the several Conference organizations. But such is the scattered condition of this people (for they are found in all the northern States and in several of the southern), that a very large portion have no connection with its organization. They are to be found in single families scattered all the way from Maine to California and Oregon. The Review and Instructor constitute, in a great number of cases, the only preachers of their faith.

Those subjects which more especially interest this people, are the fulfillment of prophecy, the second personal advent of the Saviour as an event now near at hand, immortality through Christ alone, a change of heart through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, the divinity and mediatorial work of Christ, and the development of a holy character by obedience to the perfect and holy law of God.²¹

They are very strict with regard to the ordinance of baptism, believing not only that it requires men to be buried in the watery grave, but that even such baptism is faulty if administered to those who are breaking one of the ten commandments. They also believe that our Lord's direction in John 13 should be observed in connection with the supper.

They teach that the gifts of the Spirit set forth in 1Cor.12 and Eph.4, were designed to remain in the church till the end of time. They believe that these were lost in consequence of the same apostasy that changed the Sabbath. They also believe that in the final restoration of the commandments by the work of the third angel, the gifts of the Spirit of God are restored with them. So the remnant of the church, or last generation of its members, is said to "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."²² And the angel of God explains this by saying, "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."²³ The spirit of prophecy therefore has a distant place assigned to it in the final work of Sabbath reform. Such are their views of this portion of Scripture; and their history from the beginning has been marked by the influence of this sacred gift.

In the face of strong opposition, the people known as Seventh-day Adventists have arisen to bear their testimony for the Sabbath of the Lord. They have had perils from open foes, and from false brethren; but they have thus far overcome the difficulties of the way, and from each have gathered strength for the conflict before them. They have a definite work which they hope to accomplish. It is to make ready a people prepared for the advent of the Lord.

Honorable mention should be made of the Seventh-day Adventists of Switzerland. They first learned these precious truths from Elder M.B. Czechowski, who a few years since instructed them in the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Since his labors with them ceased, God has given them strength to stand with firmness for his truth, and has added to their numbers. They have a heart to obey the truth and to sacrifice for its advancement. They number about sixty persons. There are a few individuals of this faith also in Italy, Germany, and Denmark.

The observance of the Sabbath is sometimes advocated on the ground that man needs a day of rest and will grow prematurely old if he labor seven days in each week, which is doubtless true; and it has also been advocated on the ground that God will bless in basket and in store those who hallow his Sabbath, which may be true in many cases; but the Bible does not urge motives of this kind in respect to this sacred institution. Without doubt there are great incidental advantages in the observance of the Sabbath. But these are not what God sets before us as the reasons for its observance. The true reason is infinitely higher than all considerations of this kind, and should constrain men to obey, even were it certain that it would cost them all that is dear in the present life.

The Sabbath has been advocated on the ground that it secures to men a day for divine worship in which by common consent they may appear before God. This is a very important consideration, and yet the Bible says little concerning it. It is one of the incidental blessings of the Sabbath, and not the chief reason for its observance. The Sabbath was ordained to commemorate the creation of the heavens and the earth.

The importance of the Sabbath as the memorial of creation is that it keeps ever present the true reason why worship is due to God. For the worship of God is based upon the fact that he is the Creator and that all other beings were created by him. The Sabbath therefore lies at the very foundation of divine worship, for it teaches this great truth in the most impressive manner, and no other institution does this. The true ground of divine worship, not of that on the seventh day merely, but of all worship, is found in the distinction between the Creator and his creatures. This great fact can never become obsolete, and must never be forgotten. To keep it in man's mind, God gave to him the Sabbath. He received it in his innocence, and notwithstanding the perversity of his professed people, God has preserved this sacred institution through the entire period of man's fallen state.

The four and twenty elders in the very act of worshipping Him who sits upon the throne, state the reason why worship is due to God:

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."²⁴

This great truth is therefore worthy to be remembered even in the glorified state. And we shall presently learn that what God gave to man in Paradise, to keep this great truth before his mind, shall be honored by him in Paradise restored.

The future is given to us in the prophetic Scriptures. From them we learn our earth is reserved unto fire, and that from its ashes shall spring new heavens and earth, and ages of endless date.²⁵ Over this glorified inheritance, the second Adam, the Lord of the Sabbath, shall bear rule, and under his gracious protection the nations of them which are saved shall inherit the land forever.²⁶ When the glory of the Lord shall thus fill the earth as the waters cover the sea, the Sabbath of the Most High is again and for the last time brought to view:

"For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord."²⁷

Does not Paul refer to these very facts set forth by Isaiah when he says, "There remaineth therefore a rest [Greek, Sabbatismos, literally "A KEEPING OF THE SABBATH"] to people of God"?²⁸ The reason for this monthly gathering to the New Jerusalem of all the host of the redeemed from every part of the new earth may be found in the language of the Apocalypse:

"And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing [literally, the service]²⁹ of the nations."³⁰

The gathering of the nations that are saved to the presence of the Creator, from the whole face of the new earth on each successive Sabbath, even in that holy state, and sets the seal of the Most High to the perpetuity of this ancient institution.

1 "When the London Seventh-day Baptists, in 1664, sent Stephen Mumford to America, and in 1675 sent Eld. William Gibson, they did as much, in proportion to their ability, as had been done by any society for propagating the gospel in foreign parts." - Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, vol. i. p. 43.

2 Ch. Hist. of N. England from 1783 to 1796, chap. xi. sect. 10.

3 Hist. of the S.D. Bapt. Gen. Conf. by Jas. Bailey, pp. 237, 238.

4 Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, vol. i. pp. 27, 28, 29.

5 Records of the First Baptist Church in Newport, quoted in the S.D. Baptist Memorial, vol. i. pp. 28-39.

6 Bailey's Hist. pp. 9, 10.

7 Id. p. 237.

8 Id. p. 238.

9 Manual of the S.D. Baptists, pp. 39, 40; Backus, chap. xi. sect. 10.

10 Hist. S.D. Baptist Gen. Conf. pp. 15, 238.

11 Id. pp. 46-55.

12 Id. pp. 57, 58, 62, 74, 82.

13 Sabbath and Sunday, p. 232.

14 Much interesting matter pertaining to the Seventh-day Baptists of America may be found in Utter's Manual of the S.D. Baptists; Bailey's Hist. of the S.D. Bapt. Gen. Conf.; Lewis's Sabbath and Sunday, and in the S.D.B. Memorial.

15 Rupp's History of all the Religious Denominations in the United States, pp. 109-123, second edition; Bailey's Hist. Gen. Conf. pp. 255-258.

16 New York Independent, March 1869.

17 Semi-Weekly Tribune, May 4, 1869.

18 This sister was born at Vernon, Vt. Her maiden name was Rachel D. Harris. At the age of seventeen, she was converted and soon after joined the Methodist church. After her marriage, she removed with her husband to central New York. There, at the age of twenty-eight, she became an observer of the Bible Sabbath. The Methodist minister, her pastor, did what he could to turn her from the Sabbath, but finally told her she might keep it if she would not leave them. But she was faithful to her convictions of duty and united with the first Seventh-day Baptist church of Verona, Oneida Co., N.Y. Her first husband bore the name of Oaks; her second, that of Preston. She and her daughter, Delight Oaks, were members of the first Verona church at the time of their removal to Washington, N.H. The mother died Feb. 1, 1868; the daughter, several years earlier.

19 Eld. Preble's article appeared in the Hope of Israel of Feb. 28, 1845, published at Portland, Maine. This article was reprinted in the Advent Review of Aug. 23, 1870. The article, as

rewritten by Eld. Preble and published in tract form, was also printed in the Review of Dec. 21, 1869.

20 He fell asleep March 19, 1872, in the eightieth year of his age.

21 For a further knowledge of their views, see their weekly paper, the Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath, published at Battle Creek, Michigan, at \$2.00 per year, and the list of publications advertised in its columns.

22 Rev.12:17; 14:12.

23 Rev.19:10.

24 Rev.4:10,11.

25 2Pet.3; Isa.65; Rev.21, 22. Milton thus states this doctrine:

"The world shall burn, and from her ashes spring
New heaven and earth, wherein the just shall dwell,
And after all their tribulation long,
See golden days, fruitful of golden deeds,
With joy and love triumphing, and fair truth."
-Paradise Lost, book iii, lines 234-338.

"So shall the world go on,
To good malignant, to bad men benign;
Under her own weight, groaning; till the day
Appear of respiration to the just,
And vengeance to the wicked, at return
Of Him so lately promised to thy aid,
The woman's seed; obscurely then foretold,
Now ampler known thy Saviour and thy Lord:
Last, in the clouds, from heaven to be revealed
In glory of the Father, to dissolve
Satan with his perverted world; then raise
From the conflagrant mass, purged and refined,
New heaven, new earth, ages of endless date,
Founded in righteousness, and peace, and love;
To bring forth fruits, joy, and eternal bliss."
-Id. book xii, lines 537-551.

26 Dan.7:9,10,13,14, 17-27; Ps.2:7-9; 37:9-11, 18-22, 34; Mal.4:1-3.

27 Isa.66:22,23.

28 Heb.4:9. The margin renders it "a keeping of a Sabbath." Liddell and Scott define Sabbatismos "a keeping of the Sabbath." They give no other definition, but derive it from the verb Sabbatizo, which they define by these words only, "to keep the Sabbath." Schrevelius defines Sabbatismos by this one phrase: "Observance of the Sabbath." He also derives it from Sabbatizo. Sabbatismos is therefore the noun in Greek which signifies the act of Sabbath-keeping, while Sabbatizo, from which it is derived, is the verb which expresses the act.

29 See the Lexicons of Liddell and Scott, Schrevelius, and Greenfield.

30 Rev.22:1,2.

Three Angels of Revelation 14:6-12
By J.N Andrews

Preface

THE Bible is full of references to the second advent of the Saviour and the events of the great day of God. It represents that day as the great day of his wrath; as the time when destruction from the Almighty shall come upon the wicked, and when the land shall be made desolate, and the sinners thereof destroyed out of it. The language of the inspired writers expresses in the most vivid manner the awful and terrific scenes of that day in which God arises from his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth.

Shall mankind have no warning when this destruction is about to burst upon them? Shall there be no token of coming wrath to arrest the guilty in their downward career? Shall irretrievable ruin swallow up a sinful world, and God give them no intimation of its approach?

Such was not the case with the antediluvian world, nor has it ever been the manner of the just Judge of all the earth to visit mankind in judgment without giving them warning of the coming vengeance. The attentive reader of the prophets will find ample testimony in proof of this statement. The judgments of God upon Jerusalem, Samaria, Tyre, Nineveh, and Babylon, are striking illustrations of this fact. Shall we conclude that the last and most dreadful judgment of God shall come upon our earth without previous warning to its inhabitants?

The people of God at the commencement of the great day of wrath will be translated into his everlasting kingdom. That is, they will be clothed upon with immortality, and will never taste of death. What will prepare the saints of the last generation for such a distinguished honor? Will they be found at their Lord's return in a state of confusion and anarchy? Will this be their condition when their returning Lord shall take them in a body unto himself? As the people of God, one by one, have fallen victims to the power of death, and individual work of preparation has been all that was requisite; but when the time comes that all the saints of God who are alive shall in one body be taken into glory, surely something further than an individual work is necessary. By what means shall the saints of God be gathered in one people and prepared for translation? What mighty truths has God in reserve for the last generation, with which to accomplish this great work? In answer to these questions, we cite the fourteenth chapter of Revelation.

The design of the three great proclamations of this chapter, is, first, to give warning of coming judgments; secondly, to set the people of God upon their watch-tower; thirdly, to gather in one body the scattered saints; and, fourthly, to restore the commandments of God to his people, and to prepare them for deliverance in the time of trouble, and for translation into his kingdom.

Such is the work presented in Rev. 14. It gives the world warning, and leaves them without excuse; it lights up the pathway of the saints; and yet, with its trial of patience it shakes off the heartless, and gives the men of the world, notwithstanding its warning, a chance to lull themselves into security, when the wrath of God hangs over their heads. Shall not these great truths arrest attention? Shall it be with us as with the antediluvians, who, warned of the coming destruction, nevertheless knew not until it came and took them all away? When the Son of man cometh, who of us shall be able to say, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us. "?

J. N. A. Battle Creek, Mich., Jan., 1877.

Chapter 1 - Time When The Proclamations Of Rev. 14 Are Made.

Importance of the Subject
Different Views of this Prophecy -
These Proclamations not applicable to the Future Age
Nor can they belong to the Past Ages
The Messages addressed to the Last Generation
Argument from 2 Thess. 2
From Daniel 12 From the Signs
From the Parable of the Supper
From Nahum 2
From the Destruction of Babylon
From the Work of the Two-Horned Beast
Nature of These Proclamations.

WHOEVER will read attentively the proclamations embraced in the fourteenth chapter of Revelation, cannot fail to notice their vast importance. At whatever period in the history of the church these proclamations are made, from their very nature they must constitute the great theme of interest for that generation. Whenever the angels of this chapter are commissioned by God to announce to the nations of the earth that the hour of his Judgment is come, or to proclaim the fall of Babylon, or to utter against the worshipers of the beast the most dreadful threatening which the Bible contains, no man can disregard their work, or treat their warnings as non-essential, except at the peril of his soul. If it were merely possible that these warnings were addressed to ourselves, it would become us to examine this subject with serious attention; but if this point can be proved by decisive testimony, it is certain that we cannot too carefully attend to the warnings here uttered.

It was but a few years ago that all advent believers were united in applying this prophecy to the present generation; but in the period of trial that has followed their disappointment, many of them have, to a great extent, lost sight of their original faith. A considerable number now contend that these angels are to utter their voices of warning in the future age; that is, in a period subsequent to the second advent. Another class attempt to show that they had their fulfillment many ages in the past, the first angel beginning in the days of the apostles, the second in the time of Luther, and the third at a period somewhat later.

As proof that these angels belong to the future age, the fact is adduced that John saw them flying through the midst of heaven immediately after having seen the Lamb stand upon Mount Zion with the 144, 000. As the latter event is future, it is concluded by them that the angels of this prophecy must be future also. If it were a fact that the events predicted in the book of Revelation were there given in consecutive order, there would be some force to this argument. But it is evident that that book is made up of many distinct views, usually introduced by the expression, "And I saw, " or something of that kind, as in Rev. 14:6. The series of events which begins in Chap. 12, with the dragon, evidently extends through the work of the beasts in chap. 13, and ends with a view of the remnant in their glorified state upon Mount Zion. Rev. 14:1-5. Then begins a new series of events with the angel of chap. 14:6.

The following reasons forbid the application of this prophecy to the future age:

1. This view would make the angel with the everlasting gospel to every nation, kindred, and tongue, an angel from heaven with another gospel (Gal. 1:8); for the apostolic commission extended only to the harvest, which is the end of the world. Matt. 28:19, 20; 24:14; 13:24-30; 36:43. Paul participated in this commission (1 Tim. 1:11), and he thus declares its import: that God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness. " Acts 17:30, 31. The apostolic commission extended only to the end, - the day in which God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ. A gospel preached in that day would be another gospel than that preached by Paul, and one that has no Saviour in it. This would indeed show that the angel of Rev. 14:6, 7 was the very being on whom rests the curse of Paul in Gal. 1:8.

2. The second angel announces the fall of Babylon. Rev. 14:8. After this proclamation, a voice is heard from heaven, saying, "Come out of her, my people. " Rev. 18:1-4. That the absurdity of placing this transaction after the second advent may be seen, please read 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. It is there plainly stated that at the coming of Christ, his people shall all be caught up to meet him in the air, and thenceforward be forever with the Lord. Will the Lord take his people to Babylon when he comes? - Never. He says, "I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. " John 14:2, 3. Then the Lord will not have occasion to call his people out of Babylon after the second advent; for from that time onward they are to be forever with him.

3. Let us now see whether the third Angel's Message can be applied to the future age with any propriety. Those who will compare Rev. 14:9-12 and 13:11-17, will see at once that the warning voice of the third angel relates to the fearful scene when the two-horned beast is to act its part in oppressing the saints of the Lord. But if the third angel's proclamation relates to the period which follows the second advent, then the work of the two-horned beast must also transpire in the future age. And what a scene must the future reign of the saints present, if Rev. 13:11-17 is to be fulfilled in that time! But by turning to Rev. 20:4-6 it will be seen that the period for the triumph of the beast and his image, and for the reception of his mark, precedes the thousand years' reign of the saints. And when the reign of the saints commences, the triumph of the beast is past.

The beast doubtless represents the papal power. Rev. 13:1-10; Dan 7:8, 20, 21, 25, 26. But by turning to 2 Thess. 2, we learn that the papacy is to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. Further, we learn from Rev. 19:19-21 that the final overthrow of the beast and the false prophet, or the two-horned beast, takes place in the battle of the great day of God Almighty, in immediate connection with the second advent. By these plain testimonies we establish the fact that the beast will be destroyed at the second advent. Therefore we ask, What danger will there be that men will worship the beast at a time when there will be none for them to worship? God will never send an angel to warn men against the worship of the beast when the beast does not exist.

The language of verse 12, "Here is the patience of the saints, " is sufficient of itself to overthrow the application of these messages to the future age. The following scriptures clearly teach that the patience of the saints refers to the present time, and not to the period of their future glorious reward: "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. " Heb. 10:36. "In your patience possess ye your souls. " Luke 21:19. Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. " James 5:7. Will the

saints have need of patience in the kingdom of God? Will they have to possess their souls in patience after they have received the promise, even life everlasting? 1 John 2:25. It is tribulation that worketh patience. Rom. 5:3 James 1:2, 3. Are the saints in tribulation after they are made immortal and crowned with everlasting joy? -No, never. Isa. 25:8 9; 35:10; Rev. 7:13-17. But the saints are in their patience when the Third Angel's Message is given, hence that message does not belong to the future age.

But verse 12 concludes thus: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. " It is evident that this refers to the period when the remnant are keeping the commandments of God while exposed to the wrath of the dragon (Rev. 12:17), and that it does not refer to the period 9 when the commandment-keepers shall have entered in through the gates into the holy city (Rev. 22:14); and that it refers to the period when the saints are living by faith (Heb. 10:38, 39), and not to the period when they shall have received the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls. 1 Pet. 1:9.

But verse 13, which pronounces a blessing on the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth, that is, from a point of time as late, at least, as the third Angel's Message, presents a testimony which cannot be evaded. It demonstrates that this part of John's vision relates to a period prior to the first resurrection; for the saints cannot die after being made immortal. 1 Cor. 15:51-56. Our Lord testifies that they can die no more, but are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Luke 20:36. If any are still disposed to locate these angels' messages in the day of God itself, let them carefully read the following Scriptures: Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30; Gen. 7:21, 22; Luke 21:35; Ps. 2:6-9; Rev. 2:26, 27; 19:11-21; 22:11, 12; 2 Thess. 1:6-10.

The next inquiry relates to the past. Have not these messages met their fulfillment in the history of the church in past ages? - We think not. Our reasons for this conclusion are, in part, the following:-

1. No proclamation of the hour of God's Judgment come, has ever been made in any past age.
2. If such a proclamation had been made many centuries in the past, as some contend, it would have been a false one.
3. The prophecies on which such a proclamation to men in a state of probation must be based, were closed up and sealed to the time of the end.
4. The scriptures plainly locate the message of warning respecting the Judgment in brief space immediately preceding the advent of our Lord, thus directly contradicting the view that locates these messages in past ages.

We now offer proof in support of the foregoing propositions. If they are sustained, they establish the fact that the present generation is that one to which the angels' messages are addressed. We earnestly invite all who wish to find the truth, to weigh this part of the argument with special care.

1. Has the proclamation of the hour of God's Judgment come, been made in any past age? If such a proclamation has never been made in past centuries, there is an end to controversy on this part of the subject. No person has ever been able to show any such proclamation in the past. The apostles did not make such a proclamation; on the contrary, they plainly inform

us that the day of the Lord was not then at hand. Martin Luther did not make this proclamation; for he thought the Judgment about three hundred years in the future. And finally, the history of the church presents no such proclamation in the past. Had the first angel preached to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, that the hour of God's Judgment had come, the publicity of such proclamation would be a sufficient guaranty that the history of the world would contain some record of the fact. Its total silence respecting such a proclamation is ample proof that it was never made, and should put to silence those who make such an affirmation.

2. We are on firm ground, also, when we say that had such a proclamation been made to the world in ages past, it would have been false. Four reasons sustain this statement:

(1.) There is no part of the Bible on which such a message, centuries in the past, could have been based; hence, had such a proclamation been made, it would have been without scripture foundation, and consequently not from Heaven;

(2.) It would have been in direct opposition to those scriptures which locate the Judgment, and the warning respecting its approach, in the period of the last generation. (The scriptures which sustain these two reasons we shall presently cite.);

(3.) The history of the world amply evinces that the hour of God's Judgment had not come ages in the past;

(4.) Nor would it be true of past ages, if limited to Babylon; for Rev. 18:8-10 clearly shows that the hour of Babylon's Judgment is yet in the future. It is certain, therefore, that the angel with the proclamation respecting the hour of God's Judgment has not given it at a time when it would be not only destitute of scriptural support, but would absolutely contradict their plain testimony.

3. The prophecies which give us the time of the Judgment, and which present the succession of events leading down to that great crisis, were closed up and sealed till the time of the end. We refer particularly to the prophecies of Daniel. See Dan. 8:17, 26; 12:4, 9. Hence it is evident that God preserves the warning for that generation which alone needs it. Noah's warning respecting the flood was alone applicable to those who should witness it; thus also the warning respecting the Judgment is alone applicable to that generation which lives in the last days.

4. The Bible locates these messages in the period which immediately precedes the second advent, and plainly warns us against the proclamation of the Judgment at hand prior to that time. Here we join issue with our opponents. Instead of finding that the apostles gave this proclamation, as 11 some teach, we shall find indubitable evidence that they located it far in the future, and that they admonished the church to heed none that should precede a given time. If we recur to the book of Acts, we shall find Paul preaching before Felix of the Judgment to come; and before the Athenians, that God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ. Acts 24:25; 17:31. But that book nowhere intimates that Christ was immediately coming to judgment. Peter points his hearers to the future, saying that the heavens which had then received Christ, must retain him until the times of restitution. Acts 3:21.

The first Epistle to the Thessalonians may seem to teach that the apostles expected the coming of Christ to judgment in their day. Indeed, it is evident that such an idea was received from it by the Thessalonian church. Hence it was, that in his second Epistle to them, Paul found it necessary to speak explicitly on the point. He tells them that the coming of Christ to the Judgment could not take place until the great apostasy; and as the result of that apostasy, that

the man of sin should be revealed, showing himself that he is God, and exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped. That this mystery of iniquity is the great Romish apostasy, none but a papist will deny.

Paul reminds the Thessalonians that he had told them of these things when he was yet with them. And where could Paul have learned this fact which he had thus stated to them?

Paul was accustomed to reason from the Scriptures, and not to deal in assertion. Hence it is very evident that he refers to the prophecy of Daniel, which in its seventh chapter has given the successive events which intervened between its time and the Judgment. In this series of events it has with wonderful precision described the power to which Paul has referred as the man of sin.

No Protestant will deny the identity of Daniel's little horn and Paul's man of sin. And as Daniel has brought it into a series of events which ends with the Judgment and the setting up of the everlasting kingdom, it is an easy matter for Paul to tell where in this series of events he stood, and whether the Judgment was the next event or not. The apostle, therefore, plainly tells them that that day was not at hand. For the man of sin, the little horn, must arise and perform his predicted work; and when that should be accomplished, the coming of Christ should transpire, to consume "that Wicked" with its brightness.

Now, when was the little horn to arise? Daniel was told that it should arise after the ten horns upon the fourth beast; or, in other words, after the fourth empire should be divided into ten kingdoms, which was accomplished about 12 five hundred years after Christ. The Judgment, therefore, could not come prior to that time. But how long was this little horn to have power to wear out the saints? - Daniel informs us that it should be for "a time, and times, and the dividing of time. " How long is this period? - Rev. 12 shows that it is 1260 prophetic days, or years. Verses 6, 14. It follows, therefore, that the apostle carries the mind forward five hundred years, to the development of the man of sin, and thence 1260 years for his triumph, before the Judgment could be preached as an event immediately impending. Whoever will carefully read Dan. 7, will get the original of Paul's argument in 2 Thess. 2, and will not fail to see the force of his statement.

The papal supremacy began in 538, and ended in 1798 with the overthrow of the pope's temporal power. Therefore the warning of Paul against a false proclamation respecting the Judgment at hand, expires at that time, and not before; for we will then have reached the point of time when the last important event in Dan. 7, before the Judgment, has transpired.

An angel from heaven, preaching the hour of God's Judgment come many years in the past, would be giving a different gospel from that preached by Paul. Those who locate the angel of Rev. 14:6, 7, in past ages, virtually place upon his head the anathema of Paul in Gal. 1:8. And, what is of very deep interest, the point of time at which Paul's warning expires, is the commencement of the time of the end, - the very point to which the visions of Daniel were closed up and sealed.

Compare Daniel 11:33, 35 and 7:25, and the fact that the 1260 years' persecution of the saints terminates with the commencement of the time of the end, will appear obvious. How gloriously does this view of the subject make the truth of God shine out! for the warning of the apostle against a false proclamation of the Judgment at hand, expires at the very point where the seal is taken from those prophecies which show when the Judgment sits. And it is

respecting this period, the time of the end, that it is said, Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge (on the very subject which was before concealed) shall be increased. Then the time of the end is the period in which the Judgment-hour cry, and the subsequent messages, are to be given. Dan. 8:17, 26; 12:4, 9.

Another important argument on this point is found in what our Lord has said relative to the signs of his second advent. The church were to understand when his coming was at hand, by the fulfillment of certain promised tokens. Until these should be seen, they were not authorized to look for the immediate advent of the Lord. But when the signs which our Lord promised began to appear, the church might then know that his coming to judge the quick and dead was at hand.

It is an interesting fact, that Christ has marked the time in which these signs were to begin to appear. Consequently, the messages in question could not be delivered prior to that time. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. " Matt. 24:29. "But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. " Mark 13:24, 25.

We think there can be no mistake that in these scriptures our Lord refers to the papal tribulation of Daniel the prophet. The signs of his second coming were to commence "in those days, " but after that tribulation. " In other words, the 1260 prophetic days would not be quite over, but their tribulation would be ended, when the sun should be darkened. The sun was darkened in 1780, and the tribulation of those days was then past, but the days did not expire till 1798. Thus we have the signs of our Lord's immediate advent just opening upon us, as we come down to the time of the end, the period when the vision should be unsealed, and many run to and fro with the word of warning to a perishing world.

The parable recorded in Matt. 22:1-14 and Luke 14:16-24, furnishes an important testimony on this subject. Matthew gives a particular account of the first part of this parable, but merely states in a word the final calls to the guests. Luke, on the contrary, omits the first part of the parable, but gives its concluding features with peculiar distinctness. We think the identity of the parables in Matt. 22 and Luke 14 will be seen by every one who will compare those scriptures. It is evident that Matthew, by the calls to dinner, represents the calls which were made to the Jews at the first advent. It is to be observed that the general work of inviting the guests had preceded these calls; for these are a special announcement to those that had been bidden, that the dinner is ready. These we understand to refer to the work of John the Baptist and others at the time of the first advent. And we understand that the destruction of the city and people in the parable refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and the rejection of the Jews.

The call to the dinner proving of no effect, the king turns to another people. We understand this as we do the text in which our Lord tells the Jews that the kingdom should be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. Matt. 21:43. This part of the parable Matthew has given in a word, that the servants in obedience to the command of their Lord were enabled to furnish the wedding with guests.

But Luke has taken up this portion with minute accuracy. The dinner indeed was past and the people to whom it was offered were unworthy of sharing it as guests; but the purpose of the king was not to be made void. At supper time, says Luke, a message was sent forth to

announce to those that had been bidden, that supper was ready. We understand that this call to the supper is made to the Gentiles, and that it is in immediate connection with the second advent. For we think that none will deny that the supper of Luke 14:16 and that of Rev. 19:9 are the same. Thus we see that there was to the Jews the general work of bidding the guests, and the special call at dinner time; and that to the Gentiles there is the general work of the gospel in bidding, and then at supper time the special call to the marriage supper.

These three calls to the marriage supper (Luke 14:16-24) we understand to be the same as the three messages of Rev. 14:6-12. The first call to the supper is "at supper time, " and the first angel announces that "the hour of His judgment is come. " None will dispute the fact that the judgment and the marriage supper are in immediate connection with each other. Rev. 19:20. The three calls are not the general work of the gospel in bidding; they are made at supper time, that is, at the close of the day. And the three proclamations in Rev. 14, in like manner, are not the general work of the gospel, but special warnings addressed to the world as the great work of our High Priest is closing up.

The book of Nahum furnishes a very striking testimony on this subject. The chariots are to seem like torches, and to run like the lightnings, in the day of God's preparation. Chap. 2. We may learn the event for which this day of preparation is appointed, by reading the first chapter of this prophet. That the sublime scenes of the second advent and the day of God are there portrayed, we think few will be disposed to deny. The day of God's preparation is, therefore, for this very event. Now, it is evident that the hour of God's Judgment cannot precede the day of his preparation for the Judgment.

Hence the day of God's preparation is the time for the warning respecting the Judgment, and the associated proclamations to the inhabitants of the earth. And how strikingly have we seen the sign which marks the day of God's preparation fulfilled before our eyes! Since the time of the end commenced, in which the prophecies relative to the Judgment were to be unsealed, and many were to run to and fro, and knowledge to be increased, chariots running like the lightnings have made their appearance in every part of the civilized worlds. We think this a demonstration that we are now in the day of God's preparation, and that, consequently, this is the period of time in which the three proclamations of Rev. 14 are to be made; for the day 15 of God's preparation for the second advent must be the time for the world to be warned respecting that event.

If we read the message of the second angel with care, and the more full reference to the subject in Rev. 18, we may also gather some important ideas relative to the chronology of these messages. The people of God are called out of Babylon, that the plagues which God is about to inflict upon her may not fall upon them also. These plagues are enumerated as death, mourning, and famine, and utter destruction by fire. And it is said that these shall come upon her in one day. It is evident that these plagues have not yet come upon her. The hour of Babylon's judgment, when the kings shall mourn over her for fear of her torment, is yet future. The warning, therefore, respecting Babylon, must of necessity relate to that generation which shall live when her plagues shall come upon her. The warning respecting the flood, or the destruction of Sodom, belonged to that time which witnessed those events. And the warning respecting the judgments on Babylon must relate to that generation which shall be alive when these judgments are to be inflicted.

The third angel presents a fearful warning against the worship of the beast and his image, and the reception of his mark. It must be evident to every person that this warning must relate to

the time when men shall be required to worship the image on pain of death. That this work of the two-horned beast, as recorded in Chap. 13, has as yet been accomplished but in part, is certain. See verses 13-15. Hence it is a great error to locate this proclamation in any past age.

Such are the reasons, in brief, which establish the fact that these proclamations are addressed to the last generation of men.

These messages are addressed to men in a state of probation. But it is contrary to the economy of grace that angels should visibly engage in the preaching of the gospel; therefore these angels must symbolize a body of men proclaiming the messages in question; or we may understand that literal angels have the oversight of this work, and that it is carried out through the agency of men.

Chapter 2 - The Proclamations Of The First Angel

Identity of the Angels of Rev. 14:6 and 10:1

The Open Book of Chapter 10

Nature of this Proclamation

Time when it is heard

Extent of the Warning

Evidences of which it is based

Reference to John the Baptist

The Disappointment.

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his Judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. " Rev. 14:6, 7.

WE call this the first angel, because it is the first of the series. See verse 9. John calls it "another angel, " from the fact that he had previously seen an angel flying through the midst of heaven, after the fourth angel had sounded, announcing the last three trumpets as woe trumpets. See Chap. 8:13. This was about the close of the sixth century, and this fact shows that the first angel of Rev. 14 does not belong to the apostolic age.

We understand that this angel is the same as the one brought to view in Rev. 10. We shall therefore briefly refer to that chapter as explanatory of chap. 14:6, 7, and as furnishing an important argument respecting the time of its fulfillment. Chap. 9 of Revelation, presents the first and second woes. The prophetic period connected with the second woe terminated with the political power of the Ottoman Empire, Aug. 11, 1840. * Thus ends the ninth chapter, and the tenth opens with the descent of a mighty angel from heaven with a little book in his hand, who cries with a loud voice, as when a lion roareth, and then lifts up his hand to heaven, and swears that time shall be no longer.

This oath cannot mean duration as measured by days and years, for in chap. 20 we have 1000 years measured off between the two resurrections; and, for aught that appears to the contrary, duration will ever be measured thus. Nor can it mean probationary time, for two reasons:

1. It is certain, from verse 7, that this announcement precedes the voice of the seventh angel, (seventh trumpet) and it is in the days of the commencement of his voice that the mystery of God is finished;
2. After this oath of the angel, it is said to John, who doubtless personates the church, that he must prophesy again.

These reasons furnish conclusive proof that probation has not closed when this oath is uttered. Hence we understand that this oath has reference to the prophetic periods, and that this angel with the little book open in his hand is the same as the angel of Chap. 14, announcing that the hour of God's Judgment has come.

The little book which was open in his hand, we understand to be the prophecy of Daniel, which was to be sealed up until the time of the end. The angel of Chap. 10 preached from this little book, and it is this prophecy of Daniel that contains the prophetic time on which the angel of Chap. 14:6 bases his proclamation that the hour of God's Judgment is come.

This proclamation is one of pre-eminent importance. It is not a mere local judgment, but one that concerns all the inhabitants of the earth. Hence it has reference to the final Judgment scene. It is the same gospel that Paul preached that is here styled the "everlasting gospel." But the great truth uttered by this angel would not have been a truth if uttered by Paul; for he lived at the commencement of the gospel dispensation, and this proclamation relates to its closing scenes. It seems to be the same as "this gospel of the kingdom" that our Lord presents in Matt. 24:14 as the sign of the end of this dispensation.

The truth on this point is well expressed in the following language of the late Sylvester Bliss:

"As an indication of the approach of the end, there was, however, to be seen another angel flying through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people. Rev. 14:6.

The burden of this angel was to be the same gospel which had been before proclaimed; but connected with it was the additional motive of the proximity of the kingdom - 'saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his Judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the seas, and the fountains of waters.' Verse 7. No mere preaching of the gospel, without announcing its proximity, could fulfill this message.

We firmly believe that this proclamation has been made, and that the preaching of the immediate advent of our Lord has been in fulfillment in this prophecy. Prior to the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1840, it had been shown by those who were preaching the immediate advent of Christ, that the hour, day, month, and year of Ottoman supremacy would expire the 11th of August, 1840. When the event verified the truthfulness of this calculation, the way was prepared for the advent message to go with mighty power. The prophecies were not only unsealed, but, in the providence of God, a demonstration of the truthfulness of the mode of calculation respecting the prophetic times was given to the world. Thus, at the very time when the mighty angel of God was to come down with the little book open in his hand, and to cry with a loud voice, the advent message began to be proclaimed with great power. It was the good news of the everlasting kingdom, and of the advent of our glorious King.

Hence it is evident that the advent proclamation comes in at the right time in this prophecy. The declaration of this angel, that the mystery of God should be finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, as He had declared to his servants the prophets, presents several important facts:

1. That the angel bases his preaching upon the authority of the prophets;
2. That the finishing of the mystery of God occupies days at the commencement of the voice of the seventh angel, and we understand the days of this angel to be years, as were those of the fifth and sixth angels of chap. 9;
3. That it shall be finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel in the manner that the prophets have declared. One of them, Daniel, has told how the mystery of God should be finished at the end of the 2300 days; viz., the Sanctuary should be cleansed, which event accomplishes the work of our great High Priest.

The extent of this proclamation is worthy of notice. An English writer, Mourant Brock, thus remarks:-

" 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. In America, about three hundred ministers of the word are thus preaching 'this gospel of the kingdom;' while in this country, about seven hundred of the Church of England are raising the same cry. "

Dr. Joseph Wolfe traveled in Arabia Felix, through the region inhabited by the descendants of Hobab, Moses' father-in-law. In Yemen, he saw a book which he mentions thus:-

" The Arabs of this place have a book called SEERA. which treats of the second coming of Christ, and his reign in glory! In Yemen, he spent six days with the Rechabites. 'They drink no wine, plant no vineyards, sow no seed, live in tents, and remember the words of Jonadab, the son of Rechab. ' With them were children of Israel, of the tribe of Dan, who reside near Terim in Hatramawt, who expect, in common with the children of Rechab, the speedy arrival of the Messiah in the clouds of heaven. "

The "Voice of the Church, " by D. T. Taylor, speaks as follows concerning the wide diffusion of the advent sentiment:-

" In Wirtemberg there is a Christian colony numbering hundreds, who look for the speedy advent of Christ; also another of like belief on the shores of the Caspian; the Molokaners, a large body of dissenters from the Russian Greek Church, residing on the shores of the Baltic, - a very pious people of whom it is said, 'Taking the Bible alone for their creed, the norm of their faith is simply the Holy Scriptures, ' - are characterized by the 'expectation of Christ's immediate and visible reign upon earth. ' In Russia, the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign is preached to some extent and received by many of the lower class.

It has been extensively agitated in Germany, particularly in the south part among the Moravians. In Norway, charts and books on the advent have been circulated extensively, and the doctrine has been received by many. Among the Tartars in Tartary, there prevails an expectation of Christ's advent about this time. English and American publications on this doctrine have been sent to Holland, Germany, India, Ireland, Constantinople, Rome, and to nearly every missionary station on the globe. At the Turks Islands, it has been received to some extent among the Wesleyans.

"Mr. Fox, a Scottish missionary to the Teloogoo people, was a believer in Christ's soon coming. James MacGregor Bertram, a Scottish missionary of the Baptist order at St. Helena, has sounded the cry extensively on that island, making many converts and pre-millennialists; he has also preached it at South Africa at the missionary stations there.

David N. Lord informs us that a large proportion of the missionaries who have gone from Great Britain to make known the gospel to the heathen, and who are now laboring in Asia and Africa, are millennialists; and Joseph Wolfe, D. D. , according to his journals, between the years 1821 and 1845 proclaimed the Lord's speedy advent in Palestine, Egypt, on the shores of the Red Sea, Mesopotamia, the Crimea, Persia, Georgia, throughout the Ottoman Empire, in Greece, Arabia, Turkistan, Bokhara, Afghanistan, Cashmere, Hindoostan, Thibet, in Holland, Scotland, and Ireland, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, St. Helena, also on shipboard in

the Mediterranean, and at New York City to all denominations. He declares he has preached among Jews, Turks, Mohammedans, Parsees, Hindoos, Chaldeans, Yescedes, Syrians, Sabeans, to pashas, sheiks, shahs, the kings of Organtsh and Bokhara, the queen of Greece, etc; and of his extraordinary labors the Investigator says, 'No individual has, perhaps, given greater publicity to the doctrine of the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ than has this well-known missionary to the 20 world. Wherever he goes, he proclaims the approaching advent of the Messiah in glory. ' "

None can deny that this world-wide warning of impending judgment has been given. The nature of the evidence adduced in its support now claims our attention, as furnishing the most conclusive testimony that it was a message from Heaven.

All the great outlines of the world's prophetic history were shown to be complete in the present generation. The great prophetic chain of Dan. 2, also the chains of chaps. 7, 8 and 11, 12, were shown to be just accomplished. The same was true of our Lord's prophetic description of the gospel dispensation. Matt. 24; Mark 13; Luke 21.

The prophetic periods of Dan. 7, 8, 9, 12 and Rev. 11, 12, 13, were shown to harmonize with, and to unitedly sustain, this great proclamation.

The signs in the heavens and upon the earth and sea, in the church and among the nations, with one voice bore witness to the warning which God addressed to the human family. Joel 2:30, 31; Matt. 24:29-31; Mark 13:24-26; Luke 21:25-36; 2 Tim. 3; 2 Pet. 3; Rev. 6:12, 13. And besides the mighty array of evidence on which this warning was based, the great outpouring of the Holy Spirit in connection with this proclamation set the seal of Heaven to its truth.

The warning of John the Baptist, which was to prepare the way for the first advent of our Lord, was of short duration, and limited in its extent. For each prophetic testimony which sustained the work of John, we have several which support the proclamation of Christ's near advent. John had not the aid of the press to disseminate his proclamation, nor the facility of modern methods of travel; he was a humble man, dressed in camel's hair, and he performed no miracles. If the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, in not being baptized of John, how great must be the guilt of those who reject the warning sent by God to prepare the way of the second advent!

But those were disappointed who expected the Lord in 1843 and '44. This fact is with many a sufficient reason for rejecting all the testimony in this case. We acknowledge the disappointment, but cannot acknowledge that this furnishes a just reason for denying the hand of God in this work. The Jewish Church were disappointed when at the close of the work of John the Baptist, Jesus presented himself as the promised Messiah; and the trusting disciples were most sadly disappointed when He whom they expected to deliver Israel was by wicked hands taken and slain.

And after his resurrection, when they expected him to restore again the kingdom to Israel, they could not but be disappointed when they understood that he was going away to his Father, and that they were to be left for a long season to tribulation and anguish. But disappointment does not prove that God has no hand in the guidance of his people. It should lead them to correct their errors, but it should not lead them to cast away their confidence in God. It was because the children of Israel were disappointed in the wilderness that they so

often denied their guidance as divine. They are set forth as an admonition to us, that we should not fall after the same example of unbelief.

But it must be apparent to every student of the Scriptures, that the angel who proclaims the hour of God's Judgment does not give the latest message of mercy. Rev. 14 presents two other and later proclamations, before the close of human probation. This fact alone is sufficient to prove that the coming of the Lord does not take place until the second and third proclamations have been added to the first.

The same thing may also be seen in the fact that after the angel of chap. 10 has sworn that time shall be no longer another work of prophesying before many people and nations is announced. Hence we understand that the first angel preaches the hour of God's Judgment come; that is, he preaches the termination of the prophetic periods, and that this is the time which he swears shall be no longer.

The Judgment does, of necessity, commence before the advent of Christ; for he comes to execute the Judgment (Jude 14, 15; Matt. 25:31-46; John 5:27); and at the sound of the last trumpet, he confers immortality upon every one of the righteous, and passes by all the wicked. The investigative Judgment does, therefore, precede the execution of the same by the Saviour. It is the province of the Father to preside in this investigative work, as set forth in Dan. 7. At this tribunal, the Son closes up his work as high priest, and is crowned king. Thence he comes to earth to execute the decisions of his Father. It is this work of judgment by the Father which the first angel introduces.

The great period of 2300 days, which was the most important period in marking the definite time in that proclamation, extends to the cleansing of the Sanctuary. That the cleansing of the Sanctuary is not the cleansing of any part of the earth, but that it is the last work of our great High Priest in the heavenly Tabernacle, before his advent to the earth, has been clearly shown. And we understand that it is while the work of cleansing the Sanctuary takes place that the latest message of mercy is proclaimed. Thus it will be seen that the prophetic periods, and the proclamation which is based upon them, do not extend to the coming of the Lord.

Chapter 3 - Proclamation of the Second Angel

Time of this Proclamation

Derivation of the term Babylon

Babylon not the Wicked World

Not the City of Rome Explanation of Symbols

The Seven Heads of the Beast

Rome the Seat of the of the Beast

Babylon not a Literal city

Meaning of the Symbol

Facts which identify Protestants as a part of this Great City.

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city because she made all nations drink of the wine of wrath of her fornication. " Rev. 14:8..

THE first important inquiry relates to the time when this proclamation is to be made. As this angel follows the one who proclaims the hour of God's Judgment, it is evident that this proclamation is the next event in order. And as it has been shown that the proclamation of the hour of God's Judgment is addressed to those who live in the last days, it is certain that the Second Angel's Message belongs to the same time, and that it was not fulfilled centuries in the past. And the fact that at the time when this proclamation of the fall of Babylon is made, the plagues and utter destruction of Babylon, which came under the seventh vial, are then immediately impending, is also conclusive proof that this proclamation belongs to the last days. Rev. 18:1- 10; 16:17-21. 21.

We conclude, therefore, that the generation that shall be alive when the plagues are poured out on Babylon, is the one to which the Second Angel's Message is addressed.

Our next inquiry relates to the meaning of the term Babylon. What is designated by the word Babylon in the book of Revelation?

The word Babylon signifies confusion, and is derived from Babel, the place where God confounded the inhabitants of the earth in their impious attempt to build a tower up to heaven. Gen. 11:9, margin; 10:10, margin. The word, being the chosen term of the Holy Spirit to designate "that mighty city" which is so prominently noticed in the book of Revelation, was doubtless selected with especial reference to its signification, and to the circumstances that originated the word. That Babylon does not comprise the whole wicked world, and that it does not consist of some one literal city, but that it is composed of professed worshipers of God, we think can be clearly shown. This is not an abstract question, but is eminently practical, and is intimately connected with our duty toward God.

BABYLON IS NOT THE WHOLE WICKED WORLD.

Rev. 17 represents Babylon by the symbol of a woman seated on a scarlet-colored beast. If, therefore, the woman Babylon represents the whole of this fallen world, the entire empire of

the Devil, what does the beast represent upon which the woman is seated? Is it not a fact that the beast represents the fourth empire of our earth in its papal form? And that being the case, is it not a certainty that Babylon does not include the whole wicked world? That the beast and the woman are two distinct symbols, is evident from verse 7.

The same chapter represents the unlawful connection of Babylon with the kings of the earth, and that she has made the inhabitants of the earth drunken. She is also represented as that great city that reigneth over the kings of the earth. Babylon is therefore distinct from the kings of the earth, and does not include all the wicked of the earth.

It is also stated that this great harlot sat upon many waters. In the explanation it is stated that these waters are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. , Rev. 17:1, 15. Certainly we should not confound the harlot with the waters or nations upon which she is said to sit. When Babylon is destroyed, being thrown down as a millstone is cast into the mighty deep, and utterly burned with fire, the kings of the earth, the merchants, the sailors, etc. , are still spared, and mourn, and lament over her. It is plain, therefore, that the utter destruction of Babylon is not the destruction of those wicked men who lived in iniquity with her. Hence it follows that Babylon does not comprise the whole wicked world.

BABYLON NOT THE CITY OF ROME

As some have strongly advocated the view that Rome is the Babylon of the book of Revelation, we will examine the reasons that are adduced in support of this view. The argument stands thus:-

The angel told John that the woman which he had seen was the great city which reigned over the kings of the earth, and that the seven heads of the beast were seven mountains upon which the woman sat. The explanation of "the mystery of the woman" is regarded as decisive testimony that Rome is the Babylon of the book of Revelation. To the foregoing reasons some add the statement that a woman is used in every other instance in the book of Revelation as the symbol of a literal city, and consequently must mean a literal city in this case.

But we are compelled to dissent from this view, for the following reasons:

-The grand principle assumed by the foregoing view is this: The interpretation of a symbol must always be literal, and can never consist in the substitution of one symbol for another; and hence the interpretation of the woman as a city, and of the heads of the beasts as mountains upon which the woman sitteth, must be literal. That there are exceptions to this rule, and that the case in question furnishes a manifest exception, we will now show.

In Rev. 11:3 the two witnesses are introduced. The next verse is an explanation of what is meant by the two witnesses: "These are the two olive-trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth. "

There can be no question that in this case the explanation of the symbol consists in the substitution of other symbols. In other words, the explanation consists in transferring the meaning to other symbols, which are elsewhere clearly explained.

That this is the case in Rev. 17, we will now show. The angel introduces his explanation of the heads by saying, "Here is the mind which hath wisdom, " plainly implying that wisdom was needed in order to understand what he was there communicating. With the fact before us, that in Rev. 11 the explanation consists in substituting one symbol for another, and with the caution of the angel, as he gives the explanation in this case, let us consider what he utters:-

" The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. " "The woman which thou sawest in that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth. " Verses 9, 18. The wisdom which is needed to rightly comprehend the words of the angel, would doubtless lead us to compare the different instances in which the same facts are referred to in the book of Revelation. If we do this, the following points will appear:-

1. Chap. 13 informs us that one of these seven heads was wounded unto death, and that this deadly wound was healed. Or, as the same fact is stated again, it had a wound by a sword, and did live. It would be utter folly to assert this of a literal mountain. Hence the heads are not mountains of earth.

2. Each of the seven heads is represented in chap. 12 with a crown upon it, even as each of the ten horns is thus represented in chap. 13. Each of the heads must therefore represent a kingdom or government, even as the horns represent governments.

3. It is evident that the seven heads are successive (that is, the beast has but one head at a time), in distinction from the ten horns, which are contemporary. But the seven hills of Rome are not successive; for it cannot be said of them, "Five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. " The beast itself is the eighth, and is of the seven, which proves that the beast is a literal mountain, or that the heads are not.

4. The heads of the beast must, according to Dan. 7:6 compared with Dan. 8:22, be explained as kingdoms or governments. Mountains, according to Dan. 2:35, 44 and Jer. 51:25, denote kingdoms. But the version of Prof. Whiting, which is a literal translation of the text, removes all obscurity from Rev. 17:9, 10: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and they are seven kings. " Thus it will be seen that the angel represents the heads as mountains, and then explains the mountains to be seven successive kings. Thus we see that the angel transferred the meaning from one symbol to another, and then gave the explanation of the second symbol.

Having proved that the mountains are not literal, but symbolic, it follows that the woman who sits upon them cannot represent a literal city; for a literal city cannot sit upon symbolic mountains. Hence it appears that the angel transfers the meaning from one symbol to another, as in verses 9, 10; chap. 11:4. And it is certain that the woman of chap. 12 represents the church, and not a literal city. Therefore it is a mistaken idea that a woman in the book of Revelation, as a symbol, always represents a literal city.

Another evidence that the city of Rome is not the Babylon of the Apocalypse, is found in the following important fact: Rome was and is "the seat of the beast;" therefore the city of Rome cannot be the woman seated upon the beast; for Rome cannot be both the seat of the beast and the woman that sits on the beast. Lest any should deny that Rome is the seat of the beast, we will prove that point from the New Testament. The seat of the beast is the same that had been the seat of the dragon. Rev. 13:2. This dragon is the power that ruled the world at the time of

our Saviour's birth. Rev. 12. Consequently it is imperial Rome. The seat of the imperial power, the throne of the Caesars, was at Rome in Italy. Luke 2:1; Acts 25:10-12, 21; compared with Acts 26:32; 27:1, 24; 28:14-16. The fact being established that Rome is the seat of the beast, it follows that Rome is not the woman Babylon, seated upon the beast.

The fact that Rome is not the Babylon of the Apocalypse may also be demonstrated from Rev. 16. The fifth vial is poured out upon the seat of the beast, which we have shown to be Rome. But the great city, Babylon, does not receive her cup of wrath until the seventh vial is poured out. Verses 10, 11, 17-19. Then Babylon and Rome are not the same. Were Babylon a literal city, but few, at most, of the people of God could be found in it, and but a portion of any class of the wicked; so that almost all of every class of men would in that case be outside of the Babylon of

But it is very evident that at the time of the cry, "Come out of her, my people, " the people of God, as a body, are in that great city. It is also worthy of notice that if Babylon is a literal city, it must be a place of the greatest commercial importance; for in Rev. 18 it is represented as the great center of commerce, and its destruction causes universal mourning among the merchants and sailors of the world. It is certain that Rome is far from being a commercial city as any one upon the globe; and the destruction of Rome would not in the slightest degree affect commercial business.

"At Rome, " says Gibbon, "commerce was always held in contempt. " Nor could the sailors and ship-masters of the earth lament over her, saying, "What city is like unto this great city!" for either New York or London is equal to a great number of such cities as Rome in commercial importance. And, indeed, there is not a city upon the globe whose destruction would cause all commerce to cease, and all the sailors and merchants of the earth to mourn. These arguments, we think, demonstrate that Rome is not the

BABYLON A SYMBOL OF THE PROFESSED CHURCH UNITED TO THE WORLD.

Babylon is the name of the symbolic harlot which was seen by John. A woman is the symbol of a church. Rev. 12. A harlot is the symbol of a corrupt church. Eze. 16. It is evident that the woman in Rev. 17 should be interpreted in the same manner as the one in chap. 12. As that symbol undoubtedly represents the true church, though spoken of as a woman and her seed, so the harlot and her daughters are doubtless the entire corrupt church. Rev. 18:5. We understand, therefore, that Babylon is not limited to a single ecclesiastical body, but that its very name renders it necessary that it should be composed of many.

If the harlot to whom the kings of the earth have unlawfully united themselves, symbolizes only the church of Rome, it follows that many of the wicked powers of the earth are quite free from this sin. The Greek Church is the established church of Russia and Greece; the Lutheran Church is the established Church of Prussia, Holland, Sweden, Norway, and a part of the smaller German states; England has Episcopacy for her State religion; and other countries have their established religions, and zealously oppose dissenters. Babylon has made all the nations drunk with her wine; it can therefore symbolize nothing less than the universal worldly church.

It will be seen, therefore, that we do not exclusively apply the prophecy respecting Babylon to any one of the corrupt bodies which have existed, or which now exist. In this great city of confusion, we understand that the corrupt Roman and Greek churches occupy a large space, and act an important part. War, oppression, conformity to the world, and the like, identify with sad and faithful accuracy the great body of the Protestant churches as an important constituent part of this great Babylon.

When the papal church possessed the power, it destroyed a vast multitude of the saints of God. Nor has the Protestant Church, since its rise, been free from acts of persecution whenever it has possessed the power to perform them. The Protestants of Geneva, with John Calvin at their head, burned Michael Servetus, a man who had barely escaped the same fate at the hands of the popish inquisition.

They did this for the same reason that the papists do the like; that is, they did it for a difference of opinion, and because they had the power to do it. Witness also the long-continued oppression which the Church of England was able to maintain toward all dissenters. Even the puritan fathers of New England, themselves fugitives from the wicked oppression of the Church of England, could not forbear to hang the Quakers, and to whip and imprison the Baptists. In all these cases the civil arm was under the control of these professed worshipers of Jehovah, and they could not forbear to use it.

The Protestant Church, till within a short time, held many thousand slaves; nor is the fact to be disguised that the professed church was the right arm of the slave power. Nor was slavery abolished by the churches. To the secular power falls the honor of overthrowing this gigantic evil; and the churches have never confessed their great wrong in so long upholding this iniquitous system. This great fact identifies the Protestant Church as a part of Babylon, with absolute certainty. Rev. 18:13.

The celebrated Albert Barnes, whose notes on the New Testament are so widely diffused, uses the following startling language: "There is no power out of the church that could sustain slavery an hour, if it were not sustained in it. " "The churches are the bulwark of American slavery. "

Christ forbade his people to lay up treasures on earth (Matt. 6:19); but the professed church at the present day, as a body, exhibits greater eagerness in the pursuit of wealth, and in the acquisition of Babylonish treasures (Rev. 18:11-14), than even worldlings themselves. In exposing the corruption of the Babylonish church of his time, Christ warned his own people to beware of the like abominations. "But be not ye called Rabbi, " says Christ; that is, master, or doctor; "for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. " Matt. 23:8.

Apparently to imitate the Romish Church, Protestants call their ministers Reverend. This word, which is used only once in the Scriptures, is there applied to God. Ps. 111:9. If it is a sin for the church to call her ministers Rabbi, or master, how much greater sin must it be for her to apply to them the title of Reverend, which belongs to God alone! Not content with this, some of these professed servants of Jesus Christ become Right Reverend, and Very Reverend. And not a few of them become Doctors of Divinity, so great is their proficiency in the doctrines of Christ!

The New Testament speaks in the most decisive manner respecting plainness of dress; but the majority of the professed church at the present time walk in all the fashionable follies of life.

They are arrayed in all the gaudy attire of Babylonian merchandise. The merchants of Babylon are the great men of the earth. In the fold of the nominal church is to be found a large portion of the lawyers, doctors, politicians, and great men of the world. To succeed in business, to become honorable in society, or to rise to high offices in the nation, it is important to make a profession of religion, and to have a good and regular standing in the church. This is most abominable in the sight of God; and yet it is very apparent that the church joyfully welcomes such members, because they will make the body more honorable.

It may be said that even corrupt Protestants should not be joined with Romanists, as forming the great city of Babylon; for although Romanists claim infallibility, Protestants never yet have done this. We answer that in this the difference exists only in name.

To speak in the language of their several pretensions, Romanists never can err; Protestants never do err. If Romanists claim infallibility in advance for the decrees and ordinances of their church, it is also true that Protestant bodies never afterward acknowledge wherein their churches or their councils have been in error. So that Protestant churches have all the advantage of infallibility, and leave to the Romanists all the odium of claiming it.

Babylon is represented as trafficking in the souls of men. Look at the Church of England. There the vacant parishes are in some cases even set up for sale, and the highest bidder becomes the possessor of its revenue and the pastor of its people! To come nearer home, let us look at the various religious denominations in every place where they have sufficient wealth and strength to become popular. They must erect a splendid house of worship and furnish it in the most expensive style; and the members of the church must dress in all the fashion and pride of life. Then they must have an eloquent man to preach smooth things to fashionable ears. The church which can outdo the others in these particulars will succeed in securing the fashionable sinners of the place as permanent members of the congregation.

The word Babylon, as we have seen, signifies confusion, and comes from Babel, the place where men, in their impious attempt to build a tower that should reach unto heaven, had their language confounded. Gen. 11. The church should be a unit. This was the will of Christ. Witness his intercession with the Father, as recorded in John 17. He prayed that his disciples might be one, as he and his Father are one; for this would cause the world to believe in Christ.

Since the great apostasy, the majority of the professed followers have busied themselves in attempting to climb up to heaven some other way. They have been confounded in the attempt, and scattered abroad upon the face of the earth, with creeds as discordant as the languages of those who were dispersed at the ancient tower. The Holy Spirit uses the word Babylon on account of its signification, and it is a most appropriate designation for the great city of confusion to which it is applied.

The church was represented as a chaste virgin, espoused to Christ. 2 Cor. 11:2. She became a harlot by seeking the friendship of the world. James 4:4. It was this unlawful connection with the kings of the earth that constituted her the great harlot of the Apocalypse. Rev. 17. The Jewish Church, represented as espoused to the Lord (Jer. 2; 3; 31:32), became a harlot in the same manner. Eze. 16. Even the term Sodom, which in Rev. 11 is applied to "the great city," is in Isa. 1 applied to the Jewish Church thus apostatized from God.

The fact that Babylon is distinct from, though unlawfully united with, the kings of the earth, is positive proof that Babylon is not the civil power. The fact that the people of God are in her

midst just before her overthrow, proves that she is a professedly religious body. We think it must be apparent, that the Babylon of Rev. 17 symbolizes the professed church unlawfully united to the world.

Chapter Four - The Fall of Babylon

The Fall of Babylon not the Burning of Rome
The Fall of Babylon not the Loss of her Civil Power
It is a Moral Fall
The Wine of Babylon The Churches tested by the First Proclamation
Connection of the First and Second Messages
Testimonies relative to the Fallen State of the Churches
Recent Revivals
Spiritualism as a Confirmation of the Views here Presented
Destruction of Babylon
Duty of God's People.
Failure of Reformation

WHAT constitutes the fall of Babylon? Those who contend that the Babylon of Revelation is the city of Rome, answer that the fall of Babylon is the burning of Rome; while those who make Babylon a symbol of the Church of Rome only, answer that this fall is the loss of her civil power, -the fall of the woman from the beast. We dissent from both these positions, believing that the fall of Babylon is a moral fall, and that it denotes her rejection, as a body, of God. That the fall of Babylon is not the burning of Rome, appears from the following facts:-

1. The cry, "Come out of her, my people, " is made after the announcement that she has fallen. Rev. 18:2, 4. It is therefore evident that Babylon exists after her fall, and that the people of God are still in her midst; therefore her fall must be distinct from her destruction.
2. When it is said, "Come out of her, my people, " it is added as a reason, "that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. " Her fall had taken place; but she still existed to sin against God, and her plagues were yet future; therefore her fall and her destruction were events entirely distinct.
3. When her plagues are named in verse 8, they are said to be death, mourning, and famine, and utter destruction by fire. Her plagues were yet future at the time of her fall; consequently her fall is not her destruction by fire. Between those two events the people of God make their escape from her.
4. The burning of Rome would not cause that city to become the hold of foul spirits and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird. Indeed, the only effectual cleansing that wicked city will ever receive will be by fire. These facts clearly evince that the fall of Babylon is not the burning of Rome.

Besides this, we have clearly proved that Rome is not the Babylon of the Apocalypse, which is sufficient of itself on this point.

That the fall of Babylon is not the loss of civil power by the Papal Church, the following facts clearly prove:-

1. This would make the angel say, Babylon is fallen, that is, has lost her civil power, because she made all nations drink of her wine. Such a statement would be false; for it was by this very means that she obtained her power.

2. Babylon becomes the hold of every foul spirit and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird in consequence of her fall. Rev. 18:1, 2. It would be absurd to represent this as the consequence of her loss of civil power.

3. The loss of civil power is not the fall of Babylon, for this would not make her more sinful than before, nor would such a fall as this furnish a reason why the people of God should leave her.

We understand that the fall of Babylon is her rejection by God, that the Holy Spirit leaves her in consequence of her alienation from God and her union with the world, and that thus she is left to the spirits of devils. As an illustration, we will refer to the fall of the Jewish Church, the harlot of Eze. 16. This fall is distinctly stated in Rom. 11. Its particulars may be gathered from Matt. 21:43; 23; 12:43-45.

That her fall was her rejection by God, her destruction being deferred for a considerable period, the following facts prove:-

1. The nature of the reasons assigned for the fall of Babylon proves that it is a moral fall; for it is because she has made the nations drunk with her wine. In other words, it is her wickedness that has caused God to reject her. 2. The consequences of her fall testify that that fall is her rejection by God, and not her destruction; for her fall causes her to become the hold of foul spirits, and the cage of unclean and hateful birds. This shows that God has given her up to strong delusions. It is for this reason that the voice from heaven cries, "Come out of her, my people.

The cause of the fall of Babylon is thus stated: "She made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. " Her fornication was her unlawful union with the kings of the earth; and the wine is that with which the church has intoxicated the nations of the earth. There is but one thing that this can refer to; viz. , false doctrine. This harlot, in consequence of her unlawful union with the powers of the earth, has corrupted the pure truths of the Bible, and with the wine or her false doctrine has intoxicated the nations. A few instances of her corruption of the truths of the Bible must suffice:-

1. The doctrine of a thousand years of peace and prosperity before the coming of the Lord. This doctrine will probably prove the ruin of as many souls as any heresy that ever cursed the church.

2. The corruption of the ordinance of baptism. Burial in baptism is the divinely authorized memorial of our Lord's burial and resurrection. This has been changed to sprinkling, or pouring, the fitting memorial of but one thing; viz. , the folly and presumption of man.

3. The change of the fourth commandment. The pagan festival of Sunday has been substituted by the church for the rest-day of the Lord. The Bible plainly teaches that the sanctified rest-day of the Lord is the divinely authorized memorial of the rest of Jehovah from the work of creation. But the church has changed this to the first day of the week, to make it a memorial of our Lord's resurrection, in the place of baptism, which has been changed to sprinkling.

4. The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. This was derived from the pagan mythology, and was introduced into the church by means of distinguished converts from paganism, who became "fathers of the church. " This doctrine makes man's last foe - death - the gate to endless joy, and leaves the resurrection as a thing of minor importance. It is the foundation of modern Spiritualism.

5. The doctrine of the saints' inheritance beyond the bounds of time and space. For this fable, multitudes have turned from the scriptural view of the everlasting kingdom in the new earth.

6. The spiritual second advent. It is well known that the great majority of religious teachers and commentators of the present time openly advocate the view that Christ's second advent, as brought to view in Matt. 24, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem; and also that he comes the second time whenever any person dies.

7. Until the time when slavery was forcibly abolished, the institution was upheld in the most confident manner from the Old and New Testaments, by some of the leading doctors of divinity of most denominations; and some of the most distinguished and skillful even tried to find authority for it in the golden rule.

8. Finally, the lowering of the standard of godliness to the dust. This has been carried so far that the multitudes are made to believe that "every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. " In proof of this, I might appeal to almost every tombstone or funeral discourse.

God appointed the church to be the light of the world, and at the same time ordained that his word should be the light of the church. But when the church becomes unfaithful to her trust, and corrupts the pure doctrines of the gospel, as a natural consequence the world becomes intoxicated with her false doctrine. That the nations of the earth are in such a condition at the present time, is too obvious to be denied. The world is intoxicated in the pursuit of riches and honor, but the sin lies at the door of the church; for the church sanctions what the Lord strictly forbade, and she sets the example to the world. If the church had not intoxicated the world with the wine of her false doctrines, the plain truths of the Bible would powerfully move the public mind. But the world seems hopelessly drunken with the wine of Babylon.

At the time of the First Angel's Message, the people of God were in Babylon; or the announcement of the fall of Babylon, and the cry, "Come out of her, my people, " is made after the first proclamation has been heard. Here also we have a most decisive testimony that Babylon includes Protestant as well as Catholic churches.

It is certain that the people of God, at the time of the preaching of the hour of his Judgment, were in all the popular churches; and this fact is a most striking testimony as to what constitutes the great city of confusion. In a word, Paul has well described the Babylon of the Apocalypse, and the duty of the people of God with reference to it, in 2 Tim. 3:1-5: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away. " Who would dare to limit this description to the Catholic Church?

The preaching of the hour of God's Judgment and the immediate coming of the Lord, was at once the test of the church, and the means by which she might have been healed. It was the test of the church in that it showed that her heart was with the world, and not with her Lord; for when the evidences of his immediate advent were set before her, she rejected the tidings with scorn, and cleaved still closer unto the world. But it might have been the means of healing her.

Had she received it, what a work would it have wrought for her? Her unscriptural hope of a temporal reign, her false view of the second advent, her unrighteous justification of oppression and wickedness, her pride and conformity to the world, would all have been swept away. Alas! that this warning from Heaven was rejected! The last means that Heaven had in store to heal Babylon having failed, God gave her up to her heart's desires.

It is well known that in immediate connection with the proclamation of the hour of God's Judgment, the announcement of the fall of Babylon was everywhere made throughout our land. Its connection with the advent message is well expressed by the following from Elder Himes, dated McConnellsville, O. , Aug. 29, 1844:-

" When we commenced the work of giving the 'midnight cry' with Bro. Miller, in 1840, he had been lecturing nine years. During that time he stood almost alone. But his labors had been incessant and effectual in awakening professors of religion to the true hope of God's people, and the necessary preparation for the advent of the Lord, as also the awakening of all classes of the unconverted to a sense of their lost condition, and the duty of immediate repentance and conversion to God as a preparation to meet the Bridegroom in peace at his coming. These were the great objects of his labor. He made no attempt to convert men to a sect or party, in religion. Hence he labored among all parties and sects without interfering with their organization or discipline, believing that the members of the different communions could retain their standing, and at the same time prepare for the advent of their King and labor for the salvation of men in these relations until the consummation of their hope.

When we were persuaded of the truth of the proclamation that the advent was at hand, and embraced the doctrine publicly, we entertained the same views and pursued the same course among the different sects, where we were called in the providence of God to labor. We told the ministers and churches that it was no part of our business to break them up, or to divide and distract them.

We had one distinct object, and that was to give the 'cry, ' the warning of the 'Judgment at the door, ' and to persuade our fellow-men to get ready for the event. Most of the ministers and churches that opened their doors to us and our brethren who were proclaiming the advent doctrine, co-operated with us till the last year. The ministry and membership who availed themselves of our labors, but had not sincerely embraced the doctrine, saw that they must either go with the doctrine, and preach and maintain it, or in the crisis which was right upon them, they would have difficulty with the decided and determined believers.

They therefore decided against the doctrine, and determined, some by one policy and some by another, to suppress the subject. This placed our brethren and sisters among them in a most trying position. Most of them loved their churches, and could not think of leaving. But when they were ridiculed, oppressed, and in various ways cut off from their former privileges and enjoyment, and when the 'meat in due season' was withheld from them, and the siren song of

'peace and safety' was resounded in their ears from Sabbath to Sabbath, they were soon weaned from their party predilections, and arose in the majesty of their strength, shook off the yoke, and raised the cry, 'Come out of her, my people!' This state of things placed us in a trying position.

1. Because we were near the end of our prophetic time in which we expected the Lord would gather all his people in one; and 2. We had always preached a different doctrine, and now that the circumstances had changed, it would be regarded as dishonest in us if we should unite in the cry of separation and breaking up of churches that had received us and our message. We therefore hesitated, and continued to act on our first position until the church and ministry carried the matter so far that we were obliged, in the fear of God, to take a position in defense of the truth and the down-trodden children of God. "(Adventist Review 1844)

The testimonies of the churches in 1844, relative to their fallen condition, are worthy of particular notice.

The Christian Palladium for May 5, 1844, speaks in the following mournful strain: "In every direction we hear the dolorous sound, wafting upon every breeze of heaven, chilling as the blasts from the icebergs of the north, settling like an incubus on the breasts of the timid, and drinking up the energies of the weak, - that lukewarmness, division, anarchy, and desolation are distressing the borders of Zion. "

The Religious Telescope of 1844 uses the following language: "We have never witnessed such a general declension of religion as at the present. Truly, the church should awake, and search into the cause of this affliction; for as an affliction every one who loves Zion must view it.

When we call to mind how 'few and far between' cases of true conversion are, and the almost unparalleled impenitence and hardness of sinners, we almost involuntarily exclaim, 'Has God forgotten to be gracious? or is the door of mercy closed?' "

About that time, proclamations of fasts and seasons of prayer for the return of the Holy Spirit were sent out in the religious papers. Even the Philadelphia Sun, of Nov. 11, 1844, has the following: "The undersigned ministers and members of various denominations in Philadelphia and vicinity, solemnly believing that the present signs of the times - the spiritual dearth in our churches generally, and the extreme evils in the world around us - seem to call loudly on all Christians for a special season of prayer, do therefore hereby agree, by divine permission, to unite in a week of special prayer to Almighty God, for the outpouring of his Holy Spirit on our city, our country, and the world. "

Prof. Finney, editor of the Oberlin Evangelist, Feb. 1844, says: "We have had the facts before our minds that, in general, the Protestant churches of our country, as such, were either apathetic or hostile to nearly all the moral reforms of the age. There are partial exceptions, yet not enough to render the fact otherwise than general. We have also another corroborated fact: the almost universal absence of revival influence in the churches. The spiritual apathy is almost all-pervading, and is fearfully deep; so the religious press of the whole land testifies. Very extensively, church members are becoming devotees of fashion - joining hands with the ungodly in parties of pleasure, in dancing, in festivities, etc.

But we need not expand this painful subject. Suffice it that the evidence thickens and rolls heavily upon us, to show that the churches generally are becoming sadly degenerate. They have gone very far from the Lord, and he has withdrawn himself from them. "

It may be said that our views of the moral fall and spiritual dearth of the churches are shown to be incorrect by the great revivals of 1858. Of the fruit of these revivals let the leading Congregational and Baptist papers of Boston bear testimony.

Says the Congregationalist for Nov. , 1858: "The revival piety of our churches is not such that one can confidently infer, from its mere existence, its legitimate, practical fruits. It ought, for example, to be as certain, after such a shower of grace, that the treasures of our benevolent societies would be filled, as it is after a plentiful rain that the streams will swell in their channels. But the managers of our societies are bewailing the feebleness of the sympathy and aid of the churches.

"There is another and sadder illustration of the same general truth. The Watchman and Reflector recently stated that there had never been, among the Baptists, so lamentable a spread of church dissension as prevails at present. And the sad fact is mentioned that this sin infects the very churches 38 which shared most largely in the late revival. And the still more melancholy fact is added, that these alienations date back their origin, in most cases, to the very midst of that scene of awakening. Even a glance at the weekly journals of our own denomination will evince that the evil is by no means confined to the Baptists. Our own columns have, perhaps, never borne so humiliating a record of contentions and ecclesiastical litigations as during the last few months. "

A Presbyterian pastor, of Belfast, Ireland (1858), uses the following language respecting the recent revivals in this country: "The determination to crush all ministers who say a word against their national sin [slavery], the determination to suffocate and suppress the plain teachings of Scripture, can be persisted in and carried out at the very time these New York Christians are expecting the religious world to hail their revivals. Until the wretchedly degraded churches of America do the work of God in their own land, they have no spiritual vitality to communicate to others; their revivals are in the religious world what their flaunted cries of liberty, intermingled with the groans of the slave, are in the political. "(N.Y. Independent Dec. 1859)

During the time of the great Irish revival of 1859, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland held its session in Belfast. Says the Belfast News-Letter, of Sept. 30: "Here in this venerable body of ministers and elders, we find two ministers openly giving each other the lie, and the whole General Assembly turned into a scene of confusion bordering upon a riot. "

These sad facts need no comment. In Ireland the ministers of the gospel are unable to meet in General Assembly without a riot among themselves; in America, prayers for the enslaved were not allowed in the revival meetings. No wonder that fruit of genuine piety is difficult to be found.

How unlike what God designed that his people should be, has this great city become! The church of Christ was to be the light of the world, a city set upon a hill, which could not be hid. Matt. 5:14-17. But instead of this, his professed people have united with the world, and joined in affinity with it. This unlawful union of the church and the world (James 4:4) has resulted in

her rejection by God; for how can the God of truth and holiness recognize as his people those who, in addition to their departure from their Lord, have rejected with scorn the tidings of his speedy coming?

In Rev. 18 the message announcing the fall of Babylon is presented again, with additions, showing, as we understand, that there is in the future a mighty movement to take place on this subject. We have no doubt that God has many dear saints united with the various bodies of professed Christians. Those, we believe, will yet hear the call given in Rev. 18:4. There is, however, one important fact which demonstrates that it was the providence of God which caused the proclamation of the first and second angels' messages within a few years past. Rev. 14:6-8.

Chap. 18, in presenting again the message respecting the fall of Babylon, informs us that she has become the hold of foul spirits, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. As a demonstration that we are correct in regard to the application of Rev. 14, let the present movement respecting the spirits of the dead answer. An innumerable host of demons are spreading themselves over the whole country, flooding the churches and religious bodies of the land to a very great extent. The immortality of the soul, a doctrine which is held by almost every church in the world, is the basis and foundation of all their work. This extraordinary movement clearly evinces the rapid approach of the hour of temptation that shall come on all the world, to try them that dwell on the earth.

It is an interesting fact that the judgment on the great harlot, which is so fully described in Rev. 18, is shown to John by one of the seven angels having the seven vials filled with the wrath of God. Rev. 17:1. From chap. 16:17-21, we learn that the judgment on the harlot Babylon is inflicted by the angel having the seventh vial. Hence we may justly conclude that the angel who shows John the judgment of Babylon, is that one of the seven who has her judgment to inflict; in other words, it is the angel who has the seventh vial. It is agreed on all hands that the seventh angel of Rev. 16 is yet future. It follows, therefore, that Rev. 18, which describes the judgment on Babylon and gives the call to come out of her, belongs to the future. It is manifest that Babylon is rapidly becoming the hold of foul spirits, and of unclean and hateful birds. The call to come out of her is made while her plagues are immediately impending.

The destruction of Babylon, as described in Rev. 18, takes place under the seventh vial; for it is under that vial that she comes in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. Rev. 16:17-21. The people of God are called out of her just before the seven last plagues are poured out. Those plagues are future, as we shall hereafter prove. Hence it is certain that Rev. 18 cannot be applied to the events of the sixteenth century. It is manifest that the destruction of Babylon begins before the great battle takes place; for the kings are spared to witness her destruction (Rev. 18); but in the great battle they are all destroyed. Rev. 19. While the saints eat the marriage supper, they behold the smoke of her burning; and in response to the call of Rev. 18:20, they rejoice over her. Rev. 19:1-9.

Babylon is to be thrown down with violence, as a millstone is cast into the great deep, and she is to be utterly burned with fire. If this utter destruction were her "fall", there would be no need of the second angel's proclamation to announce the fact; for her destruction is to be witnessed by the kings and merchants, and by every ship-master, and by all the company in ships, and by sailors, and by as many as trade by sea. This is conclusive proof that the fall and

destruction of Babylon are not the same, and that Babylon itself is not a literal city; for its destruction causes results that the destruction of no city on the globe could cause. It is evident from what has been said, that the destruction of Babylon takes place in immediate connection with the second advent. This fact is of itself a sufficient refutation of the view that locates the call, "Come out of her, my people, " in the future age; for Babylon is destroyed at the very commencement of that age.

The duty of the people of God is plainly expressed, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. " Her sins have reached unto heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities; she has united herself to the kings of earth, and confided in the arm of flesh, and not in Jehovah.

For the sake of this protection, she has smoothed down the terrible threatenings of God's word against sin, and has thrown the mantle of religion over some of the basest of human crimes. As an instance, we will cite the Fugitive Slave Law, which during its existence had the sanction of many of the leading doctors of divinity. Pride, love of the world, and departure from God too plainly identify the Babylon of the Apocalypse with St. Paul's description of the popular church of the last days. 2 Tim. 3:1-5. "From such, " says the apostle, "turn away. " If we would not partake of her sins, and thus share in the plagues that are about to be poured out upon her, we must heed the voice from heaven, "Come out of her, my people. "

The moral fall of the Protestant churches in general brings us to the point where we are able to say, in the language of the Second Angel's Message, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city. "

This was not true of all Babylon before this moral fall had been witnessed, and consequently the second message would not have been appropriate if it had been preached before 1844. Only two divisions of Babylon had fallen before this time. The Bible presents a testimony of the most solemn character concerning Babylon. It must be the duty of God's servants to give this testimony at the 41 proper time, even as God has given it in his word. This testimony comes from God, and is not dependent upon the will of man, and therefore no person should be offended when it is presented. If that which is said of Babylon is true of a particular denomination, then that people should receive the light with gratitude, and bring forth the fruits of repentance.

But if any church is found to whom this testimony is not applicable, let them be grateful that they do not belong to this great city, and let them not complain that this most solemn message is preached for the benefit of the vast numbers for whom it is appropriate. The servants of God are called to announce the principles of truth with faithfulness, and each one must apply them in his own case according to truth in the fear of God.

Now, lest any should deny that the Greek and the Protestant churches are included in Babylon, we invite attention to the following facts: It is evident, from the terms of this prophecy, that Babylon is composed of people who profess to be Christians. It is also evident that a great part of the true people of God are found in Babylon, even in the last days. But Babylon is a harlot because of her unlawful union with the kings of the earth; and as the result of this union she has corrupted the truth of God. Now we will prove that the Greek Church is one of the three grand divisions of Babylon. The Catholic Church became a harlot at an epoch at least as early as the time of Constantine. History records the acts of no other civil ruler who has wrought so great changes in the church as did Constantine. He gave a new form of

government to the church, having for his model the government of the empire. He created offices in the church unknown to the New Testament, and he corrupted the doctrines and practices of the church. In his time the Greek Church and the Roman Church formed together the one so-called Catholic Church.

This great church continued to corrupt itself more and more from century to century. Its history is full of examples of unlawful union with the kings of the earth. But in the eleventh century, as the result of the long quarrel between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Constantinople concerning the supremacy, the Catholic Church was divided into two churches, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Greek Catholic Church. After this separation, the Greek Catholic Church continued to be what the general Catholic Church had been before the division. The separation did not cause the Greek Church to renounce a single error of the great Catholic Church, nor to cease her unlawful connection with the kings of the earth. If the Catholic Church was Babylon before it was thus divided, then the Greek Church was, before that separation from Rome, a very considerable part of 42 the great city of Babylon. The principal difference between the Roman Church and the Greek Church since the separation is, that the Greek Church has simply retained the errors held by all in common before the separation, without making much addition to those errors, and without taking a very active part in persecuting others; while the Roman Church has added several other errors to her system of doctrine, particularly such as have respect to the power of the pope, and she has been very active in persecuting those who have not submitted to her authority. The Greek Church is less guilty than the church of Rome; but to deny that she forms an important division of Babylon, would be to deny that Babylon existed before the great schism of the eleventh century.

Five hundred years after the separation of the Greek and Roman churches bring us to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, which separated several great nations from the communion of the church of Rome. This is the second grand separation from Rome. Since that time, the religious world has existed in three grand divisions, the Greek Catholics, the Roman Catholics, and the Protestants. The separation of the Greeks from Rome was not characterized by a reformation; it is therefore certain that the Greeks continued to be a part of Babylon. But the separation of the Protestants from Rome was characterized by the renunciation of several great errors. It is therefore worthy of our attention to determine carefully whether the Protestants made such a reform as would cause them to cease to be a part of Babylon. They rejected the authority of the pope and of the church of Rome; they appealed to the Bible as the supreme rule of faith; they exposed many errors and sins of the church of Rome; and they taught justification by faith.

But to leave Babylon it is not enough to separate from the communion of those who sustain her errors. It is necessary to renounce these errors by receiving the truth of God, and it is necessary, also, to renounce the sins of Babylon by true repentance. If the Protestants returned to the purity and simplicity of the New Testament, then they ceased to be a part of Babylon; but if they retained a considerable number of the essential errors and sins of Babylon, and contented themselves to preserve their part of the old city, after a partial purification, instead of building anew after the divine model, then they have never ceased to be a part of Babylon.

The churches of the New Testament were composed of those only who repented of their sins, believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, and were buried with him in baptism. But the churches which compose the Romish apostasy are organized on a plan essentially different from that of the apostles. By means of infant baptism, 43 the entire population is brought into the church;

the church and the world are no longer distinct, and the church becomes an assembly of unconverted men. This confusion of the world and the church is one of the essential errors which made a Babylon of the Catholic church.

Now it is a painful fact that the reformers did not see it necessary to commence at the foundation, and form churches of converted persons only; on the contrary, they positively refused to do this, but their first churches were simply Romish churches which had accepted the doctrines of the Reformation, but which were composed of persons admitted by infant baptism, the larger part of whom were unacquainted with Christian experience; and the churches afterward raised up by them were of a similar character, because formed on the same model.

Now we offer a second decisive proof that the Reformation was not sufficiently complete to deliver the Protestants from Babylon. The unlawful union of Church and State is the natural consequence of the prevalence of infant baptism; for that human ordinance made the terms church and world two names for one thing. This shows how appropriate is the term Babylon as the name for this city of confusion. But Babylon is called a prostitute because of her unlawful union with the kings of the earth. This criminal union is seen when by their royal authority they exercise their influence informing the doctrines of the church, in giving form to the service and worship of God, and in creating offices in the church, and filling them with their favorites; and when the church not only accepts all this, but even sanctions the criminal practices of kings, so that she may profit by their revenues, and that she may use this power to persecute those who do not accept her dogmas.

Was it true that the reformers separated Church and State in Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Scotland and England? Did they imitate the apostles in organizing churches without the participation of the civil power? - By no means. In all these countries the civil power has exercised a strong influence in the formation of the confessions of faith, and in deciding what should be the character and manner of the worship, in creating church offices and in selecting the persons to fill those offices, and even in determining who should be the ministers of the word of God. These things are carried so far in England that the king or queen is recognized as the head of the church. This unlawful union of Church and State made Babylon a prostitute, and the reformers did not dissolve this union, but perpetuated it.

The ordinances of the church have been corrupted in Babylon. To leave Babylon it is necessary to turn from these corruptions, and to receive the 44 pure ordinances of the New Testament church. Did the reformers see the necessity of doing this? - They did not. They were satisfied with the baptism they had received in their infancy from the Catholic priests, and they perpetuated this corruption of the ordinance of baptism in the Protestant churches. They served in the work of the Christian ministry by virtue of their ordination as Catholic priests, and they never considered it important to be set apart to the holy ministry by converted men. They were satisfied with that which they had received from Rome.

Even the bishops and archbishops of the ancient Catholic Church of England have been perpetuated in the Church of England and in the Episcopal Church of America, and these churches pretend to be the Catholic Church, or rather, grand divisions of that church, because they can trace their bishops back to the apostles through the long line of popes.

These things show that the Reformation formed the third grand division of Babylon, instead of establishing a church upon the model of the ancient apostolic church. This third division is

much less soiled with error than are the other two divisions, but it is not clean in the sight of God. Since the Reformation, other Protestant churches have arisen, having less of papal errors than the first reformed churches. But a serious error which is at the foundation of the great Babylonian apostasy is found in nearly all the Protestant churches. That great apostasy has virtually annulled the commandment which forbids graven images, and the commandment which commands men to sanctify the seventh day in memory of the Creator's rest.

The action of the church of Rome with respect to the first of these commandments was considered by the reformers a just ground for separation from that church, and yet nearly all the Protestant churches have perpetuated the action of that great apostasy with respect to the fourth commandment. They violate the fourth commandment, and teach men so; or rather, they make void the commandment of God to keep the tradition of the elders. They set aside the Sabbath of the Lord that they may keep the festival day of the sun; and in thus violating the fourth commandment, they actually violate the entire law of God. No church has a right to consider itself apostolic while it violates the commandments of God. So long as a church does this, the stain of apostasy is upon her, and in this respect she is Babylonian rather than apostolic.

Though the account of the judgment upon Babylon in Rev. 18 speaks of Babylon as if she were one city, yet we learn from Rev. 16:19 that Babylon will be divided into three parts before she receives her punishment. This seems to indicate that these three parts are not alike guilty, and that God makes this division that he may punish each part according to the light which it has had, and the crimes which it has committed. It is therefore not unreasonable to conclude that Babylon is now composed of three grand sections, which are culpable in different degrees, and that God will judge each according to its deserts. The Roman Catholic Church, having its seat at Rome, and having once had the jurisdiction of the entire ten kingdoms, and now of the greater part of them, is without doubt the central section of this great city; but we have convincing proof that there are also two other sections of Babylon, and that God will punish each as it deserves.

The fall of this great city is announced after the third and last section has fallen. It is only then we are able to say in truth that Babylon is fallen. The place assigned to this proclamation in prophecy is the only place suitable for it. For us to be able to leave Babylon, it is necessary that the angel of God should illuminate the earth with his glory (Rev. 18:1, 2), and thus dissipate the darkness which its errors have caused.

This angel accomplishes his work in intimate connection with the angel who announces that the hour of God's Judgment is come, and with that other angel who preaches the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. It is at the time of these messages that the people of God are called out of Babylon, - a proof conclusive that the greater part are in Babylon when this proclamation is made. The coming of Christ must be preceded by a work which shall establish the primitive purity, and this work must be accomplished by the three angels. Consequently, the proclamation concerning Babylon pertains to the end of this dispensation.

Chapter Five - Proclamation of the Third Angel

This Proclamation not a Past Event
It Relates to the Work of the Two-Horned Beast
The Ten-Horned Beast
Its Identity with the Little Horn of Dan. 7
The Seven Heads
The Ten Horns
The Deadly Wound
The Mouth Speaking Great Things
Fate of the Beast.

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. " Verses 9-12.

THIS is the most solemn warning that the Bible contains. As the pen of inspiration has recorded this language for our instruction, it will be wise for us to listen and obey. It is certain that the record of our world's history presents no testimony that this message has been heard in the past. And the fact that the first and second angels of this series have been proved to belong to the present generation, most clearly establishes the point that this message does not belong to the past ages.

Says J. W. Himes, in 1847: "But the fourteenth chapter [of Revelation] presents an astounding cry, yet to be made, as a warning to mankind in that hour of strong temptation. Verses 9-11. A denunciation of wrath so dreadful cannot be found in the book of God, besides this. Does it not imply a strong temptation, to require so terrific an admonition?"*(Facts on Romanism 112)

The work of the two-horned beast in performing miracles, and causing those that dwell upon the earth, by means of those miracles, to form an image to the beast which all men must worship, certainly pertains to the future. The Third Angel's Message is a warning to prepare the church for this fearful scene. In proof of this fact, we place the prophecy respecting the two-horned beast, and the warning of the third angel, in contrast:-

Of the two-horned beast the prophet says:

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. . . . And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. " Chap. 13:12- 17.

Of the warning of the third angel he says: If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. " Rev. 14:9-11.

A comparison of these scriptures shows us what an hour of temptation and anguish there is yet before us. If men worship the beast and his image, they will receive of the wine of the wrath of God; and if they refuse, it is at the peril of their lives at the hands of men. This doubtless refers to the time when all who dwell upon the earth, whose names are not written in the book of life, shall worship the beast. Rev. 13:8.

That we may understand the cause of this fearful warning against the worship of the beast and his image, and the reception of his mark, it is necessary that we should examine the testimony respecting the beast, and also the two-horned beast that causes the image to be made to the first beast.

This question may be answered by referring to Rev. 13:1-10. When Daniel, in his vision of the seventh chapter, was shown the various empires that should successively bear rule over the earth, they were represented under the symbols of beasts arising from the sea. Three of these having passed away in John's day, it is proper that the fourth of this series, only, should be shown to him. The beast with ten horns, described by Daniel, is also seen by John to ascend out of the sea.

In him were blended the marks of all the preceding beasts, - the body of the leopard, the feet of the bear, and the mouth of the lion. Dan. 7:4-6.

The beast is evidently the papal form of the fourth empire; for it receives its power and seat from the dragon, imperial Rome. Verse 2. In proof of this, we present the following evidence as arranged by Litch. He is showing the identity of the papal power in Dan. 7 with the beast of Rev. 13:1-10.

"1. The little horn was to be a blasphemous power. 'He shall speak great words against the Most High. ' Dan. 7:25. So, also, was the beast of Rev. 13:6 to do the same. 'He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God. '

"2. The little horn 'made war with the saints, and prevailed against them. ' Dan. 7:21. Thus the beast of Rev. 13:7 was also 'to make war with the saints, and to overcome them. '

"3. The little horn had a 'mouth that spake very great things. ' Dan. 7:8, 20. So, likewise, there was given the beast of Rev. 13:5 'a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies. '

"4. Power was given the little horn of Dan. 7:25, 'until a time, times, and the dividing of time. ' To the beast, also, power was given to 'continue forty and two months. ' Rev. 13:5.

"5. The domination of the little horn was to be taken away at the termination of that specified period. The beast of Rev. 13:10, who led into captivity and put to death with the sword so many of the saints, was himself to be led into captivity, and be killed with the sword, at the end of the forty and two months.

"With these points of similarity in the two emblems, the little horn and the beast, who can doubt their identity?*(Restitution p. 119)

"The dragon (imperial Rome) gave unto the beast (papal Rome) his power, and his seat, and great authority. "

We have before proved that the city of Rome was the seat of the dragon, which is here represented as transferred to the beast. It is well known that the seat of empire was by the emperor Constantine removed from Rome to Constantinople; and that Rome itself, at a later period, was given to the popes by the Emperor Justinian.

The seven heads are seven forms of civil power which successively bear rule. These seven heads belong alike to the dragon of Rev. 12, the beast of chap. 13, and that of chap. 17. This shows conclusively that the dragon and these two beasts are symbols of the same power under different heads for there are not three sets of seven heads, but it is evident that the heads are successive forms of its power, one of them bearing rule at a time, and then giving place to another. Rev. 17:9, 10.

It appears that the dragon of chap. 12 and the beast of chap. 13 and that of chap. 17 each represents some one or more of the seven heads yet as each is seen with the seven heads, they must each in a certain sense extend over all the period covered by the three symbols; for there are not twenty-one heads. The proper period of each seems to be this: the dragon before the 1260 years, the beast of chap. 13, during that period, and the beast of chap. 17 since the deadly wound and captivity at the close of that period.

The ten horns are the ten kingdoms of the fourth empire. They are distinct from the seven heads, and hence the ten kingdoms are not to be counted as one of the heads as some have done. The horns are contemporary, that is, all reign at the same time; while the heads are successive, but one existing at a time. It seems that John in Rev. 13:1-10, goes twice over the history of the beast, once in verses 1-3, and again in verses 4-10.

We now inquire respecting the time when the beast received its deadly wound. That this event took place at the close of the 1260 years and not before the commencement of that period or during its continuance, we think evident from the following facts:-

1. A head wounded before that period would not be a head of the beast, but a head of the dragon. The prophecy does not relate to the wounding of a head of the dragon, to make way for the rise of the beast, as some suppose, but to the wounding of a head of the beast.

2. Nor could it take place during the 1260 years; for it is said that the beast receives his power and seat from this dragon, and that from that time he was to have power for 1260 years, so that he should be able to overcome the saints, and should have power over all kindreds and tongues and nations.

This 1260 years' rule began with the act of the dragon in giving his seat, the city of Rome, unto the beast, in 538, and ended in 1798, when the city of Rome was taken from the beast, and his power was wrested from him. During this period, therefore, the deadly wound and overthrow of the beast could not take place.

3. The time when the beast received this deadly wound seems to be clearly marked in verse 10. It is there stated that he that leadeth into captivity and killeth with the sword, must be led into captivity and killed with the sword. That is, the papal power, which had thus acted for 1260 years, must at the close of that period of triumph be thus used. Such were the facts in 1798. So John goes over the history of the beast twice, first in verses 1-3, ending with the deadly wound; and the second time in verses 4-10, ending with the beast's being led into captivity and slain. This is the event predicted in Dan. 7:26: "They shall take away his dominion. "

The mouth given to the beast speaking great words and blasphemies, evidently signifies the same as the mouth of the little horn of Dan. 7, which should speak great words against the Most High, and think to change times and laws. It is the papacy claiming infallibility, and pretending to be the vicar of God upon earth. That this prophecy has been fulfilled in the most wonderful manner, and that the 1260 years of papal triumph expired about the close of the last century, cannot be denied. The papal power was then subverted, and the seat of the dragon wrested from him.

We believe, however, that verse 8 - And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" - has never yet been fully accomplished.

It is certain that the time never yet has been when all except true Christians worshiped the beast. But this time is yet to be witnessed in the fulfillment of the prophecy respecting the two-horned beast.

We expect this in the hour of temptation that shall come on all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. It is in view of this scene that the third angel utters his voice of warning. The beast of Rev. 13:1-10, though wounded with a deadly wound, was to recover from that wound, and must, according to Rev. 19:19, 20 and Dan. 7:7-11, continue till the battle of the great day of God Almighty, after which he is to be cast into the lake of fire.

CHAPTER VI - Two Horned Beast

The Two-Horned Beast cannot arise in the Ten Kingdoms of Papal Europe

- Time and Manner of his Rise
- Testimony of the Dublin Nation
- Symbol of the Two Horns
- An Age of Wonders
- The Spirits of Devils working Miracles
- The Hour of Temptation.

IT is the Two-Horned beast that is to cause the world to worship the first beast, and to form an image to that beast, which all must worship on pain of death. We have shown that it is the two-horned beast which is to cause the fearful scene respecting which the third angel utters his voice of solemn warning. It is therefore evident that if we would understand this warning, we must carefully examine the prophecy respecting the two-horned beast.

What power, then, is symbolized by this beast with two horns like a lamb? We have already seen that the fourth beast of Daniel, which in its papal form is the same as the beast that received the deadly wound, of which John speaks, does not give his place to another beast, but continues until the Judgment, when he is to be cast into the fiery flame. Dan. 7:11; Rev. 19:20. Hence it is certain that the location of the two-horned beast is not in the ten kingdoms of the fourth beast. We cannot take one of the horns of the fourth beast, and with it constitute another beast, or the horns of another.

The two-horned beast is "another beast" besides the ten-horned beast. It is not the first beast healed of his deadly wound; for the work of the two-horned beast is in the sight of that beast. Rev. 13:14. It would indeed be a surprising change if the ten horns were to be plucked up, and in their stead two other horns should arise. Yet such is a necessary conclusion if the two-horned beast is but another form of the first beast. Hence we conclude that the two-horned beast is another and a distinct power.

It is, however, from the time of its rise a power contemporary with the beast whose deadly wound was healed. It acts in the sight of the first beast in performing its wonders.

The manner of its rise is not to be overlooked. The four beasts of Daniel, of which series John's first beast constituted the fourth, are all seen to rise out of the sea in consequence of the striving of the winds. Dan. 7:2, 3; Rev. 13:1. They arose by overturning the powers that preceded them, by means of general war. Winds denote war or strife among men, and sea or waters denote people, nations, etc. Rev. 7:1-3; 17:15.

But this power rises in a peaceful or lamb-like manner from the earth. It does not arise by the strife of the winds upon the sea, that is, by the overthrow of other nations and empires, but it arises where no other beast exists, and acts its part in the presence of its predecessors. This shows that it must arise from a new and previously unoccupied territory.

When was this power to arise? - Not prior to the first beast, certainly. Not at the same time; for then there would be no propriety in designating either as the first beast. It is said that it shall

exercise all the power of the first beast before it. Then we may look for it to come on the stage of action about the close of the first beast's dominion, at the end of the 1260 years. Again, it is to cause the world to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed, which shows that its period of action is this side of 1798.

J. Litch says: "The two-horned beast is represented as a power existing and performing his part after the death and revival of the first beast. . . . If asked for my opinion as to what will constitute that beast with two horns, or the false prophet, I must frankly confess I do not know. I think it is a power yet to be developed or made manifest as an accomplice of the papacy in subjecting the world. It will be a power which will perform miracles, and deceive the world with them. See Rev. 19:20. "Restitution" pp 131,132

Mr. Wesley, in his notes on Rev. 13, says of the two-horned beast: "He has not yet come, though he cannot be far off: for he is to appear at the end of the forty-two months of the first beast. "

One fact of interest may be noticed here: The course of empire, beginning with the first great empire near the garden of Eden, has been ever tending westward. Thus the seat of the Babylonian and Persian empires was in Asia. The seat of the Grecian and Roman empires was in Europe. The Roman Empire, in its divided state, as represented by the ten horns, occupies all the remaining territory west of the Atlantic Ocean. Hence, we still look westward for the rise of the power described in this prophecy.

Bishop Berkeley, in his celebrated poem on America, written before the American Revolution, foresaw the greatness of this power, and he forcibly describes its connection with its predecessors:-

" Westward the course of empire takes its way;
The first four acts already past,
A fifth shall end the drama with the day;
Time's noblest offspring is the last. "

By "the four acts" the bishop doubtless refers to the four great empires of the prophet Daniel. The fifth, with which the scene closes, is the power that has arisen this side of the Atlantic. As the four powers of the Eastern Continent were not to be succeeded by a fifth, we understand that the power represented by the beast with two horns, which arises in the last days of the fourth beast, must be located in America. This lamb-like power, the noblest and the last offspring of time, must also in its dragonic character prove itself the basest.

As we have said, the two-horned beast does not arise by overthrowing its predecessors. And it is worthy of notice that the ten kingdoms of the fourth empire were all complete long before the discovery of America. The war of the Revolution was not for the purpose of overthrowing one of the ten kingdoms of the fourth empire, but it was to maintain the just rights of the American people.

This power is evidently the last one with which the people of God are connected; for the Third Angel's Message, which immediately precedes the coming of Jesus on the white cloud pertains almost entirely to the action of the two-horned beast. Compare Rev. 14:9-11 with 13:11-18. And it is a fact which ought not to be overlooked, that those powers with which the people of God are connected, are the only ones noted in prophecy.

It is also plain that the march of civilization and of Christianity, like the course of the natural sun, has ever been westward; and it is evident that the territory of this last power is to be the field of the angels' messages, the land where the crowning truths of the gospel, as it finishes its course, are to be brought out.

The rise of each of the great powers has been gradual. For a series of years they were preparing for the stations which they afterward assumed; but they begin to be represented in prophecy at the time when they are prepared to act their part. We are now to trace the rise of an empire which has come up in the sight of the first beast, - a power still further on toward the setting sun, with the history of which the great circuit of empire will be accomplished, for the boundary of the vast Pacific has been reached.

A short time before the Reformation in the days of Martin Luther, a new continent was discovered. The rise of the reformers brought out a large class who were determined to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They desired a greater measure of civil and religious freedom; hence they with many others fled to the wilds of America, and laid the foundation of a new empire. They did not establish their power by overturning another power, but they planted themselves in an uncultivated waste, and laid the foundation of a new government. The preceding powers had arisen through the strife of the winds on the great sea; but this power arises out of the earth. That is, the first powers arose through the action of wars in overturning and subverting other nations, to be in turn overthrown and subverted by their successors; but this power appears to arise from the earth in a peaceful manner.

It comes up in the sight of the first beast like the settlement and growth of a new country.

The Dublin Nation thus notices the progress and the power of this republic: "In the East, there is arising a colossal centaur called the Russian Empire. With a civilized head and front, it has the sinews of a huge barbaric body. There one man's brain moves 70, 000, 000. There all the traditions of the people are of aggression and conquest in the West. There but two ranks are distinguishable, serfs and soldiers. There the map of the future includes Constantinople and Vienna as outposts of St. Petersburg.

"In the West, an opposing and still more wonderful American Empire is EMERGING. We islanders have no conception of the extraordinary events which, amid the silence of the earth, are daily adding to the power and pride of this gigantic nation. Within three years, territories more extensive than these three kingdoms, France, and Italy put together, have been quietly, and in almost 'matter of course' fashion, annexed to the Union.

"In seventy years, seventeen new sovereignties, the smallest of them larger than Great Britain, have peaceably united themselves to the federation. No standing army was raised, no national debt, sunk, no great exertion was made, but there they are. And the last mail brings news of the organization of three more great States about to be joined to the thirty, Minnesota in the north-west, Desert in the south-west, and California on the shores of the Pacific. These three States will cover an area equal to one-half the European continent.

"Nor is this a mere addition on the map. It is not piling barren Pelion upon uncultivated Ossa. It is an actual conquest of new strength and resources. Already has Minnesota its capital, St. Paul, which has its journals, churches, schools, parties, interests, and speculations. . . . Instead of becoming a lawless horde of adventurers, the settlers in California are founding cities,

electing delegates, magistrates, sheriffs, and congressmen as methodically and as intently as if they trod the beaten paths of life on the Atlantic shore of the continent.

"And with this increase of territory, there is a commensurate increase of industry in the older States. The census of 1850, about to be taken in the United States will show a growth of numbers, territory, and industry entirely unexampled in human history. Let the 'gray powers of the Old World' look to it; let the statesmen of France, Germany, and Russia read the census carefully, though it should startle them. Let despotism count every man of these millions as a mortal enemy, and every acre of that vast commonwealth as an inheritance of mankind mortgaged to the cause of freedom. America is as grand a field for human enterprise as when the ships of Columbus first neared the shores of Guanahani. "

The progress of our country since its first settlement has indeed been wonderful. We trace its rise onward, from the time of its first settlement by those who fled from the oppression of the fourth empire till it assumes its station among the great powers of earth, a little previous to the end of the 1260 years. Its territory has increased more than three-fold since that period, by the addition of the vast territories of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, New Mexico, and California, and the extension of an undisputed title to Oregon, thus extending its dominion to the vast Pacific.

The youth, as well as the apparent mildness of this power, seems to be indicated by its lamb-like horns. What do these horns mean? The symbol of horns like those of a lamb is not elsewhere used in the prophetic scriptures, with the exception of those texts which represent Christ as a lamb having seven horns, etc. Rev. 5:6. The idea appears to be generally prevalent, that a horn is used only to designate civil power. This is certainly a mistake.

In "History of the Church" "The horn as an emblem of power was originally taken from beasts, such as the urus, wild ox, buffalo, or perhaps the rhinoceros, who were perceived to have so much power in their horns. Hence, a horn was frequently worn on crowns and helmets, as is evident on ancient coins; and to this day it is an appendage to the diadems of the kings and chiefs of Abyssinia. "

We may learn from those symbols, which are explained in connection with other powers, some facts that will throw light on this. The two horns of the ram in Dan. 8 denoted the union of the two powers of Media and Persia in one empire. The great horn of the Grecian goat was the symbol of the first form of that power.

The ten horns of the fourth beast denoted the ten distinct powers into which the fourth empire was divided. Dan. 7:23-25. And the little horn which came up after the ten, represented the papacy, a purely ecclesiastical power. It was a horn before the three were plucked up. See Dan. 7:8, 24. This was accomplished in 538, but the papacy did not become possessed of temporal dominion until 755.

Says Goodrich: "As a reward to the Roman pontiff, Pepin, in the year 755, conferred on Stephen, the successor of Zachary, several rich provinces in Italy, by which gift he was established as a temporal monarch. "(Bower's History of the Popes," vol.2 p. 108)

Hence it is certain that ecclesiastical as well as civil power is represented by a horn. And it is evident that the horns of these beasts symbolize the entire power of the beasts. From these facts we may learn that the horns of Daniel's fourth beast (the first beast of Rev. 13) denoted

civil and religious power. Hence we regard the horns of the last beast of Rev. 13 as symbolizing the civil and religious power of the nation represented by that beast.

A plurality of horns is not always the symbol of a power divided; for the two horns of the ram in Dan. 8 symbolize the union of Media and Persia in one government. In appearance, if we may judge from the symbols used, this beast represents the mildest power that ever rose; for in the prophetic history of the governments that have preceded this, no one has been represented by symbols so mild. We understand these horns to denote the civil and religious power of this nation, - its Republican civil power, and its Protestant ecclesiastical.

If it be objected that its civil power ought to be represented by the beast, rather than by a horn of the beast, we refer to one or two facts that will meet this point. The civil power of Grecia was represented by the great horn of the goat; and when that civil power was broken, the beast still continued to exist; and in the place of that one civil government arose four. And we may add, that when the dominion of the different beasts of Dan. 7 was taken away, their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. That is, the nations still lived, though their dominion was destroyed. Hence, we understand that the beasts denote the nations which constitute the different kingdoms, and the horns of the beast denote the civil and religious powers of the nations.

No civil power could ever compare with Republicanism in its lamb-like character. The grand principle recognized by this form of power is thus expressed: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. "

Hence all should have a right to participate in making the laws, and in designating who shall execute them. Was there ever a development of civil power so lamb-like before? And what, in religious matters, can be compared with Protestantism? Its leading sentiment is the distinct recognition of the right of private judgment in matters of conscience. "The Bible is the only religion of Protestants. " Was there ever in the religious world anything to equal this in its lamb-like professions?

The symbol of the beast with two horns like a lamb fitly represents this new power. Observe the combination of the lamb and the dragon. Both these symbols had been previously seen by John. There is an evident reference to them in this description of the beast with two horns. He had seen a Lamb with seven horns and a dragon with ten horns. Rev. 5:6; 12:3. The Lamb represents Jesus Christ in his office of King of kings. Rev. 17:14.

The dragon represents the Roman power animated by Satan. Rev. 12. In fact, if we omit the heads and horns which represent that empire in its several forms, we shall find that the real dragon, or serpent, is Satan himself. Rev. 20:2, 3, 7.

The kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan are opposite in character. Christ's kingdom is one and indivisible; but the kingdom of Satan is full of confusion and division. For this reason the horns of the Lamb and the horns of the dragon, though alike symbolic, are by the Spirit of God interpreted very differently.

The horns of the dragon are the same as the horns of the beast to whom the dragon gave his power. They are the ten kingdoms, into which the kingdom of the dragon or beast has been divided. Rev. 17:12; Dan. 7:24. But the horns of the Lamb, who is King of kings, are the

seven spirits of God. Rev. 5:6. The seven horns must therefore represent the nature of Christ's dominion as King of kings, and not that his kingdom should be divided; for his title, King of kings, indicates not one kingdom broken up into many, but rather many united in one; for the servants of Christ will be princes under him (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:30; Rev. 20:4; 21:24); and he, as King over an undivided kingdom, will wear many crowns. Rev. 19:12.

In the symbol of the two-horned beast, the character of the horns, and not merely the number, is intended to be expressed by the words, "two horns like a lamb"; for there is nothing peculiar to a lamb with respect to the number of its horns, but there is something peculiar in the character of these horns. It is important to notice this fact; for the interpretation of the horns of a lamb in John's vision is essentially different from that of the horns of the dragon, or of the beast.

Thus the horns of the beast represent the division of his kingdom; but the horns of the lamb represent the nature of his power, and do not signify that his kingdom is to be divided. We therefore understand the two horns like those of a lamb to represent the nature of the power symbolized, and not that it should be divided into two parts.

The spirit of God, in giving us the symbol of the ten-horned beast, thought proper to place crowns upon each of those horns. But in giving us the symbol of the beast with two horns like those of a lamb, it placed no crowns upon those horns.

Now these two symbols are not only given in immediate connection, but they are joined in the same work, according to this prophecy. Rev. 13:1, 11, 12, 14; 16:13; 19:20. It cannot, therefore, be without design that crowns are placed upon the horns of the first beast, and omitted in the case of the second. We know that the horns with crowns represent kingly governments (Rev. 17:12); and we think it a necessary conclusion that these horns like those of a lamb, and without crown, represent a government in which the people bear rule.

In some form, two kinds of power everywhere exist. These are, the civil power, as seen in the State; and the spiritual power as seen in the Church. In almost every country these powers are blended together in one, and both are in the hands of the rulers, and not in those of the people. But the American Republic presents the first instance in the history of the world in which these two powers are separated, and both are reserved by the people in their own hands. It is a government by the people and for the people, and it acknowledges them as the fountain of all authority. Here we have a State without a king and a Church without a pope; and Church and State are separate. The civil power recognizes the equality of all men before the law; and the spiritual power acknowledges the right of every man to worship God according to his own convictions of what God requires. Here are the two horns like those of a lamb.

"And he spake like a dragon. " With all these lamb-like appearances, the real spirit by which he is actuated is that of the dragon, - the Devil. "For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. " Matt. 12:34.

What he is to speak we may notice hereafter. Rev. 13:14. "And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him [or in his sight, as Whiting translates it], and causeth the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. "

Here is conclusive proof that the two-horned beast is distinct from the ten-horned beast, and contemporary with it from the time that its deadly wound was healed, or about the

commencement of the present century. This exercise of power will constitute the very scene of trouble and danger before us, respecting which the third angel utters his voice of warning,

"If any man worship the beast, and his image, and receives his mark on his forehead or on his hand, he himself shall also drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation. Rev. 14:9

The anguish of that period, when all the power of the first beast shall be exercised, may be learned from reading the history of the first beast. Rev. 13:5-7; Dan. 7:23-26.

It is certain that since the 1260 years of triumph of the first beast, no power has exercised such oppression as that which is here predicted. Hence this has not been accomplished in the past; and the prophecy clearly shows us that this dragonic work is to proceed from a government the mildest in appearance that the world ever saw, its power being represented by "horns like a lamb"; so that from a power that has presented to the world the most extraordinary spectacle of civil and religious liberty, bitter and unrelenting persecution is yet to be experienced by the church. This important fact should be carefully considered.

The lamb-like character is first to be exhibited. This is to deceive the nations. Then the dragonic character - the real character of the beast - is to appear. For as the dragon gave power to the first beast, and thus prepared the papacy for its 1260 years of persecution, so the two-horned beast gives power to the image of the first beast, to act a part like that beast in warring upon the saints.

The only civil government that has ever existed, exhibiting the lamb-like appearance of this symbol, is the United States, one of the articles of its Constitution containing these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. " As the lamb-like power of this beast, represented by its horns, is not in accordance with its dragonic character, as exhibited in its exercising all the power of the first beast, we think the conclusion a reasonable one, that its period of mildness and deception precedes that of its tyranny and oppression. We shall notice hereafter what this power does in causing the world to worship the first beast.

That we are living in an age of wonders is an admitted fact. The expression is oft times repeated, "There is nothing too wonderful to happen. " The increase of knowledge in every department of the arts and sciences has indeed been without precedent in our world's history. Our own country takes the lead in all this: we see the chariots, with the speed of lightning, coursing their way through the land, and with similar speed men traverse the mighty deep.

The prophecy of Nahum is now literally fulfilled: "The chariots shall be with flaming torches in the day of His preparation, and the fir-trees shall be terribly shaken. The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings. " Chap. 2:3, 4.

"The fire of God" (the lightning, Job 1:16; Ex. 9:23, 24) has been here brought down from heaven. Such is the wonderful power that man has obtained over the elements. And the lightning thus brought down from heaven is now made obedient to the will of man, and sent as a messenger from one end of our land to the other. God said to Job, "Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go and say unto thee, Here we are? Job. 38:35. To send the lightning seems almost an attribute to Omnipotence, if we may judge from the manner in which Jehovah speaks to his ancient servant; Yet men are now able to employ this executor of the

wrath of God as their own obedient servant. It has been observed by one speaker: "If Franklin tamed the lightning, Prof. Morse taught it the English language. " And all this bids fair to be eclipsed by other and more astonishing wonders.

We do not indeed regard this as the fulfillment of the prophecy, "He doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men;" but these facts are worthy of notice as marking the age in which we live.

When men in ancient times had reached that pass that there was nothing restrained from them that they imagined to do, we read that God came down and confounded them. Gen. 11:6-9. If the men of the present generation do not occupy a similar position, they certainly bid fair to do so before long. The world may indeed be deceived by the things that we have named, and many others of a like character, and be caused to believe that better days are coming, and that the earth is being prepared for the happy residence of men, and that men are becoming more virtuous and enlightened, and that thus the way is preparing for the temporal millennium.

But there is a class of wonders now in process of development that bids fair to present to the world the perfect fulfillment of this prophecy. We refer to that which is now called "Spiritualism, " the work of the unclean spirits in our land.

In almost every part of our land, multitudes of men of every class are now holding communion, as they suppose, with the spirits of the dead. And that they are holding communion with spirits of some kind is undeniable, for the fact of their presence is attested by astounding miracles. We think that no one can deny the facts that are brought to substantiate the work of the spirits, however they may judge of the spirits themselves.

Hon. J. W. Edmonds, judge of the Supreme Court of New York, said in 1853: "Scarcely more than four years have elapsed since the 'Rochester knockings' were first known among us. Then, mediums could be counted by units, but now, by thousands; then, believers could be numbered by the hundreds, now, by tens of thousands. It is believed by the best informed that the whole number in the United States must be several hundred thousand, and that in this city [New York] and its vicinity there must be from twenty to twenty-five thousand.

There are ten or twelve newspapers and periodicals devoted to the cause, and the Spiritual library embraces more than one hundred different publications, some of which have already attained a circulation of more than ten thousand copies. Besides the undistinguished multitude, there are many men of high standing and talent ranked among them, - doctors, lawyers, and clergymen in great numbers, a Protestant bishop, the learned and reverend president of a college, judges of our higher courts, members of Congress, foreign ambassadors, and ex-members of the United States Senate. "

This statement of Judge Edmonds was written about 1855. Since that time this work of the spirits has been steadily progressing, and they have now extended themselves over Great Britain, France, Germany, and many other countries. The Roman pontiff, the Queen of Spain, and the Empress of France, also the late Emperor, have all sought to these spirits for knowledge. It may be proper that we enumerate some of the many remarkable acts performed by them. Among them are the following:-

Many well-attested cases of healing; writing performed by them without the aid of any one; the transportation of things from a distance by the spirits alone; and persons carried by the

spirits through the air in the presence of many others. Tables have been suspended in the air with several persons on them; beautiful music has been performed by the spirits, with and without the aid of instruments; extraordinary communications respecting distant persons and places have been many times made with complete accuracy; and the spirits have represented themselves to the natural vision of some, and talked with them in an audible voice, the persons not knowing them to be spirits until they disappeared.

The astonishing progress of these wonders should awaken serious reflection on the part of every one. If these things continue to progress as hitherto, what a scene is there before us! It is evident that these things are but the beginning of the miracles with which the world is to be deceived. That all this is the work of demons, and not of the spirits of the dead, appears from several decisive facts, as follows:-

1. As to the dead, the Bible plainly testifies that they "know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5); that they are in the grave, where there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom (verse 10); that they have laid down, and that they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep, until the heavens be no more (Job 14:12); that they praise not the Lord (Isa. 38:18, 19 Ps. 115:17; 6:5); that in the day of death the thoughts perish (Ps. 146:2-4); and that if there is no resurrection, they which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. 1 Cor. 15:18. To this we may add, that God has most solemnly forbidden necromancy, which is the pretended science of dealing with the dead. Deut. 18:11; Isa. 8:19. We may all see for a certainty that the dead cannot impart knowledge to us when they have none for themselves; and hence may understand that God warns us against seeking knowledge from that source, as we shall only expose ourselves to the delusion of the Devil.

2. The Bible clearly predicts that in the last days Satan is at work with all power, and signs, and lying wonders; that the spirits of evils are to work miracles; and that they will come in the guise of the spirits of the dead. We beg the reader to carefully compare 2 Thess. 2:9, 10 with Rev. 16:13-15 and Isa. 8:19-22. That the two-horned beast, which performs the miracles spoken of in Rev. 13, is the same as the false prophet from whose mouth one of the unclean spirits issues (chap. 16:13), we shall hereafter prove.

3. The third reason for regarding these as the spirits of devils is found in the fact that they most openly contradict the authority of the Holy Scriptures. They deny the resurrection of the dead, the second advent of Christ, the Judgment, and, indeed, all the leading doctrines of the Christian religion; they place the most profligate and wicked men, like the infidel Paine, in the highest heaven, and represent him as engaged in the same work that he so faithfully adhered to while he lived, viz. , the overthrow of the authority of the Bible; and, finally, they openly deny the inspiration of the word of God, and seek to substitute in its place their own worthless fables.

The foregoing facts are, in short, the most important reasons that prove them to be these spirits of devils, and they can be appreciated by every person who fears God and trembles at his word. We have referred to the unclean spirits as the agency by which the miracles of the two-horned beast are to be performed. As proof that we are correct in this, we refer to Rev. 16:13, where one of the three unclean spirits is represented as going out of the mouth of the false prophet to perform miracles. A comparison of Rev. 13:11-17 with 19:20, as we shall notice hereafter, proves that the two-horned beast and the false prophet are the same; hence it is certain that the unclean spirits are the agency by which the two-horned beast performs his miracles.

But these miracles are to be carried so far that fire is to be brought down from heaven upon the earth in the sight of men. In the days of Elijah, the test between Jehovah and Baal was this very thing; the god that could cause fire to come down from heaven in the sight of the assembled multitude, was the true God. Satan was not then able to perform this astonishing miracle.

1 Kings 18. But this very act, by which the true God was distinguished from the false, is now to be performed by Satan himself. This shows, as we think, that this act of the two-horned beast relates to the hour of temptation that shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. Rev. 3:10, 11.

Who will be prepared to resist such miracles as this? - None but those who are especially kept by God. The multitude will inevitably be carried away by them. The truth of God, that shows all this to be the work of the Devil, will then be the only shield. Those only who have kept the word of God's patience will be kept in that time. This fearful hour of temptation, when Satan shall work with all power and signs and lying wonders, is before us, and who will stand when it shall come upon all the world? "Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man. " Luke 21:36.

CHAPTER VII - Work of the Two Horned Beast

Influence of this Power upon the Nations
Its Deceptive Character
Identity of the Two-horned Beast with the False Prophet
The Dragon Voice of the Beast Creates an Image
His Mark
The Number of his Name
The Worship of the Beast
The Final Contest.

NO form of power ever arose in any past age combining the remarkable features which appear in our own government. It is of itself a wonder, a system of government which has not its like elsewhere. What is needed throughout the world to relieve its inhabitants of their oppression, but that Republicanism should remodel all their civil governments?

The leaven of its principles has deeply diffused itself throughout the nations of the earth. In proof of this, witness the revolutions of 1848, which shook nearly all the thrones of Europe. And what is so well calculated to develop and maintain religious freedom as Protestantism?

With the diffusion of these principles, how many are now confidently expecting a long period of prosperity and triumph for the church, - a period of emancipation to the poor enslaved nations of the earth, - the ushering in of the period when the nations shall learn war no more, and a universal spiritual kingdom shall be set up and fill the whole earth (Micah 4:1-5); and those wonders which we have briefly noticed promise to mankind a better revelation than the Scriptures of truth afford us?

The people of God indeed are looking forward to the time when the Lamb, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, shall reign in person over the whole earth. But with the mass this view has given place to the more congenial idea of a spiritual reign, and of temporal prosperity and triumph.

This view holds out to men the prospect of peace and safety (1 Thess. 5), notwithstanding the evidence has been spread out before them that the hour of God's Judgment has come, and that no better state of things can ever exist till the curse shall be removed from the earth. The warning respecting the coming storm of wrath has been most faithfully given; but by the multitude it has been rejected, thus leaving them to the deceptions that are already coming upon the earth. They dream that the earth, with all its progress and all its improvements, is far too lovely and excellent for God to destroy. Peace and safety is the delusive dream in which men indulge while the wrath of God hangs over them.

We regard the two-horned beast, then, as the symbol of a civil and religious power, differing in many respects from those which have preceded it. It is in appearance the mildest form of power that ever existed; but it is, after having deceived the world with its wonders, to exhibit all the tyranny of the first beast. If the right of private judgment be allowed by the Protestant Church, why does she expel men from her communion for no greater crime than that of

attempting to obey God in something wherein his word may not be in accordance with her creed? Read Charles Beecher's work, "The Bible a Sufficient Creed. " Why are men, for no other crime than looking for Jesus Christ, expelled from the churches of those who profess to love his appearing?

To these and many other questions of a similar character, we can only answer, that the lamb is such only in pretension; he is dragon in character. His ostensible appearance is that of a lamb; but the power which he exercises is that of a dragon. The true kingdom of the Lamb, the King of kings, is not set up on the earth until the destruction of all the wicked powers that now bear rule. Then the Jubilee will end the bondage of the saints. God speed the right!

A further view of the two-horned beast may be obtained by comparing his history with that of the false prophet. The two-horned beast is represented as working miracles in the sight of the first beast. Rev. 13:14. The same is affirmed respecting the false prophet. Chap. 19:20.

The nations of the earth are deceived by these miracles, and caused to worship the image of the first beast, and to receive his mark. The same work is ascribed to the false prophet.

Still further, we may say that the Bible gives us the origin of the two-horned beast, but does not under that name give us his final destiny. The origin of the false prophet is not given under that name, but his destiny is clearly revealed. Rev. 19:20; 20:10.

Inasmuch as their work is identical, and they act their part at the same time, we cannot doubt their identity. This is positive proof that the two-horned beast is, from the time of its rise, a power contemporary with the first beast, and not the first beast in another form. What power has ever risen in the past history of the world that could answer the description of this lamb-dragon, or false prophet?

If Satan has been permitted to make use of paganism, as an instrument of oppression and deception, and also of papacy, which is Christianity in a corrupt form, why may he not make use of Protestantism also, when it becomes corrupt, as, if possible, a more efficient means of deception than either of the former?

Has not the Protestant Church acted the part of the false prophet most effectually in promising to the world a thousand years of peace and prosperity before the day of wrath? She has prophesied this out of her own heart, for God has ever spoken the reverse. 2 Tim. 3; Dan. 7; Matt. 13; 2 Thess. 2. The Protestant Churches as a body now proclaim this doctrine as expressing the great object for which they labor, - temporal prosperity and triumph in a world that has ever rejected Christ.

Mohammedanism is not this false prophet; for it is introduced in the prophecy under the symbol of locusts, and its power departed with the hour, day, month, and year of the second woe. Rev. 9. But the two-horned beast, or false prophet, acts as an accomplice of the papacy in Satan's great work of final deception, and unites in the great conflict against the King of kings. Rev. 19.

The work of deception prepares the way for the dragon voice of the beast. He says "to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast which had a wound by a sword, and did live. "

And thus it would seem that the history of this symbol is in part, at least, twice presented, each time ending with its oppressive acts, first, with its power represented by horns like a lamb, and subsequently exercising all the dragonic power of the first beast; and, secondly, as a power working miracles to deceive the dwellers upon the earth; and when this deception is accomplished, it is to cause them to unite in making an image that should have power to put every one to death who would not worship it.

In noticing the prophetic history of the first beast, we called attention to the fact that the prediction respecting the time when all that dwell upon the earth whose names are not written in the book of life shall worship the beast, has never yet met its fulfillment; and we would here express the conviction that this prophecy relates to the time when the two-horned beast is to speak as a dragon, and to exercise all the power of the first beast. In that hour of strong temptation, we may expect to see all the dwellers upon the earth united in the worship of the beast.

The beast was the papacy clothed with power to put to death the saints of God. Rev. 13:5-8; Dan. 7:23-26. An image to the beast, then, must be another ecclesiastical body clothed with power and authority to put the saints to death. This can refer to nothing else but the corrupt and fallen Protestant Church.

If it be asked whence the beast receives this power, we can only answer that, by permission of God, the dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, is without doubt the very being who communicates this power to the beast. The kingdoms of the world are claimed by him, and the right to give them to whom he will. Luke 4:5, 6.

Should it be objected that the world is too much enlightened to submit to such deception, or to unite in such a work of persecution, we answer that the word of God gives us this prophecy in clear language; and it is with reference to this scene of danger that the third angel utters his solemn warning.

Look at the Jewish Church, and mark how soon after they had rejected the Messiah at his first coming, they put him to a cruel death, and also slew many of his apostles and saints. They said, indeed (Matt. 23), that had they lived in the days of their fathers they would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets; but when their "hour and the power of darkness" came upon them, how completely did it show them to be under the power of Satan. Luke 22:53; John 7:30.

The rejection of the truth of God leaves men the captives of Satan, and the subjects of his deception. 2 Thess. 2:9-12. The greater the light which men reject, the greater the power of deception and of darkness which will come upon them. The advent message has been given in our own land, and by the mass rejected, and no greater, and indeed no other, light can ever be given to those who have turned away from that. The third angel gives us warning of the danger which is now before us. The warning precedes the danger, that we, by seasonable admonition, may make our escape.

Another religious power enforces the claims of the first beast and his image, and causeth the world to receive his mark. What is this mark of the beast? -It is the mark of that beast to whom the image was made - the first beast. Rev. 19:20; 16:2. But it is enforced by the two-horned beast; hence we understand it is an institution of the papacy, enforced by Protestantism.

The beast and his image unite in this thing, in opposition to the saints, who are engaged in keeping the commandments of God. Have we an institution of the papal apostasy which the civil power supports, and to which the religious world pay homage? -

We have. It is found in the weekly Sabbath, which the "man of sin" has placed in the stead of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

If we turn to the law of God, we shall find that the fourth commandment alone points out Jehovah, the first three forbid the worship of false gods, and blasphemy, and the last six pertain wholly to our duty to our fellow-men. Not one of these nine commandments point out the true God. But the Sabbath commandment points out the true God as that being who in six days created heaven and earth, and rested upon the seventh. By the observance of the sanctified rest-day of the creator, he is acknowledged as the true God, in distinction from every object upon which the eye can rest, in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. The being that created all these things is God. Such is the teaching of the fourth commandment.

But the Scriptures plainly predict that the man of sin should exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, and should "THINK TO CHANGE TIMES AND LAWS. " 2 Thess. 2; Dan. 7:25.

It is not said that he should be able to change them; but he should think to do it; or, as the Catholic version reads, "He shall think himself ABLE to change times and laws. " They are not the times and laws of men which he thinks to change, for these he might be able to change, as other powers have done; but it is an act of arrogance in which he does not succeed. The times and laws of God are doubtless intended. This apostasy began in the apostolic age (2 Thess. 2:7), and it has resulted in the perfect development of the man of sin, and of his blasphemous acts, among which we may name the change of the fourth commandment.

No one can produce any other authority for changing the Sabbath than Romish traditions.

Listen to the following cutting reproof from a Romanist: " The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy; you [Protestants] without any precept of Scripture, change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of the Scripture, where it is said the first day of the week. Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting from these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn. "(See "History of the Sabbath" and "Who Changed the Sabbath?" RH)

Notwithstanding the fourth commandment in the plainest terms enjoins the observance of the sanctified rest-day of the Lord, almost all the world now wonders after the beast, and observe the pagan festival of Sunday, which the great apostasy has substituted for the holy Sabbath.

By the observance of the Sabbath, men acknowledge the great Creator as their God; but when they understandingly choose in its stead the Sabbath of the man of sin, they acknowledge him as above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, and as able to change the times and laws of God. There is no evading the point.

If we observe the Sabbath of the Lord, and that of the apostasy also, we only make the man of sin equal with God. But when we profane the Lord's Sabbath, and observe in its stead the Romish festival of Sunday, we acknowledge the papacy to be above God, and able to change his times and laws.

We speak of those who have the light of truth and act contrary to it. Those who have never yet understood that the observance of Sunday is a tradition of the fathers which makes void the fourth commandment, are not referred to. It is the bringing of this Sabbath of the apostasy to the test that will constitute it the mark of that power that should think to change times and laws.

There is no other papal institution that directly sets aside one of the ten commandments, that the whole Protestant world observes. This mark is very conspicuous in the forehead or hand, and signifies not a literal mark, but a public profession, or act, that all may see or know.

The number of the name of the beast is also to be enforced as a test of submission to him. This name, which is said to be that of a man, is seen, without doubt, in the title of "Vicar of the Son of God, " which the pope has caused to be inscribed upon his mitre. It is written in Latin, and the numeral letters employed make the sum of 666. The design of this test is to cause men to acknowledge the authority of the papacy.

The manner in which the Protestant Church would enforce the Sabbath of the man of sin, had it the power, is well expressed by a distinguished clergyman.

Says Dr. Durbin. "I infer, therefore, that the civil magistrate may not be called upon to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, as required in the spiritual kingdom of Christ; but when Christianity becomes the moral and spiritual life of the State, the State is bound, through her magistrates, to prevent the open violation of the holy Sabbath, as a measure of self-preservation. She cannot, without injuring her own vitality and incurring the divine displeasure, be recreant to her duty in this matter. (Christian Advocate and Journal)

It is proper that we should speak with carefulness of that which relates to the events of the future. That the scene described in the conclusion of Rev. 13 pertains to the time of trouble before us, such as never was, we have no doubt. It is also evident that in the providence of God the line of separation between the worshipers of the beast and his image on the one hand, and those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus on the other, will be most distinct and visible.

The third angel's proclamation will prepare the people of God for the coming crisis; and the formation of the image and the reception of the mark will prepare all the various classes of adherents to the beast, to receive the vials of the wrath of God, the seven last plagues. The image of the beast, as we have seen, is made up of apostate religious bodies. The name of the beast, as given in verse 1, is "Blasphemy. " The mark will determine to which class each individual belongs.

We have seen the cause of danger fully laid open before us in Rev. 13. We now turn to the voice of warning as presented in chap. 14:9-11.

The warning of danger is a warning which refers directly to the scene of trouble described in Rev. 13:11-18. This warning shows that that trouble is yet to come. Its fearful character may be learned from the thrilling and dreadful import of the angel's message. The Bible nowhere else depicts such dreadful wrath. On one side stands the decree of the beast, who is to exercise all the power of the first beast before him, that all who will not worship the image and receive his mark shall be put to death; on the other hand stands the solemn warning of the third angel. Here, then is the strait before us. We can worship the beast and his image, and as the penalty, drink the wine of the wrath of God, or we can refuse, and peril our lives here, that we may obey God.

This message will draw a line between the worshipers of God and the worshipers of the beast and his image; for on either hand it reveals a dreadful penalty, and leaves no chance for half-way work. Those who disregard this warning will be found with the worshipers of the beast and his image, and will drink of the wine of the wrath of God. Those who heed this warning will obey God at the risk of their lives.

The one class is designated by the mark of the beast, the other class is seen in the patience of the saints, keeping the commandments of God. That the law of God should thus be made a great testing truth to draw a line between the subjects of the fourth and fifth kingdoms, is an idea not unworthy of the God of the Bible. That the commandments of God are the great subject of controversy between the dragon and the remnant of the seed of the woman, is plain from Rev. 12:17.

The issue of this struggle cannot be a matter of doubt; for, as in all past ages those who have had the ark of God and have kept his commandments have triumphed, even so will it be now.

What, then, is it to worship the beast? for this is a prominent part of the act against which the wrath of God without mixture of mercy is denounced, and, as we have seen, all the world are yet to unite in this act?

It is worthy of notice that at the conclusion of this dreadful warning the saints are introduced as keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Thus we may understand that the worship of the beast and his image, and the reception of his mark, is the opposite of keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And we have seen that one of the commandments of God has been superseded by an institution of the Romish apostasy.

A remark by Prof. Bliss, bearing on this point, is worthy of lasting remembrance;

"Whenever any civil or ecclesiastical enactment conflicts with the requisitions of Jehovah, that power is worshiped which is obeyed in preference to the other. 'Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?' Rom. 6:16. " (Bliss on the Apocalypse, page 233)

We have already seen that the conflict is between the commandments of God and the requirements of the beast; and that a papal institution, which has usurped the place of one of the commandments of God, is yet to be made a test by the two-horned beast.

It is not difficult, therefore, to see how men will be made to worship the beast; for whenever they obey the requirements of the beast, in the place of the commandments of God, they worship the beast; for they acknowledge him as above the Most High. It is a remarkable fact that the pagan festival of Sunday, which the great apostasy has substituted for the Sabbath of

the Bible, is now enforced by law in most of the States of the union. A papal institution which directly contradicts the fourth commandments is thus enforced by a protestant government!

But many of our State governments have already enacted that the Sabbath of the Bible (?) shall be kept on Sunday, and the judges have decided such laws to be constitutional! If the government has a right to nullify the fourth commandment, there is an end to the principle of religious liberty; for it has an equal right to nullify any or all of the others.

It may be proper that we should notice some of the most probable causes that will induce the two-horned beast to create the image, and to require the reception of the mark:-

1. The first which we should name is the work of the spirits in performing miracles, etc.

It is certain that this agency, as we have already seen, is to deceive the dwellers upon the earth, and to cause them to make the image which all must worship on pain of death. We may rest assured that this extraordinary development of Satanic power has been reserved by him to act an important part in preparing men for the seven last plagues. If our public men become mediums (and some of them are such already), and our citizens become believers in this new system of divinity, or government is hopelessly in the hands of the Devil. Such a result may be neither improbable nor distant.

2. A second cause, and one, too, which should not be lightly passed over, is this; The preaching of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

This is the cause of the conflict between the dragon and the last fragment of the church. We shall hereafter show that the commandments of God, as distinguished from the faith or testimony of Jesus, mean the ten commandments. The fourth of these commandments the dragon has attempted to change. It is because the saints are keeping all the commandments of God that the dragon makes war upon them. This prophecy (Rev. 12:17) doubtless refers to the scene described in the conclusion of Rev. 13.

Mr. Miller remarks respecting this prophecy: "I am therefore constrained to believe this battle of the dragon's last power will be in America; and if so, it must be mainly in these United States. " (Lectures," p. 213)

It is because the commandments of God will be vindicated, and the unscriptural character of the Sunday-Sabbath exposed, that the two-horned beast will require all to receive the mark. The lack of scriptural argument has been the chief cause why men have resorted to the argument of fire and fagot to convince dissenters.

Chapter VIII - The Penalty Threatened

A Fearful Penalty
The Seven Last Plagues
The Third Woe
The Lake of Fire
Limited Duration of Final Conflagration
New Heavens and New Earth
Recompense of the Righteous
Annihilation of the Wicked.

THE fearful penalty connected with the warning of the third angel now claims our attention. It consists of two things:

1. The wine of the wrath of God, poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation;
2. The torment with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb.

Let us carefully consider each in order. What is the wine of the wrath of God? The next chapter clearly explains this point: "And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God. " And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials, full of the wrath of God, who liveth forever and ever. " Verses 15:1.

It follows, therefore, that the wine of the wrath of God is the seven last plagues. The fact will be further apparent as we proceed to show that these plagues are future, and that they do pertain to the future we think can be established beyond controversy.

1. The wrath of God, as threatened by the third angel, is poured out in the seven last plagues; for the first plague is inflicted on the very class that the third angel threatens. Compare Rev. 14:9, 10; 16:1, 2. The fact proves that the plagues must be future when the Third Angel's Message is given; and it also proves the identity of the wrath of God without mixture with the seven last plagues.

2. We have shown that the plagues and the wrath of God without mixture are the same. And wrath without mixture must be wrath with nothing else; that is, wrath without mercy. God has not yet visited the earth with unmixed wrath; nor can he while our great High Priest ministers in the heavenly Sanctuary, and stays the wrath of God by his intercession for sinful men. When the plagues are poured out, mercy has given place to vengeance.

3. Hence it is that the seven angels are represented as receiving the vials of the wrath of God--the seven last plagues--after the opening of the Temple of God in heaven. If we turn to Rev. 11:15-19, we shall find that the opening of the Temple in heaven is an event that transpires under the sounding of the seventh angel. And that account concludes with a brief statement of the events of the seventh vial, or last plague.

Now if we turn to chap. 11:5-8, and 16:1-21, we shall read an expanded view of the facts stated in chap. 11:15-19, and we shall find that the two accounts conclude in the same

manner, viz. , with the events of the last plague. These scriptures show that the seven angels do not receive the vials of the wrath of God to pour out upon the earth until the Temple in heaven is opened. That Temple is opened under the voice of the seventh angel. The third woe is by reason of the voice of the seventh angel. Rev. 8:13; 9:12; 11:14. The seven plagues are poured out under the sounding of that angel; hence the plagues are future, and constitute the third woe.

The foregoing reasons establish the fact that the plagues are future. We see no reason why they will not be similar in character to those poured out on Egypt, while their consequence will be far more terrific and dreadful. We will now briefly compare the account of these plagues with other scriptures calculated to shed light upon the subject. The first vial is thus presented:

"And the first went and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image. " Rev. 16:2.

This may be best understood by referring to Ex. 9:8-11. "And the Lord said unto Moses and unto Aaron, Take to you handfuls of ashes of the furnace, and let Moses sprinkle it toward the heaven in the sight of Pharaoh. And it shall become small dust in all the land of Egypt, and shall be a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast, throughout all the land of Egypt. And they took ashes of the furnace and stood before Pharaoh; and Moses sprinkled it up toward heaven; and it became a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and beast. And the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boil; for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians. "

Why will not the antitype be as real and literal? The wine of the wrath of God unmixed with mercy must be far more dreadful than the judgment inflicted on Egypt.

The second and third vials are thus presented: "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea. And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood. And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments. " Rev. 16:3- 7.

As an illustration of these plagues, read Ex. 7:17-21: "Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord; behold, I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink; and the Egyptians shall loathe to drink of the water of the river. And the Lord spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand upon the waters of Egypt, upon their streams, upon their rivers, and upon their ponds, and upon all their pools of water, that they may become blood; and that there may be blood throughout all the land of Egypt, both in vessels of wood and in vessels of stone. And Moses and Aaron did so, as the Lord commanded; and he lifted up the rod, and smote the waters that were in the river, in the sight of Pharaoh, and in the sight of his servants; and all the waters that were in the river were turned to blood. And the fish that was in the river died; and the

river stank, and the Egyptians could not drink of the water of the river: and there was blood throughout the land of Egypt.

The third vial is a retribution for the blood of the saints. As the blood of all the righteous that had been slain upon the earth came upon that generation which rejected Christ at his first advent (Matt. 23:34-36), so also may it be now. It should be remembered that these fearful judgments are inflicted in consequence of the acts described in the conclusion of Rev. 13.

"And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues; and they repented not to give him glory. And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds. " Rev. 16:8- 11.

The scorching of the fire in the midst of their trouble will be terrible in the extreme. Ex. 10:21-23 will illustrate the fifth vial: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, even darkness which may be felt. And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days; they saw not one another, neither rose any⁷⁶ from his place for three days; but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings. "

On this subject, Litch remarks: "What a terrible scene! with all their grievous sores, blood to drink - stagnant blood - and putrid fish filling the waters, scorched with burning heat; and then, to crown the whole, the kingdom of Anti-christ is to be full of darkness. Oh, what a picture of woe! Reader, make haste to escape it! 'Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and stand before the Son of man. ' "

And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. " Rev. 16:12-16.

The effect of the sixth vial will be, first, to prepare the way for the kings of the East to come up to the great battle; and, secondly, to send forth the spirits of devils to deceive, by miracles, the kings of the whole earth, and their armies, and to gather them.

The battle of the great day of God Almighty is very fully described in Jer. 25:- " For thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me, Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it. And they shall drink, and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them. Then I took the cup at the Lord's hand, and made all the nations to drink, unto whom the Lord had sent me. "

"And all the kings of the North, far and near, one with another, and all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the earth; and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them. "

Therefore, prophesy thou against them all these words, and say unto them, The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations; he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground. " Verses 15-17, 26, 30-33.

The coming of Christ as a thief (see Matt. 24:42-44) does not take place until after the sixth vial is poured out. The gathering of the nations to the great battle, which is accomplished by the spirits, is brought to view in many scriptures. Joel 3:1, 2, 9-16; Zeph. 3:8; Rev. 19:19-21.

The present development of the spirits of devils in our land, we do not regard as anything but their preparatory work; for there is always a period in which Providence is preparing those agents which are to fulfill prophecy; but the fulfillment of prophecy begins at the point where the agents are prepared to act the predicted part. Thus Rome, though it constituted the fourth empire, was founded when Babylon, the first empire, was in the height of its glory. But when Greece, the third empire, had fulfilled its part, Rome was prepared to act the part assigned it in prophecy. It is thus that we understand the work of the spirits. Under the sixth plague, the spirits will be prepared to act the part predicted in verse 13.

"And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the Temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell; and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of wine of the fierceness of his wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent; and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great. " Verses 17-21.

The voice from the temple may be illustrated by the following texts: "The Lord, also, shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake; but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. " Joel 3:16.

"Therefore, prophesy thou against them all these words, and say unto them, The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations; he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. " Jer. 25:30, 31.

The great earthquake may also be found spoken of in other scriptures:

"The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a

cottage; and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it; and it shall fall, and not rise again. " Isa. 24:19, 20.

"And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. " Rev. 6:14; 11:19.

The great hail out of heaven is well illustrated by the following scriptures: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch forth thine hand toward heaven, that there may be hail in all the land of Egypt, upon man, and upon beast, and upon every herb of the field, throughout the land of Egypt.

And Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven; and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground; and the Lord rained hail upon the land of Egypt. So there was hail, and fire mingled with the hail, very grievous, such as there was none like it in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation. And the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that was in the field, both man and beast; and the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field. " Ex. 9:22-25.

"Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow, or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail, which I have reserved against the time of trouble, against the day of battle and war?" Job. 38:22, 23.

"Judgment, also, will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding-place. " Isa. 28:17.

Such is a brief view of the dread realities of the seven last plagues, - the third woe! How fearful will be the events of that woe! May God count us worthy to escape the things coming on the earth, and to stand before the Son of man.

The seven last plagues are poured out on the living wicked; but the second part of the penalty affixed to the warning of the third angel, is not inflicted until the end of the thousand years, when all the wicked are raised and suffer together. This part of the penalty we will now consider.

"He shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," etc.

The final perdition of ungodly men in the lake of fire is without doubt the subject of these awful words. That we may rightly understand this text, we call attention to several important facts:-

1. The punishment of the wicked will be inflicted upon them on this earth; for the final conflagration of our globe is to constitute the lake of fire in which they are to be rewarded, each according to his works. "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner. " Prov. 11:31.

"But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men" 2 Peter 3:7.

"But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death. " Rev. 21:8.

"For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, said the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. " Mal. 4:1.

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of who is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them. " Rev. 20:7-9.

2. The prophet Isaiah (chap. 34) describes the final conflagration of our globe in language which is a complete parallel to that of the third angel in describing the punishment of the wicked. Those who contend that Isaiah refers only to ancient Idumea, must admit that the period of time described in this strong language must finally come to an end. And those who admit that Isaiah, in the language we are about to quote, refers to the conflagration of our earth, will find in what follows, ample proof that that scene will finally close.

"For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion. And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever. " Isa. 34:8-10.

3. But this terrific scene of final conflagration is not to last throughout unlimited duration. For the earth having been burned, and all its elements melted, new heavens and a new earth are to follow, as the present earth succeeded to that which was destroyed by water. And in the earth thus made new the righteous are to be recompensed.

"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also; and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness; looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. " 2 Pet. 3:10-13.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. " Rev. 21:1.

4. Thus, however dreadful and long-continued the punishment of the wicked will be (for each is to be punished according to his deserts), that punishment will finally result in the utter destruction of all transgressors. All the wicked will God destroy. Ps. 145:20.

They shall die the second death. Rev. 21:8; Rom. 6:23; Eze. 18:4, 20.

They shall perish, being consumed into smoke. Ps. 37:10, 20, 38.

They shall be punished with everlasting destruction, being burned up in unquenchable fire. 2 Thes. 1:9; Matt. 3:12.

And thus, having been consumed, root and branch, they shall be as though they had not been. Mal. 4:1. Obadiah 16.

Chapter IX - The Chronology (or Time) of the Third Angel

The Patience of the Saints
The Commandments of God
Opening of the Temple in Heaven
The Wrath of God without Mixture
The Faith of Jesus
Practical Duties
The Time of Trouble
The Triumph of the Saints
Conclusion.

WE will now briefly refer to several important facts that prove that the present is the period in which the warning of the third angel is to be given. We have proved that the proclamations of the first and second angels belong to that generation that is to witness the final overthrow of all earthly powers, and the sublime scenes of the second advent; and that the present is that generation that shall witness these fearful events. We have also shown that the two former proclamations have already been made, and consequently the warning of the third angel is the great theme which should now arrest the attention of every mind.

The chronology of this message seems to be distinctly marked by the fact that it is given in the period of the "patience of the saints," which follows the proclamation of the two former messages. "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Verse 12. And this period of the saints' patience is marked by a most important fact, viz. , the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We wish to call attention to several points:

1. We have shown that the First Angel's Message refers to the solemn proclamation of the immediate second advent; consequently the period of patience here brought to view must be the same as that which in many scriptures is located immediately preceding the second advent. A few text must suffice as examples: "Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Heb. 10:35-39.

"Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and later rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned; behold, the Judge standeth before the door. Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, or an example of suffering affliction and of patience." James 5:7-10.

"Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.

Behold, I come quickly; hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. " Rev. 3:10, 11.

"And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation. " Isa. 25:9.

2. The period of the saints' patience, here brought to view, is distinguished by the fact that they are keeping the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. It should be distinctly noticed that the commandments here brought to view are not the commandments of Christ.

There may be a certain sense in which all the precepts of the Saviour may be called the commandments of God; that is, if viewed as proceeding from the sovereign authority of the Father; but when the commandments of God are spoken of in distinction from the testimony of faith of Jesus, there is but one thing to which reference can be made; viz. , the commandments which God gave in person, - the ten commandments.

See John 15:10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love. And thus we find the law of God, which he proclaimed in person, referred to in the New Testament as the "commandments of God, " or as the "commandments. "

"And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God; but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. " Matt. 19:17-19.

"And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. " Luke 23:56.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven, " Matt. 5:17-19.

"Honor thy father and thy mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. " Eph. 6:2, 3.

"But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother; and he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. " Matt. 15:3-6.

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking

occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law, sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore, the law is holy; and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. " Rom. 7:7-14.

It is a fact beyond dispute that the fourth commandment, some ages since, was changed from the rest-day of the Lord to the pagan festival of Sunday. This change was made in express contradiction of the Holy Scriptures, which everywhere recognize the seventh day as the only weekly Sabbath of the Lord. It was accomplished by the great apostasy, which Daniel predicted should "think to change times and laws. "

This power is essentially the same as the beast which was to be worshiped by all the world. And it is a fact of deep interest that this commandment, which has been so long trodden down, is now being vindicated, and the people of God are striving to keep it with the other nine.

Thanks be to God that he is preparing the remnant for their final conflict with the dragon, and for admittance through the gates into the holy city. Rev. 12:17; 22:14. The vindication of the fourth commandment in opposition to the Sabbath of the apostasy, and the preaching of all the commandments of God, is a striking testimony that the present is the period of the saints' patience, and of the warning of the third angel.

3. The opening of the holiest of all in the Temple in heaven, by which the ark is seen, is an event that takes place under the sounding of the seventh angel. And as the ministration of our great High Priest is changed to that apartment at the termination of the 2300 days, *18 we understand that the opening of the Temple is marked by the termination of that period, as presented by the proclamation of the first angel. The entrance of our high Priest into the most holy place to minister before the ark of God, call the attention of the church to the commandments of God contained within that ark. The commandments of God have been shining out from the heavenly Sanctuary since that time.

The period between our Lord's entrance into the holiest of all to cleanse the Sanctuary (Heb. 9:23) and complete his great work of ministration, and the close of that period as marked by the seven angels' coming out of the Temple to pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth. (Rev. 15:5, 6), we understand to be the period of the saints' patience. It is the days of the voice of the seventh angel in which the mystery of God is being finished; that is, the period when human probation is brought to a close.

Besides the fact of the termination of the 2300 days, which marks the opening of the Temple in heaven, the anger of the nations is an important testimony that we are now in the days of the voice of the seventh angel. Rev. 11:18. The present time is, therefore, the proper period for the last message of mercy to perishing men; and it is marked by the actual presentation of that voice of warning, and of the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

4. Another important fact that determines the chronology of the third angel is that the seven last plagues are poured out upon those who reject his warning, the first plague being inflicted upon the very class which the third angel threatens.

The seven last plagues are the wine of the wrath of God, poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. We have already seen that they are not inflicted until the work of mercy for man is accomplished. The third angel warns us respecting this outpouring of the exterminating wrath of God, and consequently gives the latest message of mercy.

The mystery of God, or work of salvation for sinful men, (Eph. 3) is finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he begins to sound (Rev. 10); and as the third angel has the last warning of mercy before the vials of God's wrath are poured out, it follows that it must be given in the days when the seventh angel begins to sound. It is likewise evident that the conclusion of the work of our great High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary must also take place in the days when the seventh angel begins to sound; for it is then that the mystery of God is finished.

The reason why the third woe, or seven last plagues, does not commence at once when the seventh angel begins to sound, is the fact that a period of days is occupied in finishing the mystery of God.

In this period the warning of the third angel is given, that every one who has an ear to hear may escape the vials of the wrath of God; and in this period, also, the Saviour completes his work in the Sanctuary in heaven. This being accomplished, the vials of the wrath of God are poured out upon the defenseless heads of the wicked. We think, therefore, that the evidence is conclusive that the present is the time for the warning of the third angel.

A false fulfillment of prophecy cannot occur at the time when the true should be expected. It is certain that one of the commandments of God has long been trodden down by the beast, and that in this thing almost the whole world has wondered after the beast. This commandment, as well as all the others, is now being vindicated, that the remnant may be prepared for their final conflict with the dragon. May God interest the hearts of all his people in this work.

We have already briefly spoken of the commandments of God; a few words should be devoted to the faith of Jesus. This term is used in distinction from the commandments of God. What, therefore, shall we understand by the "faith of Jesus"? We think that it cannot refer to a particular degree or kind of faith which the Saviour exercised in the performance of his miracles; for it appears that he wrought these by the power which he had already received from his Father. Matt. 8:2, 3; Mark 1:40, 41; Luke 5:23, 24.

The world itself was made by him. John 1. He had ample power, therefore, to perform every miracle which he wrought. There is but one other thing to which this term can refer; viz. , the precepts and doctrines of our Lord, as recorded in the New Testament.

Thus, "the faith of the gospel" (Phil. 1:27) must refer to the precepts and doctrines of the gospel. "The faith" to which a multitude of the priests were obedient (Acts 6:7), which was resisted by Elymas, the sorcerer (Acts 13:8), which was committed to the apostles for the obedience of all nations (Rom. 1:5). which Paul testifies that he had kept (2 Tim. 4:7), and which is to be earnestly maintained, as once delivered to the saints (Jude 3), must refer, we think, to the precepts and doctrines of the everlasting gospel.

That the faith of Jesus is used in this sense in Rev. 2:13, we think cannot be denied. "Thou holdest fast my name, " says Jesus, "and hast not denied my faith. " That this is the sense in which it is used in Rev. 14:12, is further evident from the fact that it is spoken of as being kept in the same manner that the commandments of God are kept.

It remains that we notice a few of the most important practical duties that devolve upon us at the present time:-

1. First of all we would mention holy living. God has committed to our trust the most precious truths, and he holds us responsible for the light with which we are intrusted. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. " Matt. 5:16. The sanctifying effect of the truth must be witnessed in us by others, if we would do them good. Especially must we watch unto prayer. Watchfulness and prayer are mighty weapons with which to resist the Devil. Their importance may be seen from the following scriptures:

" Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary, the Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour; whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world. " 1 Pet. 5:8, 9.

"Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints. " Eph. 6:18.

"And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. " Luke 11:9, 10.

"If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body. " James 3:2.

"But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer. " 1 Pet. 4:7. "But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment; for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. " Matt. 12:36, 37.

2. Growth in grace. It is greatly to be feared that the importance of this is too much lost sight of. If we would be final overcomers and stand upon Mount Zion, we must be daily overcoming the great foe of our souls. The long-suffering of God is meant for our salvation. Let us most faithfully improve the gracious opportunity now granted us to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord.

"BUT growth in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. " 2 Pet. 3:18. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. " Heb. 12:14. "But as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. " 1 Pet. 1:15, 16.

3. The duty of searching the Scriptures. This is solemnly enjoined by our Lord. John 5:39. Without this, we cannot obey the precept of Peter. "Be ready always to give an answer to

every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear. " 1 Pet. 3:15.

The sword of the Spirit, the word of God, is an important part of the armor which God has prepared for us. Eph. 6.

It is certain that events before us are such that every person will be tested. If the truth of God is understood, appreciated, and loved by us, we must examine the Scriptures for ourselves. If it is not loved, the time is not distant when we shall be sifted out.

Everything is before us to deceive and lead astray. The spirits of evils are about to perform the most extraordinary miracles. They will do this, professing to be the spirits of our departed friends. Hence the great importance of a thorough knowledge of the Bible doctrine of the sleep of the dead. The Lord would not have us ignorant concerning them which are asleep.

4. The duty of sacrificing to sustain the cause of God. There is no plainer duty in the Scriptures. Ourselves, our time, our means, all that we have, all that we are, belong to God alone. Those who go out to preach the word of God are called upon to make the greatest sacrifice.

All are not called to do this; but those who are not, if they love Christ and the truth, will gladly sustain those who are thus thrust out. Let not the cause of truth suffer for the means to sustain it. Read Rom. 12:1; 2 Cor. 8; Luke 12:33, 34; 1 John 2:15; Matt. 6:19-34.

5. The duty of waiting and watching for our Lord's return. Let this ever be our position, and let all our words and acts be in accordance with our profession, that the end of all things is at hand. "Watch ye, therefore; for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch." Mark 13:35-37.

"But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." 1 Thess. 5:4-6.

"And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28.

"Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he shall return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching; verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them." Luke 12:35-37.

6. Finally, let us indeed be Bible Christians. Let the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus be the continual rule of our lives, and the governing principle of our conduct. May the great Head of the church help us all to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord.

WE have now briefly and imperfectly surveyed this most important subject. Sufficient evidence has been adduced, we think, to satisfy the honest inquirer that we occupy one of the most solemn and interesting periods in the history of the church.

The first and second proclamations of Rev. 14 are in the past, and the warning voice of the third angel is now addressed to us; the fearful scenes of Rev. 13:13-17 are about to open upon us; and last of all, the seven last plagues are soon to be poured out upon those who, regarding the decree of the beast more than the warning of the third angel, shall be found worshipping the beast and his image, and possessing his mark.

Who among us will be able to meet the fearful test between the warning of the third angel and the decree of the beast? Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.

The situation of the church when the decree goes forth that all shall worship the image of the beast on pain of death, will be precisely that of the three Hebrew worthies whom Nebuchadnezzar commanded to worship the golden image. Read carefully Dan. 3. God saved them by direct interposition. He has promised thus to interpose for his people; but it will not be until the time of trouble, such as never was, has fully opened upon the world.

With this fearful prospect of the coming storm before us, we may well appreciate the words which follow the warning of the third angel. "And I heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them. " Rev. 14:13. The following scriptures will show us why those are pronounced blessed who now fall asleep in Christ, and will also show the situation of the saints at the time when God delivers them:

- "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the

"Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it. " Jer. 30:7. "Oh that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me! Job 14:13.

"When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice; rottenness entered into my bones, and I trembled in myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble: when he cometh up onto the people, he will invade them with his troops. " Hab. 3:16.

"And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18:6-8.

Finally, we see the unclean spirits preparing for the great battle. We see the preparation for the law which shall compel all men to observe Sunday. We see the papal power awakening to declare itself infallible, and to claim anew the power to rule over the kingdoms of the earth. We hear the voice of alarm of the third angel, and we already see many thousands in response to his warning turning to the observance of God's commandments. These things are striking signs of the great day of God now just before us.

The conflict with the beast and his image is inevitable; but the issue of this conflict is not a matter of doubt. God will interpose to save his people. Though the last act of Satan be to unite all the wicked of the earth in the worship of the beast, and to attempt the utter extermination of the saints, yet God has said that the saints shall triumph!

"And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. " Rev. 15:2, 3.

Glorious indeed will be the triumph of the saints! Reader, may it be your lot to join in singing that song of victory upon the sea of glass.

The Story Of Daniel The Prophet

"But go thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Dan. 12:13.

By
Stephen N. Haskell

Author's Preface

THE world is flooded with fictitious reading of all grades. The unreal is presented in the most fascinating style, while too often the living truths taken from God's Word are presented in a heavy somber style. The Bible is the most interesting of all books. It is adapted to every mind. In the STORY OF DANIEL THE PROPHET, a few of the interesting facts in regard to God's dealings with his people have been gathered into a simple narrative. The book is the result of much prayerful study. It is sent forth with an earnest prayer, that in the hands of the parents it may be the means of making the study of the Bible in the family a blessing to young and old; and that the teacher in the schoolroom may see precious rays of light flashing from its pages, pointing both teacher and pupil to the Great Divine Teacher. God grant that as it falls into the hands of the careless and unbelieving, they may be influenced to read, and as they read, may behold the beauty of our God, and be led to worship toward his holy temple.

We trust that while its simplicity will attract many who might not be inclined to read a deep argumentative treatise, the most studious will find food for thought, and thus become better acquainted with the character of our Heavenly Father. Those who wish to enter into a more comprehensive study, will find that the marginal references open up many veins of precious ore in the deep mines of God's Word.

We earnestly pray that even the skeptic may not cast it aside; but that he may give it a careful reading, and while tracing the fulfilled prophecy in the history of the world, learn to prize the Word of God.

Throughout the entire book the special providence of God of those who are faithful to him is brought out in clear contrast to the fate of those who

ignore his guiding hand. The truth is the same, whether in the history of nations or individuals.

As the STORY OF DANIEL THE PROPHET goes forth on its mission of love for the Great Master, may it prove a blessing to all classes, young and old, rich and poor, learned and unlearned. S. N. H.

iii

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION, ...	iv
I.-DANIEL AND HIS FOLLOWERS TESTED, ...	10
II.-A CONTROVERSY BETWEEN TRUTH AND ERROR, ...	19
III.-TRUE FREEDOM IN WORSHIP, ...	26
IV.-THE MOST HIGH RULETH, ...	33
V.-LAST YEARS OF THE BABYLONIAN KINGDOM, ...	39
VI.-THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL (CHAP. 5), ...	44
VII.-DANIEL IN THE LIONS' DEN (CHAP. 6), ...	50
VIII.-PROPHECY OF DANIEL SEVEN, ...	57
IX.-THE EIGHTH OF DANIEL, ...	67
X.-HISTORY OF THE JEWS (CHAP. 9), ...	76
XI.- THE SANCTUARY, ...	86
XII.-INTRODUCTION TO THE LAST VISION (CHAP. 10),.....	98
XIII.-HISTORY OF THE DECREES (CHAP. 11 : 1,2), ...	102
XIV.-HISTORY OF GREECE (CHAP. 11:3-13), ...	113
XV.-THE FOURTH KINGDOM, (CHAP. 11 : 14-22)	126
XVI.-THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY (CHAP. 11:23-31), ...	138
XVII.-WORK OF THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY (CHAP. 11 : 32-45), ...	149
XVIII.-THE CLOSING SCENE (CHAP. 12), ...	158
APPENDIX, ...	168
QUESTIONS FOR STUDY.....	179

iv

Introduction

THE prophecies of the Bible are like rare diamonds lying hidden in the solitude of the mine. The practiced eye of the prospector discovers the gems, and intuitively reads their value; and the skillful hand of the lapidary brings out their many-faced beauties in all their sparkling glory. Every facet shines like the sun. One can not exhaust a diamond; neither can one exhaust the prophecies. New facets remain to be polished, to add their brilliant reflection to the whole. In the prophecies as many features appear as there are different temperaments that men bring to their study.

The prophecy of Daniel is no exception. This book has lessons for all classes. Because the magnitude of the field of his vision is unlimited in extent, it may be studied from points of view which no man can number.

The historian feasts upon his records. The chronologist delights in calculating his periods. The lover of the Messiah rejoices in the contemplation of the times and events that led to his first advent, and demonstrated his Messiahship. And the friend of God traces with pleasure

the providential movements by which the course of events has been controlled, and men have been put up, and cast down, just according as they have been instruments in God's hands to carry out his beneficent designs and purposes.

There are lessons in these respects for those who take an interest in such themes; but above all, and greater than all, are the lessons to be drawn from Daniel's character,— his integrity, his devotion to duty, and his steadfastness in adhering to true principles, in the face of the greatest apparent danger, and in opposition to the dictates of worldly policy. These principles glow with undimmed luster through all his career, and have encouraged, comforted, and strengthened the servants of God in all ages.

Much has been written on the book of Daniel, and much more might be written, as long as principles of divine truth, and noble examples of adherence to them, form interesting and profitable themes of study. In the present work, lessons from this latter source have been especially drawn out. These will be found wonderful subjects for study, and many remarkable thoughts are presented on these points in the following pages. These are lessons which can be laid to heart with the most satisfactory and lasting profit. One who desires to master the philosophy of an acceptable Christian life, and the means and methods by which a close connection with God may

v

be maintained, can find no more competent text-book than is furnished in the record of the experiences of the prophet Daniel. Do you wish to acquire a vivid sense of God's care for his people, and his constant remembrance of them, and the easy means he makes use of to accomplish his ends, you will find the subject fully exploited in the prophecy of Daniel. Example is a powerful factor in the promotion of the Christian life. "Be ye followers of me," says Paul, "even as I also am of Christ." I Cor. 2:1. He exhorts Timothy to be an "example of the believers." I Tim: 4:12. What higher standard can be raised to attain unto, than is shown in Daniel's relation to God? for it is said of him that he was a "man greatly beloved." Such was the emphatic testimony borne from God by the angel Gabriel to Daniel, coming as he did immediately from the court of heaven and the presence of God.

The occasion on which, these words were first spoken, shows what relation the man thus addressed maintained to God, and God to him. It was when the prophet, burdened with anxiety in regard to a previous vision which he had not understood, appealed to God for help. He had been seeking the Lord, by earnest prayer, to learn the meaning of it. An angel had been strictly enjoined to make Daniel understand all the matter. And now when the angel came to complete his mission, and make the prophet understand the vision, which he had been prevented by Daniel's illness from doing in its completeness in his previous interview (Dan. 8:27), he says: "O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the *beginning* of thy supplication the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art *greatly beloved*; therefore understand the matter and consider the vision." Dan. 9:22, 23. The angel asserts that one reason, perhaps the leading reason, why he had now come to give him skill and

understanding, was that he was a man "greatly beloved."

Think of the circumstances of this case. God was imparting truth to make known to the world what was to come thereafter. He was making use of one of his servants for this purpose. The process was temporarily interrupted. But Daniel had fixed his heart on understanding all that God had to reveal; and he lifted up his petition to the only source from which help could come. Now mark the answer borne from the throne of the universe, by the hand of a mighty angel: "*At the beginning of thy supplication, the commandment came forth.*" The commandment referred to, was the commandment, or instruction, to Gabriel, to go down to the earth, to this servant of the Lord, and clear up all doubts and uncertainty in his mind in regard to the truth on which he was perplexed.

vi

Will anyone now raise the query, Does the Lord hear prayer? Is he attentive to the wants of his people? In view of this narrative, how can we harbor the least vestige of doubt? No sooner does Daniel's prayer *begin* to ascend to the throne than instruction comes forth from God to Gabriel, to go down to the earth and complete his mission to the prophet. With alacrity he obeys. And the prophet says of him, "*Being caused to fly swiftly.*" From the beginning of Daniel's prayer, as recorded in Daniel 9, to that point in the prayer when Gabriel appeared upon the scene (verse 20), could not have been over three minutes and a half, at the ordinary rate of speech. In this brief space of time the prophet's prayer ascended to heaven, it was heard, decision made, and the answer came. There is no loitering in heaven. The first faint whisper of want by the child of God, is instantly lodged upon the throne. The command to answer is given, and the return messenger is at once by the side of the prophet, with the response of comfort and joy. No earthly "rapid transit" can equal this. What a glimpse does this give us into the inner courts of the heavenly world! What a view of the divine telegraphy there employed, and waiting at the court's command! What assurance, encouragement, and comfort must these great facts impart to every true and trusting servant in the vineyard of the Lord!

In this story of Daniel, not only is one such incident given, but a whole series of them is woven together in this tapestry of truth. They begin with Daniel as prime minister in the court of the kingdom of Babylon—Babylon, the city of renown, clothed with such magnificence that inspiration has seen fit to describe it as the head of gold on the world's great representative image. Daniel 2. The Lord by the prophet has called Babylon "*the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency.*" Isa. 13:19. In that city there were beauty, glory, and excellency combined in most striking and prolific forms.

Imagine a space (we must imagine it; for no such spot existed before, and has not existed since);—imagine this space containing 225 square miles, situated in a fertile plain, wrought up by expert cultivation to the superb production of oramental trees and shrubs, fragrant flowers, and substantial fruits, till the whole became a veritable paradise, as the garden of the Lord; imagine this space laid out in a perfect square, watered by the magnificent

Euphrates, and surrounded by a wall eighty-seven feet thick and three hundred and fifty feet high, fifteen miles in length on each side, and the great square of the whole area of the city, subdivided into lesser squares by twenty-five streets running from each side of the city, parallel with the opposite walls, and at right angles with each other, and adorned with
vii

palaces, porticoes, columns, colonnades, towers, monuments, and hanging gardens, arrayed with everything that art could embellish or money and labor produce, to make a spot pleasant to the sight and touch and every bodily sense.

Such was Babylon, glowing in the light of the Syrian sun, and fanned by the blandest zephyrs that ever blew, when Daniel entered to serve the long period of seventy years in captivity. But he was a captive only to political power. He served the Lord, and was spiritually free. From this point through all the personal experience of the prophet, and on through the scenes opened to his mind by the spirit of prophecy, the divine narrative runs. These scenes and experiences are woven together in this book into one connected whole, and the spiritual and practical lessons to be drawn from them are hung like banners of light all along the way.

No one can rise from the study of the prophecies without the conviction being deeply graven upon his heart that the end of the Christian course well repays all the toil and effort of the heavenly journey. The words of the *hymn* well voice this sentiment:—

"Then let us hope; 'tis not in vain;
Though moistened by our grief, the soil;
The harvest brings us joy for pain;
The rest repays the weary toil.
For they shall reap who sow in tears,
Rich gladness through eternal years."

After his long service and all his trying cares, the word to Daniel was, "Thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." The outcome of the Christian service of the disciples in the latter days is expressed in a similar strain by the apostle John in the Revelation: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14: 13. To Daniel, "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." To John: "Surely I come quickly;" and "my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:20, 12. Rest follows the labor; and the end will come. Then follows the remainder of the promise: "Thou shalt stand in thy lot." The rest is undisturbed, and the lot is sure.

What is the lot in which Daniel and all of like character are at last to stand? Who can describe it? for who can conceive of it? It must embrace the
viii

condition and all the circumstances of the people of God, when gloriously redeemed. And in reference to this, Paul utters the following living words: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of

man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him." I Cor. 2:9. That is, the boldest flight of the imagination, the most intense conception of the unseen glories of the heavenly world, have never formed, and can not form, in the human mind any tangible idea of what God has prepared and has in store for his people. "*But* God," the apostle continues, "hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." Yes, the Spirit has revealed these things to those who are filled with that Spirit, and have received the Holy Ghost. We are happy to give, by way of introduction, this word of commendation to this book, which has new phases for every earnest and spiritually minded reader; and which never grows old.

U.S.

Battle Creek, Mich., April, 1901.

ix

A Word To The Reader

IT has been with much prayer, and a deep sense of the importance of the subject, that these pages have been prepared. We are living in the closing scenes of this world's history. The Lord's own testimony, in the closing words of the book of Daniel, "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days," should arrest the attention of all who are interested in preparing for the coming of Christ. Then the manner in which the Saviour himself makes mention of the prophecies of Daniel should not be lightly passed by. He says, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (*whoso readeth, let him understand*)." Daniel the prophet is the only one in the Bible to whom the Lord addressed, through the angel Gabriel, the words, "Thou art greatly beloved." Such words to any living mortal in the flesh are worthy of consideration by the devout.

We invite a careful perusal of the contents of this work, with the prayer that the Lord will impress minds by his Holy Spirit. The book is not designed to arouse controversy or awaken discussion upon theories, but to tell the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. From the beginning to the end we have tried to tell the story of the prophet and his writings in a brief, simple style, to create a religious interest in the things of God. To the Bible student we have suggested thoughts, both in the story and by the side references, that will encourage study in the home and in the school.

Yours in the blessed hope,

S. N. H. STORY OF DANIEL THE PROPHET

10

CHAPTER I

Daniel And His Followers Tested

ALTHOUGH Daniel lived twenty-five hundred years ago, he is a latter-day prophet. His character should be studied, for its development reveals the secret of God's preparation of those who will welcome Christ at his appearing. His prophecies should be understood, for in them is the key which unlocks history to the end of time. The Saviour himself bore witness to this. When the disciples asked, "*What* shall be the sign of thy coming and

of the end of the world?" he said, "*When ye see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet ...whoso readeth, let him understand.*" In this we have the divine permission to read and understand the prophecies of Daniel. These prophecies are intended, therefore, to warn a people of the coming of Christ.

True, it was once a sealed book, for the prophet was told to shut up the words, and seal the book "to the time of the end," "for at the time of the end shall be the vision." And again, "The words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end." But the time of the end has come. It began in 1798, and though "*none of the wicked shall understand,*" yet "*the wise shall understand.*" With the book of Daniel in hand, and a heart open to hear the voice of God, man may come in touch with the Father of light. "*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith.*"

Daniel begins the book with the simple statement that in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, 607 B. C., Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, came unto Jerusalem and besieged it; that in the siege, Jehoiakim was given by the Lord into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, but allowed to remain on the throne in Jerusalem, yet Nebuchadnezzar carried with him to Babylon, as tribute, a part of the vessels of the house of God, and, as hostages, some of the members of the royal household.

This act, with similar ones which followed in swift succession, was but the culmination of events which began years before. In order to appreciate this climax, it is essential that we study the causes which led to it. Since the captivity of Judah is an object lesson to people of the last generation, it is doubly necessary that we trace the relationship between certain causes and results.

11

HISTORY IN BRIEF

God had an object in calling the Jewish nation to separate themselves from other nations of the world. It was that his people might stand before the world as light-bearers. As a beacon set on a hill, Israel was to send beams of light to the world. The plan of education made known to Israel through her prophets was the means of keeping that light burning. When this God-given plan was neglected, the light, as a candle deprived of the life-giving oxygen, burned dim. Then it was that the nation was pressed upon all sides by the foe. There is a Hebrew maxim which says that "*Jerusalem* was destroyed because the education of her children was neglected." The prophecies of Daniel and the connected history prove the truth of this maxim. It may be added that the Jews were restored to Jerusalem as the result of the proper education of a few Hebrew boys.

Just about one hundred years before the days of Daniel, Hezekiah was king of Judah. After a reign of thirteen years, he was on his deathbed, but he pleaded with God to lengthen his life. This was done, and fifteen years were added. On the king's recovery he was visited by ambassadors from Babylon, to whom he showed all his treasures. They came to hear of the mighty God, that could heal the sick; but he showed them only earthly treasure. He lost the opportunity to give them of the treasure of heaven. Then came a

message from God by the hand of the prophet Isaiah, saying, "Behold, the days shall come, that all that is in thine house...shall be carried into Babylon; nothing shall be left." He was also at the same time told that his descendants should be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Here was portrayed the future captivity of the Hebrew race. The prophecy was placed on record, and repeated again and again by Jewish mothers as they taught their children. "*Must* my son be a captive in the court of a heathen king? Then let me so train him that he will be true to the God of his fathers." There were other mothers who lightly let pass the thought, and the history of their sons' lives is recorded for our instruction.

Three years after his life had been saved, a son was born to Hezekiah. Notwithstanding the recent prophecy, Hezekiah and his wife, Hephzibah, failed to teach the young Manasseh in the way of truth. He was but twelve years of age when he came to the throne, but if he had been trained in the fear of God, he would not have chosen the worship of the heathen. The youthful Christ at the same age settled not only his own destiny, but the destiny of the universe. When twelve years of age, standing by the temple in Jerusalem, his future work opened before him, and he accepted his

12

appointed mission. Why? Because Mary, his mother, had taught him that heart service to God was his highest pleasure. Manasseh decided in favor of the heathen deities; did evil in the sight of God; and "*for* the sins of Manasseh" came the captivity of Judah.

At the age of twelve years, Christ made a decision which saved the world; at the same age Manasseh chose a course which brought ruin to the nation. In the training of your child, are you Hephzibah or Mary?

The long reign of Manasseh passed, and the prophecy sent to Hezekiah was not yet fulfilled. Men began to wonder if it ever would come to pass. "*Since* the fathers fell asleep," said they, "*all* things continue as they were."

It was in the days of Josiah, the grandson of Manasseh, that Jeremiah prophesied. Through this prophet, God pleaded with Jerusalem to return to him. "*Lo*, I will bring a nation upon you from afar, O house of Israel, saith the Lord: it is a mighty nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language thou knowest not." Thus was Babylon described, and Jerusalem's impending doom portrayed.

Josiah was spared the sight of the complete destruction of Jerusalem because of the reforms which he attempted. In his days there was kept by Judah, and by Israel also, the greatest Passover feast in the history of the nation. "*Because* thine heart was tender and thou hast humbled thyself before the Lord,...behold I will gather thee unto thy fathers...and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place." In a peculiar way God gave Josiah an opportunity to avert the impending calamity. It was not yet too late to change the course of events. This opportunity was through the gifts of his sons. Josiah had three sons and one grandson, who were in turn seated on the throne at Jerusalem. Each, because of wrong training in youth, refused to take God at his word, and failing, hastened the final overthrow.

The three sons were Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah. The grandson was Johoiachin, who preceded his uncle, Zedekiah. The fate of each is a solemn warning to people living at the end of time. He who might have been the light of heathen nations was swallowed up by Egyptian darkness.

Jehoiakim, the second, who, properly trained, would have been so charged with the power of God that the heathen king would either have united his forces with the king of Judah, or, opposing, would have been smitten as by a thunder-bolt, failing, paid tribute to Babylon. His capital was entered.

Treasures from the house of God were ruthlessly torn from their place and dedicated to heathen worship. Youth,—bright, promising youth,—were taken
13

from the royal family to serve the king of Babylon. Jehoiakim beheld this, but was powerless to interfere. His life was gone; he was not connected with the throne of God. His mother and his father made a fatal mistake, for they did not give him the training which God had commanded them to give. Neither did he profit by these mistakes, but educated his son in courtly manners and in the philosophy of the world; and, as a result, his son Jehoiachin languished nearly thirty-seven years in a prison in Babylon. This was another lamp without the oil; another soul without the heavenly food; another son improperly trained to add to the disgrace of Judah. *"Jerusalem was destroyed, because the education of her children was neglected."*

Zedekiah, the third son of Josiah, had still an opportunity to save Jerusalem. Part of the treasures of this city were already in Babylon. Daniel and his companions had been in the court seventeen or eighteen years when Jeremiah came to Zedekiah with the words: *"If thou wilt assuredly go forth unto the king of Babylon's princes, then thy soul shall live, and this city shall not be burned with fire...Obey, I beseech thee, the voice of the Lord which I speak unto thee: so it shall be well unto thee, and thy soul shall live."* In this time of peril, how did Zedekiah act? Did he deliver himself unto the Babylonians? God had commanded it; the city would have been saved by it; his own soul would have been saved. Zedekiah pleaded a most human excuse, saying, "I am afraid."

In these three sons is revealed the weakness, the cowardice, the wickedness, and the final ruin of those trained for the service of the world and not for the service of God.

A TRUE EDUCATION

Living at the same time and in the same city with the princes already named, were others which the Scripture mentions by name. These were Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, children of Judah, of the royal family—relatives of Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah.

At the first siege of Jerusalem, 607 B.C., Daniel was not over eighteen years of age; about the age of the prince Zedekiah, who afterward ruled in Jerusalem. Daniel had a godly mother who knew of the prophecy concerning the destruction of their city. She repeated to her son the words of God, that some day Hebrew children must stand in the heathen court at Babylon. Carefully did this mother teach her son to read the parchment scrolls of the prophets. The history of Israel was studied; the story of Nadab

and Abihu was told and retold. The effect of strong drink was impressed upon the mind. The laws of his own being were studied. He knew that excess in eating and drinking would so dull the mind that the voice of God could not be heard.

The songs which these Hebrew children sang told the story of God's dealings with his people. It was in this manner that the image of God was engraven on their hearts. This education was not gained in the schools of the time, for they had departed from the plan of God; but holy mothers, living close to the everlasting Father, led their children by precept and example, by word and song, to form characters that would stand the test. It was the age when most of the young men in the capital of Judah were wild and reckless. They were excusing themselves because of their youth. But God chose from their midst certain ones whom he could trust in a foreign land. Daniel and his three companions were snatched from the shelter of home, and with others were placed under the charge of Ashpenaz, master of the eunuchs in Babylon.

Now can be seen the results of the home training. Pure food, clean thoughts, and physical exercise placed them on the list of "children in whom was no blemish, but well-favored." But what of their intellectual ability? They had not been educated in the schools of Jerusalem, much less in those of Babylon. Was there not great danger that they lacked in the sciences or the essential branches? On examination, these four passed as "*skillful* in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science," and able to learn a difficult, foreign language. God had fulfilled his promise in these children of the home school.

The crucial moment came when "*the king appointed them a daily provision of the king's meat and of the wine which he drank.*" Daniel had unbounded confidence in the principles of temperance, not alone because he knew them to be scientifically true, but because they were God-given, and, in his case, had been put into practice. His education had a Biblical foundation, and he knew that it was in harmony with true science. It was a life and death question; but the principles were divine, and he would obey, walk by faith, and leave the results with his Maker. "*Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank.*" The language of the prince of the eunuchs shows that there were other Hebrew youth who were selected, who did not make this request; "For," said the prince of the eunuchs, "*why should he [the king] see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort?*" Daniel

and his companions, after considering their dangerous and difficult position, took this matter to the Lord in prayer, and decided to be true to principle. Much was involved in this decision. If they sat at the king's table, they would partake of food which had been consecrated to idols; and the Hebrew children would thus dishonor God, and ruin their own characters by removing the safeguard of temperance, and allowing themselves to be influenced by corrupt associations. Even at the cost of appearing singular,

they decided not to sit at the table of the king. They might have reasoned that at the king's command they were compelled to partake of the food at the royal table which had been dedicated to an idol. But they determined not to implicate themselves with heathenism, and not to dishonor the principles of their national religion and their God. Surrounded by perils, after having made a most determined effort to resist temptation, they must trust the results with God.

With true courage and Christian courtesy, Daniel said to the officers who had charge over them: "Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink. Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenances of the children that eat the portion of the king's meat; and, as thou seest, deal with thy servants." It was no experiment with them; for they foresaw the result.

The officer hesitated. He feared that the rigid abstinence they proposed would have an unfavorable effect upon their personal appearance, and that, in consequence, they would lose favor with the king. The Hebrew children explained to the officer the effect of food upon the body; that overeating and the use of rich foods benumbed the sensibilities, unfitting mind and body for hard, stern labor. They urged most earnestly that they be allowed the simple diet, and begged that they be given a ten-days' trial, that they might demonstrate by their own physical appearance at the end of that time the advantages of plain, nutritious food. The request was granted; for they had obtained favor with God and with men. It was an act of faith; there was no feeling of envy toward those who were eating of the king's meat. The minds of the four were filled with thoughts of love and peace, and they actually grew during those ten days.

God approved of their course; for, "*at the end of ten days, their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat of the portion of the king's meat.*" The clear sparkle of the eye, the ruddy, healthy glow of the countenance, bespoke physical soundness and

16

moral purity. The Hebrew captives were thereafter allowed to have their chosen food.

The pulse and water which they then desired was not always the exclusive diet of Daniel; for, on another occasion in his later life, he said, "*I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth.*" But when entering upon the king's course of study and becoming connected with the royal court, he and his brethren voluntarily chose this simple, nourishing food. Likewise, when brought face to face with any difficult problem, or when desiring especially to know the mind of God, the record speaks of Daniel's abstinence from flesh food, wine, and foods which tempt the appetite.

The character of Daniel is referred to by Ezekiel, who was a contemporaneous prophet, as representing those who will live just before the second coming of Christ. People will be called to pass through experiences which require the keenest spiritual eyesight; therefore God asks them to give up all things which will in any way check the flow of the Holy

Spirit through the mind. Herein lies the reason for strict adherence to the principles of health reform. Daniel and his companions gained the victory on the point of appetite. This was the avenue, and the only one, through which Satan was permitted to tempt Adam; and, had Adam proved true in the garden of Eden, and not eaten of the forbidden fruit, sin and suffering would never have been known. Appetite was the open door through which came all the results of sin, which, for six thousand years, have been so manifest in the human family.

As Christ entered upon the work of his ministry, he began where Adam fell. The first temptation in the wilderness was on the point of appetite. Here the Saviour bridged the gulf which sin had made. He redeemed the whole family of Adam, and wrought out a victory for the benefit of all who are thus tempted. In the last days God will prove his people as he proved Daniel. A voluntary self-control of appetite lies at the foundation of every reform.

It means much to be true to God. It embraces health reform. It means that the diet must be simple; it calls for the exercise of temperance in all things. Too great a variety of food taken at the same meal is highly injurious; and yet, how often this is forgotten. Mind and body are to be preserved in the best condition of health. Only those who have been trained in the fear and knowledge of God, and who are true to principle, are fitted to bear responsibilities in the closing work of the gospel.

17

Daniel and his companions passed through a strange school in which to become fitted for lives of sobriety, industry, and faithfulness. Surrounded with courtly grandeur, hypocrisy, and paganism, they exercised self-denial, and sought to acquit themselves so creditably, that the Israelites, their downtrodden people, might be honored, and that God's name might be glorified.

These children had the Lord as their educator. They were connected with the Fountainhead of wisdom, by the golden channel, the Holy Spirit. They kept continually a living connection with God, walking with him as did Enoch. They were determined to gain a true education; and, in consequence of their copartnership with the divine nature, they became in every sense complete men in Christ Jesus. While diligently applying themselves to gain a knowledge of the languages and sciences, they also received light direct from Heaven's throne, and read God's mysteries for future ages.

When, at the end of three years, King Nebuchadnezzar tested the ability and acquirements of the royal princes from nations whom he had been educating, none were found equal to the Hebrew youth, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. They surpassed their associates tenfold in their keen apprehension, their choice and correct language, and their extensive and varied knowledge. The vigor and strength of their mental powers were unimpaired. Hence *they* stood before the king. "And in all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm."

These youth respected their own manhood, and their intrusted talents had not been enfeebled or perverted by indulgence of appetite. The good they wished to accomplish was ever in mind. They were faithful in the little things. God honored them; for they honored him. God always honors adherence to principle. Among all the most promising youth gathered from the lands subdued by Nebuchadnezzar, the Hebrew captives stood unrivaled. Their regard for nature's laws and the God of nature was revealed in the erect form, the elastic step, the fair countenance, the untainted breath, the undimmed senses. It was not by chance that they attained to their marvelous wisdom. "*The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*" The foundation of the highest education is religious principle. Faith had been developed in childhood; and when these youth had to act for themselves, they depended upon God for strength and efficiency in their labors, and they were richly rewarded.

18

Where are the parents who to-day are teaching their children to control appetite, and to look to God as the Source of all wisdom? Our youth are daily meeting allurements to gratify appetite. Every form of indulgence is made easy and inviting, especially in our large cities. Those who steadfastly refuse to defile themselves will be rewarded as was Daniel. The youth of today may bear a weighty testimony in favor of true temperance.

These principles, cherished, would fit young men who are rooted and grounded in the Scriptures, to enter worldly universities, and, while taking a course of study, disseminate the truths of the gospel, and at the end of their course, come forth unsullied. There were consecrated youth among the Waldenses who entered worldly universities, and, while gaining their education, scattered the seeds of the Reformation. The papal authorities could not, by the most careful inquiries, find out who had introduced the so-called heresy; and yet the work had been accomplished, bearing fruit in the conversion of many who became leaders in the cause of Protestantism. Were these principles practiced, more young persons could be trusted as missionaries in responsible positions and in institutions of learning. Many will yet be called to stand before judges and kings. How are the children being educated?

The last words of the first chapter of Daniel are truly significant: "Daniel continued even unto the first year of King Cyrus." In other words, Daniel lived all the days of the Babylonish captivity,—over seventy years,—and had the pleasure of knowing that Cyrus whose name the prophet Isaiah had mentioned nearly two hundred years before he had issued his wonderful decree for the deliverance of God's people.

19

CHAPTER II

A Controversy Between Truth And Error

"IN the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams." It is thus that we are introduced to the monarch of the greatest of earthly kingdoms in his *own* home. In chapter one, Nebuchadnezzar is referred to

as the one who besieged Jerusalem; in chapter two, he is spoken of as the ruler of every nation on earth. The kingdom which Nebuchadnezzar brought to the height of its glory can be traced in Bible history to its foundation. The history of Babylon is the story of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, begun in heaven, continued on earth, and which will end only when the stone cut out without hands from the mountain shall fill the whole earth. Satan's accusation against God is that the Father is unjust. "*But give me a fair chance,*" argued Lucifer, "*and I can establish a kingdom on earth which will excel in glory the kingdom of God in heaven.*" He was granted the privilege of making a trial. The plains of Shinar were chosen; the people whom God told to fill the whole earth were gathered into a city. Babylon grew, and its mighty walls three hundred and fifty feet in height and eightyseven feet thick, with the massive gates of brass, were designed to imitate the strength of the city of God. At the time of the founding of Babylon, Satan was still meeting with the council of the representatives of worlds, which was held at the gates of heaven. It was his design to counterfeit the plans of God. The earthly city was patterned after the heavenly. The Euphrates flowed through it as did the river of God through Paradise. The government was an absolute monarchy; a man occupied the throne, and as it grew, every knee of earth was caused to bow to its king. Tyranny took the place of love. This is always true when man is exalted above God. There was a close union of church and state, for no power was tolerated above that of the monarch. It was to such a kingdom that Nebuchadnezzar fell heir, and the beauty and power of the kingdom were increased by him in every possible way, until it was spoken of everywhere as "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency."

Not only the power, but the wisdom also, of Nebuchadnezzar was exceedingly great. The king favored education, and during his reign Babylon was the educational center of the world. Every art and science was taught in the schools of Babylon. The wisdom of the ancients was made known to the students who sat at the feet of her magicians and wise men.

20

They reveled in the study of astronomy and the higher mathematics. There were linguists who could teach the language of every nation.

The king himself was highly educated, for it was he who examined the students on the completion of their course, and granted their degrees.

Babylon was proud of her educational system; she trusted to it for salvation, but it was the cause of her ruin. "*Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it hath caused thee to turn away.*" God himself speaks, saying: "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" In the Babylonish court this was exemplified. Nebuchadnezzar and his counselors,—the wise men, astrologers, and soothsayers,—on one side, represented the education of the world. Daniel, a youth not over twenty-one years of age, a Hebrew and a slave, was chosen by God to confound the wisdom of the mighty.

THE DREAM

The Scripture gives the story in language that can be readily understood. But why did God give Nebuchadnezzar a dream? How could the God of

heaven reveal truth to this heathen king? Doubtless he could not during his waking moments; but Nebuchadnezzar had contemplated the glory of his kingdom, and fell asleep with a longing desire to know its future. He knew that life was short. Soon he must die; what would the future be? It was God's opportunity, and while those eyes were closed to earthly things; while self was lost,—dead, as it were,—the future history of the world was spread before Nebuchadnezzar. On awaking, he found no language to express his thoughts. He who was acquainted with the world's wisdom knew not the language of heaven. This he had never been taught. He tried to think what he had seen, but as his eyes again rested on the glory about him, the vision faded away. Earthly things drew a veil over the things of God, and while he knew he had seen something, he knew not what it was.

The king demanded an interpretation, but the wisest men of the king answered: "There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter...There is none other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh." That the pretended knowledge of the wise men of Babylon might be exposed, the Lord had in his providence given Nebuchadnezzar this dream, and then allowed him to forget the details, while causing him to retain a vivid impression of the vision. The king was angered by the request of the wise men for him to tell them the dream, saying, "I know of certainty that ye would gain the time, because ye see the thing is gone from me." That is, they would be able to agree on

21

some interpretation if the king could tell the dream. The king then threatened that if they failed to tell the dream, they should all be destroyed. The wise men urged that the requirement was most unreasonable; but the more they argued, the more furious the king became, and in his anger he finally "commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon."

This decree was made in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. He had ruled two years conjointly with his father, Nabopolassar, and two years alone; so Daniel and his fellows were serving their first year as wise men in the court of Babylon, having finished their three years' course in the schools. They were therefore sought out by Arioch, the king's captain, to be slain. Daniel asked: "Why is the decree so hasty from the king?" Then Arioch made the thing known to Daniel. Daniel alone had the courage to venture into the presence of the king, at the peril of his life, to beg that he might be granted time to show the dream and the interpretation. The request was granted.

"There are in the providence of God particular periods when we must arise in response to the call of God." The supreme moment had come to Daniel. For this very moment had God been giving him a preparation. From his birth every detail of his life had been pointing forward to this time, although he knew it not. His early education was such that at this moment when death stared him in the face, he could look up to God and claim his promise. Although Daniel had been granted a diploma from the schools of Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar himself, and had been accounted ten times wiser than his fellow students, he had not as yet been classed with the astrologers and

wise men of Chaldea. Probably his youth and inexperience delayed such recognition. But God chooses the weak things of earth to confound the mighty, because the foolishness of God is wiser than men.

Four Hebrew youth bowed in prayer, and that night "*was* the secret revealed unto Daniel." How could God talk with Daniel?—Because the Spirit of the Lord is with them that fear him. Daniel's education had acquainted him with the voice of God. He was in the habit of seeing eternal things with the eye of faith. God showed Daniel the same things which he had revealed to Nebuchadnezzar, but which were hidden from him by the glamour of worldliness.

The song of praise which rose from the lips of Daniel when the vision came, shows how self-forgetful he was, and how close his heart was knit to the heart of God.

22

The schools of Babylon developed pride, love of pleasure, haughtiness, and self-esteem. They fostered an aristocracy, and cultivated the spirit of oppression and slavery. Contrast with this the native simplicity, the courtesy, gentleness, and self-forgetfulness of the child of God as he enters the court and is introduced by Arioch.

Years before this, when Egypt was the educational center of the world, God taught Egyptian senators by the mouth of Joseph, a boy no older than Daniel. When Babylon had outgrown the counsels of Heaven, another Hebrew meets the men of the schools. "Can not the wise men show the secret unto the king?"

Before Daniel was the king in his glory; around him stood the very teachers with whom he had studied three years. At this time were exemplified the words of the psalmist' "*I have more understanding than all my teachers; for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts.*"

Nebuchadnezzar was careworn from loss of sleep, and in great anxiety because the dream troubled him; but Daniel was calm, conscious of his connection with God, the King of kings. Daniel now had opportunity to exalt his own wisdom, but he chose rather to give all the glory to God. He plainly told the king that it was beyond the power of man to reveal the dream or give the interpretation; "*but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days.*" The king's mind was directed to God alone.

In one night God revealed the history of over twenty-five hundred years, and what the human historian requires volumes to explain is given in fifteen verses. The Scriptures explain themselves, and in divine records every word is well chosen and put in the proper setting.

In the image revealed to Nebuchadnezzar, the glory of the Babylonian kingdom is recognized by the Lord, and represented by the head of gold. But while giving due credit to the present state of things, the spirit of prophecy with equal candor points out to the self-exalted king the weakness of the institutions in which he has placed his trust, and the inability of the Babylonian learning to save from impending destruction.

"Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground; there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans; for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones and grind meal." From being master of all, Babylon must become the most humble servant.

23

Because these people had disregarded the God of heaven, and had said, "*None* seeth me," evil would come from unknown sources, and Babylon should be cut off. She would make a desperate effort to save herself by turning to her educators and wise men. "*Let* now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from these things...Behold, they shall be as stubble." When the trial came, there was nothing in all the realms of Babylon that could save her.

"The strength of nations and of individuals is not found in the opportunities and facilities that appear to make them invincible; it is not found in their boasted greatness. That which alone can make them great or strong is the power and purpose of God. They, themselves, by their attitude toward his purpose, decide their own destiny."

Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom lasted only until the reign of his grandson, when the second or inferior nation represented by the breast and arms of silver came upon the stage of action.

Medo-Persia took the place of Babylon; Grecia followed the Medo-Persian kingdom, while Rome, the fourth kingdom, was to be broken into ten parts, which were to remain until the end of time. In the days of these kings the God of heaven would set up a kingdom which would never be destroyed nor conquered by any other people; it would break in pieces and consume all former kingdoms, and stand forever.

The image was a comprehensive outline of the world's history. The "glory of kingdoms" formed the head of gold, all following kingdoms deteriorated from Babylon as shown by the grade of metals forming the image. First gold, then silver, brass, and iron. In the latter part of the world's history, a marked change was revealed by the iron being mixed with miry clay. There were to be no more universal kingdoms ruled by men when the power of the fourth kingdom was broken, it was to remain divided until the end. In place of one kingdom there would be several.

The clay mixed with iron also denoted the union of church and state. This combination is peculiar to the latter part of the world's history, to the feet and toes of the image.

Religion was the basis of government in the heathen nations; there could be no separation of the church and the state. When apostate Christianity united with the state, each remained in a sense distinct as the miry clay is separate from iron. This union continues until the stone smites the image upon the feet. The very fact that the "stone was cut out of the mountain without

24

hands," shows that the last kingdoms on earth will not be overthrown by any earthly power, but that the God of heaven will bring upon them final destruction by giving them to the burning flames.

A CHANGED HEART

The king listened to every sentence Daniel uttered when telling the dream, and recognized it as the vision which had troubled him. When Daniel gave the interpretation, he was certain that he could accept it as a true prophecy from the God of heaven. The vision had deeply affected the king, and when the meaning was given, he fell upon his face before Daniel in wonder and humility, and said, "*Of a truth, it is that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldest reveal this secret.*"

The youth of twenty-one was made ruler over all the provinces of Babylon, and chief governor over all the wise men of the kingdom. Daniel's companions were also given high positions in the government. It should be remembered that this dream as recorded in the second chapter of Daniel was given to Nebuchadnezzar in the second year of his sole reign. It was still during the lifetime of Jehoiakim, king of Judah.

It was in the providence of God that his people should carry the light of truth to all the heathen nations. What they failed to do in the time of peace, they must do in time of trouble. Babylon was the ruling power of the world; it was the educational center. The Jews were comparatively a small people; they lost the power of God by neglecting the education of their children; they failed to let their light shine. From their midst God took a few who were trained in the fear of the Lord, placed them in the heathen court, brought them into favor with the ruler of the world, so making himself known to the heathen king. He did even more; he revealed himself to the king, and used these children of his to prove that the wisdom of God excelled the wisdom of the Chaldeans. Having exalted true education, he put Daniel and his companions at the head of that vast empire that the knowledge of the God of heaven might go to the ends of the earth.

Having acknowledged the God of Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar was in a position to save Jerusalem instead of destroying it. It was because of these experiences that God could send word by his prophet a few years later that, should Zedekiah, king of Judah, deliver himself to the king of Babylon,

25

Jerusalem would not be burned, and the world would receive the light of the gospel.

The history of the city of Babylon is put on record because it is God's object lesson to the world of to-day. The book of Revelation, which is the complement of the book of Daniel, frequently uses the name, applying it to the modern churches. The relation of the Jews to the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar is the same as that sustained by the remnant church, the true Israel, to the churches which, having known the truth, have rejected it. The sins of ancient Babylon will be repeated to-day. Her educational system is the one now generally accepted; her government, with its excessive taxes, its exaltation of the rich and the oppression of the poor, its pride, arrogance, love of display, its choice of the artificial in place of the natural, and the exaltation of the god of science instead of the God of heaven, is the one toward which the world of to-day is hastening.

As God called Abraham out from the idolatry of Chaldea, and made him the

father of the Hebrew nation; as he delivered to that people a form of government that would exalt God; as he gave them commandment so to teach their children that the Jews would become a teacher of nations and might be an everlasting kingdom, so to-day he calls forth a people from modern Babylon. He has intrusted to them principles of healthful living which will make them mentally and physically a wonder to the world. He has given them educational principles which, if followed, will make them the teachers of the world, and finally bring them into the kingdom of God. And to them he has delivered the principles of true government which recognize the equal rights of all men, and which in the church organization bind all together—one body in Christ Jesus.

Only a few—four out of thousands—were true to these principles in the days of Daniel. How will it be to-day?

26

CHAPTER III

True Freedom In Worship

"*NEBUCHADNEZZAR* the king made an image of gold." According to Usher's chronology it had been twenty-three years since the dream of this same Nebuchadnezzar as recorded in the second chapter of Daniel. As a result of the experience at that time, Daniel was made counselor, sitting in the gate of the king, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were appointed rulers in the province of Babylon. Many opportunities had presented themselves to these men of God, and they had kept the knowledge of their God before the people of Babylon. Jerusalem had in the meantime been destroyed. The Jews as a nation, were scattered throughout the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar; their king, Jehoiachin, languished in one of the prisons of Babylon. It was a time of sorrow and mourning for the chosen people of God. Could it be that they were forgotten by Him who smote Egypt, and led the hosts across the Red Sea? As far as human eye could see, it was right to think so.

Nebuchadnezzar had been humiliated when Daniel interpreted his dream, and he had then worshiped God. But as the years passed, he lost the spirit which characterized true worship, and while in the mind acknowledging the God of the Jews, in heart he was pagan still. So he made an image of gold, patterning it as closely as possible after the image revealed to him in his dream, at the same time gratifying his own pride, for the entire figure was gold. There was no trace of the other kingdoms which were represented by the silver, the brass, the iron, and the clay in the dream. On the plain of Dura it stood, rising at least one hundred feet above the surrounding country, and visible for miles in every direction.

Then a decree was issued by Nebuchadnezzar calling to the capital the governors and rulers of provinces from all over the world. He, the ruler of kingdoms, thus showed his authority. It was a great occasion, and subject kings and governors dared not disobey the mandates of this universal king. Heaven was watching with intense interest, for this was the occasion when the highest worldly authority was to meet the government of heaven.

Babylon was not only the greatest and most powerful government in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, but it is a symbol of earthly governments of all time, and for that reason we have the record as given in Daniel 3.

27

As a king, he had a perfect right to call his subjects together. As subjects, it was the duty of those who were called to obey.

As that great company gathered around the image on the broad plain, the voice of the herald was heard: "At what time ye hear the sound ...of all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image...Whoso falleth not down and worshipeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."

"God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit." But of spiritual worship, paganism is entirely ignorant. Except there be some form, some image before which they can bow, there can be, to them, no worship. It was wholly in accordance with the religion, the education, and the government of Babylon, for the king to erect an image such as he did. It was wholly in harmony with the customs—educational, religious, and civil—for the people in general to respect a command to worship such an image. While it was in harmony with worldly government, it was not, however, according to the principle of the heavenly government. Hence it is, that again, in the person of the Babylonian king, Satan is challenging the government of God. When Lucifer and his angels refused to bow before the throne of God, the Father would not then destroy them. They should live until death should come as a result of the course they pursued. The Babylonian king, however, threatened utter destruction to all who refused to worship his golden image. The motive power in the heavenly government is love; human power when exercised becomes tyranny. All tyranny is a repetition of the Babylonian principles. We sometimes call it papal; it is likewise Babylonian. When the civil power enforces worship of any sort, be that worship true or false in itself, to obey is idolatry. The command must be backed by some form of punishment,—a fiery furnace,—and the conscience of man is no longer free. From a civil standpoint, such legislation is tyranny, and looked at from a religious point of view, it is persecution.

The vast throng fell prostrate before the image, but Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego remained erect. Then it was, certain Chaldeans, teachers in the realm, jealous of the position and power of these Hebrews,—having waited for a chance to accuse them, said to the king, "*There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon,...these men have not regarded thee.*"

Can it be, thought the king, that when the image is made after the pattern of the one shown me by the God of the Jews, that those men, Shadrach,

28

Meshach, and Abed-nego, have failed to worship at my command? Can it be possible that when I have elevated those men, who were only slaves, to high positions in the government, that they disregard my laws? The thought rankled in the heart of the king. Self exaltation brooks no opposition, and

the men were called forthwith into the presence of Nebuchadnezzar. Can it be possible, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, after all that has been done for you, that ye do not serve my gods nor worship the image which I have set up. The reason for making the image was doubtless explained, and another opportunity offered them in which they might redeem the past offense. But if it was willful disregard of authority, the law of the land should be enforced. The furnace was pointed to by the king as awaiting traitors and rebels.

What a test of the fidelity of these three companions of Daniel! They realized that they were in the presence of not only the richest monarch of earth, and that disobedience meant death, but before the assembled multitudes of the plain of Dura, and that they were a spectacle to God, to angels, and to the inhabitants of other worlds. The whole universe was watching with inexpressible interest to see what these men would do. The controversy was not between man and Satan, but between Satan and Christ, and eternal principles were at stake. Men were actors in the contest. They could stand as witnesses either for Christ or for Satan in this time of decision. Would they allow an unsanctified emotion to have possession of their lives, and compromise their faith? What could a religion be worth which admitted of compromise? What can any religion be worth if it does not teach loyalty to the God of heaven? What is there of any real value in the world,—especially when on the very borders of eternity,—unless it be God's acknowledgment of us as his children?

These Hebrew youth had learned from the history of God's dealings with the Israelites in times past, that disobedience brought only dishonor, disaster, and ruin; and that the fear of the Lord was not only the beginning of wisdom, but the basis of all true prosperity. They therefore calmly and respectfully told the king that they would not worship his golden image, and that they had faith that their God was able to protect them.

The king was angry. His proud spirit could not tolerate this refusal to obey his decree. He ordered that the furnace be heated seven times hotter than usual, and that the most mighty men of his army bind these three Hebrews and throw them into the fire. This was done, but God in this act began to vindicate his worthies. The furnace was so exceedingly hot that the mighty

29
men who cast the Hebrews into the fire were themselves destroyed by the intense heat.

God suffered not envy and hatred to prevail against his children. How often have the enemies of God united their strength and wisdom to destroy the character and influence of a few humble, trusting persons! But nothing can prevail against those who are strong in the Lord. The promise is, "The wrath of man shall praise thee."

God preserved his servants in the midst of the flames, and the attempt to force them into idolatry resulted in bringing the knowledge of the true God before the assemblage of princes and rulers of the vast kingdom of Babylon. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." All things are possible to those who believe. "What things soever ye desire, when ye

pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." God may not always work deliverance in the way that we think best, but he who sees everything from the beginning, knows what will bring honor and praise to his name.

Suddenly the king became pale with terror. He looked intently into the midst of the fiery furnace, and turned to those near him with the words, "*Did* we not cast three men bound into the midst of the fire?" They answered, "*True*, O king." The king then said, "*Lo*, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God."

How did the king recognize the form of the Son of God? Evidently by the teachings of the Jews in the court of Babylon and in remembrance of his vision. Daniel and his companions had ever sought to bring before the king, the princes, and the wise men of Babylon, a knowledge of the true God.

These Hebrews, holding high positions in the government, had been associated with the king; and as they were not ashamed of their God, they had honored and given glory to the Lord whenever opportunity afforded. The king had heard from their lips descriptions of the glorious Being whom they served; and it was from this instruction that he was able to recognize the fourth person in the fire as the Son of God. The king also understood the ministry of angels, and now believed that they had interfered in behalf of these faithful men who would yield their bodies to punishment rather than consent with their minds to serve or worship any God but their own. These men were true missionaries. They held honored positions in the government, and at the same time let the light of the gospel shine through their lives. This miracle was one of the results of their godly lives.

30

With bitter remorse and feelings of humility, the king approached the furnace, and exclaimed, "Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, ye servants of the most high God, come forth, and come hither." They did so, and all the hosts of the plain of Dura were witnesses to the fact that not even the smell of fire was upon their garments, and not a hair of their heads had been singed. God had triumphed through the constancy of his faithful servants. The magnificent image was forgotten by the people in their wonder, and solemnity pervaded the assembly.

What the Jewish nation as a nation had failed to do in proclaiming the truth to the nations of the world, God accomplished under the most trying circumstances, with only three men. The story of the miraculous deliverance was told to the ends of the earth. The principles of religious liberty and freedom of conscience were made known. The history of the Jews was told from mouth to mouth as those unacquainted with the three Hebrews asked who they were and how they came into Babylon. The Sabbath was proclaimed. The story of Jewish education was made known. The glory of Babylon was for the time forgotten as the splendor of the heavenly kingdom and the principles of God's government became the absorbing theme. Without doubt some men dated their conversion from that day, and forces were set in operation which paved the way for the return of

the Jews a few years later.

Again the heathen monarch is brought to acknowledge the power of heaven's King. When Daniel interpreted, the dream, worldly wisdom and the learning of the Babylonian schools fell before the simple gospel teaching as carried out by faithful mothers in Israel. When the three Hebrews were saved from the heat of the furnace, the principles of God's government—true Protestantism, as it would be called to-day,—were proclaimed before the nations of the earth.

It was only a partial appreciation of these principles which Nebuchadnezzar at first gained; nevertheless it led to the decree that throughout the whole dominion, wherever a Jew might be living, no man should speak against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. This gave freedom to every believer to worship unmolested. Satan, in attempting to destroy the Hebrews, had overstepped the bounds, and in place of the death of three, life was granted to thousands.

The trial on the plains of Dura was the crowning act in the lives of the three Hebrews. We are told that they were advanced to higher positions in the province of Babylon, but we hear nothing further of them. In the testing

31
time they did not know that the Lord would deliver them from the furnace, but they had faith to believe that he had power to do it if it were his will to do so. In such times it takes more faith to trust that God will bring about his purposes in his own way than it does to believe in our own way. It is the absence of this faith and trust in critical times which brings perplexity, distress, fear, and surmising of evil. God is ever ready to do great things for his people when they put their trust in him. *"Godliness with contentment is great gain."*

Seldom are we placed in the same circumstances twice. Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Daniel, and others were sorely tried, even unto death, yet each test came in a different way. Each one to-day has an experience peculiar to his character and circumstances. God has a work to accomplish in the life of each individual. Every act, however small, has its place in our life experience. God is more than willing to guide us in the right way. He has not closed the windows of heaven to prayer, but his ears are ever open to the cries of his children, and his eye watches every movement of Satan to counteract his work.

Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were men of like passions with ourselves. Their lives are given to show what man may become even in this life, if he will make God his strength and wisely improve the opportunities within his reach. Among the captives of the king who had similar advantages, only Daniel and his three companions bent all their energies to seek wisdom and knowledge from God as revealed in his Word and works. Although they afterward held high positions of trust, they were neither proud nor self-sufficient. They had a living connection with God, loving, fearing, and obeying him. They allowed their light to shine in undimmed luster, while occupying positions of responsibility. Amid all the temptations and fascinations of the court, they stood firm as a rock in adherence to

principle.

A direct compliance with Bible requirements, and a faith in God, will bring strength to both the will and the body. The fruit of the Spirit is not only love, joy, and peace, but temperance also. If these youth had compromised with the heathen officers at first, and yielded to the pressure of the occasion by eating and drinking according to the custom of the Babylonians, contrary to God's requirements, that one wrong step would undoubtedly have led to others, until their consciences would have become seared, and they would have been turned into wrong paths. Faithfulness in this one point prepared

32

them to withstand greater temptations, until finally they stood firm in this crucial test on the plain of Dura.

The third chapter of Daniel may be studied with profit in connection with the message referred to in the thirteenth chapter of Revelation. The principles are the same in both. All the world was called to worship the image set up in the province of Babylon; refusing, they would suffer death. In Revelation there is brought to view an image to the beast,—governments on earth which will frame laws contrary to the requirements of God. Life and power will be given to this image, and it shall both speak and decree that as many as will not worship it shall be put to death. All, small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, will be required to receive a mark in the right hand or in the forehead. Men will be disfranchised for not worshipping this image; for no one will be allowed to buy or sell who has not the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

Who will be able to stand the test when this decree to worship the image to the beast is enforced? Who will choose rather to "*suffer* affliction with the people of God than to enjoy f the pleasures of sin for a season"? What children are now being trained and educated in these principles of integrity to God? From what homes will come the Daniels and the Meshachs? This will be the final test brought upon the servants of God. The scenes portrayed in the third chapter of Daniel are but a miniature representation of those trials into which the people of God are coming as the end approaches.

33

CHAPTER IV

The Most High Ruleth

THE fourth chapter of Daniel is, in some respects, the most wonderful chapter in the Bible. It is a public document written by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, after his humiliation by the God of heaven. It was sent "*unto* all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth." It therefore comes to us with as much freshness and vitality as though it were issued to the generation in which we live. The object was, says Nebuchadnezzar, "*to* show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me." Contemplating what had been done, he exclaimed in language similar to that of the apostle Paul, "*How* great are his signs! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation."

Nebuchadnezzar's reign had been one long scene of warfare. He was a man of war. This characteristic was so prominent in the life of the great king that prophecy calls him "the terrible of the nations," and the "hammer of the whole earth." He had met the foe on every side and had been successful, because God had put his "sword into the hand of the king of Babylon," and had made use of this monarch to punish other nations which had refused the light of truth. To illustrate: For thirteen years the city of Tyre resisted every effort made by Nebuchadnezzar. Finally he was successful, but gained no spoils, for Tyre, captured on the seacoast, removed to an island. Then Nebuchadnezzar turned his arms against Egypt, and that nation, which years before held Israel in bondage, now became a slave to the Babylonian power. The prophet Ezekiel, one of the Hebrew captives, was given a view of the capture of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, and was told to send the testimony to Pharaoh, king of Egypt. In this prophecy Egypt is represented as a mighty tree towering above all the trees of the earth. Even the trees of Eden envied the splendor of this one. All the fowls of heaven nested in its boughs; the hosts of earth dwelt beneath its branches. But this tree of Egypt was lifted up because of its greatness, and God sent Babylon to hew it to the ground. The crash of its fall shook the earth.

This prophecy must have been known to Nebuchadnezzar, if not before, at least after his victory over Egypt, for it was familiar to the Jews and there

34

were Hebrews in the Babylonian court. This throws light on the fourth chapter of Daniel.

Having conquered the world, Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in his house, when one night he dreamed a dream. Success had followed him wherever he turned. At his feet bowed the representatives of all nations. Into his coffers flowed the wealth of the east and the west, and the north and the south. About him was clustered the wit and the learning of the age. Libraries were at his command, and art flourished. Why should not King Nebuchadnezzar flourish in his kingdom? But he had dreamed a dream which troubled him, and he called upon his wise men for an interpretation. They listened, but strange to say, could give no explanation. God always permitted the wise men of earth to have first trial. When these wise men failed, Daniel was called.

Daniel's name had been changed when he first entered the Babylonian court, and to the king and his associates he was known as Belteshazzar, a son of the heathen god Bel, but Daniel himself always retained his own Hebrew name. Years before this, however, the God of Daniel had said, "Bel boweth and Nebo stoopeth;...they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Daniel again had an opportunity of proving the wisdom of his God and the weakness of the Babylonian deities. The dream, as repeated by the king in Daniel's hearing, is wonderful to contemplate. The tree was a familiar object and a striking symbol. The most magnificent specimens that the world afforded had been transplanted into the Babylonian gardens. The story of Eden and its trees was handed down by tradition, and the people knew of the tree of life, and also of the tree of

the knowledge of good and evil. The tree seen in the dream was planted in the midst of the earth, and as he watched, the king saw it grow until the top reached heaven, and its boughs stretched to the ends of the earth. Strange that this tree which grew toward heaven in spite of everything, which was watered by the dews of heaven and fed by God's own sunshine, knew only of the earth and earthly kingdoms!

As it had been with the Egyptian tree, so with this; fowls rested in the branches and beasts dwelt in its shadow. The king in his dream saw only the upper part of the tree, the branches, leaves, and fruit, but the roots of any tree are as numerous and widespread as its branches; hence this mighty tree, whose top reached heaven, and whose branches spread forth to the ends of the earth, was supported by roots which, though hidden, ran through all the earth. Deep-rooted, it was drawing nourishment from hidden springs. In

35

fact, the fair leaves and abundant fruit were dependent upon the condition of the roots.

As Nebuchadnezzar gazed upon the tree, he saw a "*watcher*, even an holy one,"—a messenger from heaven, whose appearance was similar to the one who walked in the midst of the fiery furnace with the Hebrew children. At the command of this divine messenger, the tree was hewn down, the stump alone remaining. Hewing down the tree did not kill the stump nor the roots. The life remained, and it was ready to send forth new shoots more numerous than before.

It is doubtful whether man ever received a message freighted with greater importance than this one given to Nebuchadnezzar. In his former dream he was shown the shortness of his kingdom and given proof of the decline of the empire. Had he lived in harmony with what was then revealed to him, the experience about to come would have been avoided. The parting words of the angel as he left Nebuchadnezzar were, "This matter is by the decree of the watchers...to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." More than that, "He setteth up over it the basest of men." Because a man holds a position, it does not signify that he is better than others.

When Daniel realized the true significance of the dream, and foresaw the humiliation of the king of Babylon, "his thoughts troubled him." He was encouraged by the king not to be troubled, but to give the true interpretation. He did so, plainly telling the king that the tree seen in the vision was emblematic of Nebuchadnezzar himself, and his dominion. "*It is thou, O king, that art grown and become strong; for thy greatness is grown and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth.*" Great as was Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom, it had grown from a small beginning. Gradually the principles upon which it was founded—principles much older than the king, for they originated with Lucifer, and were a perversion of heavenly truths—had taken root. In government it was the most rigid monarchy; the king held the lives of his subjects in his hand. Slaves bowed before him in abject subjugation; exorbitant taxes were forced from subject provinces; crowned heads were laid low and men enslaved that the king of

Babylon might revel in the wealth of the world. The seeds of that form of government were sown wherever Babylon established her power, and as she sowed, so she, as well as others, have reaped. When Babylon fell, the principles by which she had controlled others were in turn applied to her. Wherever there is tyranny in government in any nation of earth to-day, it is

36

an offshoot of that root which filled the earth, the stump of which was allowed to remain until the end of time.

Wherever Babylon laid her hand in conquest, the principles of her religion were implanted. The vilest forms of worship were practiced in that kingdom with all its outward glory. The heart was rotten. The mystery of iniquity held full sway, hidden by the outward glitter of gold. The mysteries of Greece in a later day were but a repetition of the Babylonian mysteries. From the golden cup which she held in her hand, and which was a familiar symbol in Babylonian secret societies, she made all nations drunk with the wine of her fornication.

Nations and peoples to-day, unconscious of their origin, are perpetuating Babylonian religious customs when they celebrate Christmas with feasting, lighted candles, holly, and mistletoe. It is in commemoration of Babylonian heathen gods that they eat eggs on Easter, and even the wild capers of Hallowe'en repeat the mysteries of Babylon. The root was not destroyed; her religious principles have sprung up afresh in every generation and borne fruit in every country.

The influence of Babylon in educational lines was no less marked than her influence in government and religion, and the educational root of the tree was as vigorous as the others. We are in the habit of tracing the educational system of the world to Greece or Egypt; its principles are older than Greece. They belong to Babylon. The prominence given this phase of Babylonian life by the Spirit of God in the book of Daniel, and the fact that the leading educators and educational institutions of the world were brought in direct contact with the more simple principles of true education every time the Hebrews met the Chaldeans and wise men, shows the place which education occupies both in the false kingdoms of which Babylon is a type, and in the true, which the Hebrews represented. The so-called "*higher* education" of to-day, which exalts the science of the world above the science of salvation; which sends forth students bearing worldly credentials, but not recognized in the books of heaven, students who love display, who are filled with pride, selfishness, and self-esteem, —this education is a plant which has sprung from that broad root which supported the tree representing the Babylonian dominion.

Seeds of truth had been planted in Babylon. The holy Watcher sought constantly for the growth of a tree which would bring life. All nations were gathered under the influence of Babylon in hopes that they might there be

37

fed with fruit which would prove to be the bread of life; but instead, it was a mixture of good and evil, which poisoned the consumer.

The leaves of the tree were fair to look upon, and might have been for the

healing of the nations; but the very odor they exhaled, intoxicated and led to excesses. So with the plant which has sprung from those hidden roots. It may be fair to look upon, its fruit may be so sweet that the eater can not be persuaded that it is not truth, but the wisdom of God will stand long after that of the world has been destroyed. We should watch and guard against the evils which spring from the Babylonian root.

Aside from the general application to the entire kingdom, a part of the dream pictures the experience of Nebuchadnezzar personally. Because of his pride of heart, he would lose his reason, forsake the abodes of men, find his home with the beasts of the field, and remain in this condition for seven years—until he had learned "that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Daniel exhorted the king, "Let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." There was yet time for repentance, and had the king heeded this counsel, it would have saved him from the great humiliation which came upon him. But when men's hearts are set, the message to change, though given by an angel from heaven, remains unheeded. Consequently, "all this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar."

A year of probation was granted the king after this solemn warning had been given. At the end of this time the king was in his royal palace, and thinking of his kingdom with pride and satisfaction, exclaimed, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" He was repeating the thoughts, almost the exact words, of Satan, when he sought to exalt his throne above God. When proud thoughts were entertained, and these words were uttered, the sentence was pronounced which blasted the tree, and degraded the monarch whom the tree symbolized. It was God who had given the king his reason and ability to establish a kingdom like this. The same God could take away the judgment and wisdom upon which the king prided himself. And God did so. It is the mind which elevates man above the beasts. When the power of the mind is removed, he sinks to the lowest level. Nebuchadnezzar became as the beasts. David says, "*I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he*

38
passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found."

When God can not save men in prosperity, he brings upon them adversity. If in all this they reject God, then they bring upon themselves destruction. Let the results be as they may, God is clear from all censure. This is illustrated by Nebuchadnezzar's case. The proud and powerful monarch no longer swayed the scepter. He became a maniac, and for seven years he was found with cattle, the companion of beasts, feeding as they fed. His reason dethroned, he was no longer regarded even as a man. The mandate had gone forth, "*Hew down the tree, and cut off his branches, shake off his leaves, and scatter his fruit.*"

It is necessary in the cause of God and in the world, that men bear

responsibility. But when men are lifted up in pride and depend upon worldly wisdom, God can no longer sustain them, and they fall. Nations and individuals alike have this experience. Even the professed church of Christ which departs from the humility of the Master, loses its power, and will certainly be brought low. The people who glory in wealth, or intellect, or knowledge, or in anything save Jesus Christ, will be brought to confusion. In Christ alone" are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Every brilliant thought, every intellectual idea, which in any way brings greatness, originates with our Lord. It is God who is dealing with humanity. He rules. It should be remembered that in all of God's dealing with the king Nebuchadnezzar, God was working for the salvation of the ruler and those affected by his influence. God allowed him to suffer seven years of deplorable degradation, and then removed his chastening hand. After passing through this terrible humiliation, he was brought to see his own weakness; he confessed his guilt, and acknowledged the God of heaven. He sent to all the world the description of this experience as recorded in the fourth chapter of Daniel. He had learned that those who walk in pride, God is able to abase. In comparison with God and his universe, the inhabitants of the earth sink into insignificance, and are reputed as nothing. *"He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?"*

39

CHAPTER V

The Last Years Of The Babylonian Kingdom

THE history of the Babylonian nation reveals to the one who searches for hidden principles, all that is necessary in order to understand the relation of earthly governments to God; the dealings of God with all the nations of the earth, and the attitude which men should assume toward God and toward earthly governments. These four principles can be gained from the study of the history of Babylon as recorded in the book of Daniel and by the prophets who wrote concerning this kingdom. This is true, because in Babylon is seen in some respects the highest development of the plans of Satan. Here were counterfeited the principles of the heavenly kingdom, and so much of the true metal was mingled with the alloy that an unusual strength was developed. In other words, the kingdom of Babylon was built and developed in accordance with laws which were in themselves divine, but since the greatest evil lies near to and is a perversion of the greatest good, so the perversion of the principles of the government of heaven made the strongest of earthly kingdoms. Built so that it was difficult for beings who were watching the progress of events to detect error, God, who never deals arbitrarily with men or angels, not even with Satan himself, allowed the Babylonian kingdom to run its natural course, that the world might have an object lesson and know forever after that truth brings life, but that the least perversion of truth, no matter how slight, brings death.

In order to vindicate himself before the universe, God bestowed all manner of blessings upon this earthly kingdom which Satan boastingly claimed as

his own. Wisdom was given to the people of Babylon, the holy Watcher protected the king on his throne, and God gave power to the ruler in battle, making him a conqueror. It was God who caused the tree to reach unto heaven, and gave strength and beauty to its branches. Everything by way of warning and entreaty was used by Infinite Wisdom to cause the Babylonians to see the difference between the true and the false, and lead them to choose the true. It is one of the most forcible commentaries in earth's history on the care of God for all, even the veriest sinner.

Had Babylon taken the proffered help, she would, in spite of all the power of Satan as prince of this world, have linked her throne with the throne of

40

God, and would have been an everlasting kingdom. How easily might the history of the world have been changed!

People living in these last days, whether they be Christian or not, need not remain ignorant concerning their duty toward the civil government. Nations can not plead ignorance concerning their duty toward Christians, toward other nations, nor toward God, for the prophecies of Daniel explain it all. It is a book for rulers as well as for the common people. Babylon is an object lesson to the nations which are in existence to-day. Her growth was according to the laws of the growth of nations; her failures describe the failures which are made to-day, and her destruction is a description of the end of all earthly kingdoms.

Nations have a time of probation, as do individuals. A record is kept of national events, and when the cup of iniquity is full, destruction comes, and another power more vigorous, because less corrupt, takes its place. "*The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men,*" whether he is recognized or not, and things which, to human eyes, appear to have happened by chance, are directly under the control of the *holy Watcher*.

The study Of the book of Daniel demands, therefore, that we take time to trace the history of Babylon as a nation.

A period of about twenty-five years intervenes between the close of the fourth and the opening of the fifth chapter. The reign of Nebuchadnezzar closed shortly after the restoration of his reason as related in the fourth chapter of Daniel. From a worldly point of view, his had been a long and prosperous reign, and at its close there were no signs of weakening in the empire. Nebuchadnezzar had a son of age to fill the place of his father. No one questioned his right to the throne, and while they mourned the death of Nebuchadnezzar, apparently the subjects had much reason to rejoice over the succession of the son. In the eyes of heaven this history was a checkered one. There had been periods when a desire to know the right and rule justly were written opposite the name of the king. But these were followed by still longer periods when the voice of the Divine One was altogether unheeded. There was a record of wonderful providences, rich blessings, and bitter trials, all having one object,—into turn the minds of the world to the only source of life and power. If Heaven ever grows weary in watching the struggles of nations, what must have been the burden as they saw this kingdom repeatedly choose the course which was leading to inevitable ruin.

Evil-merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, is mentioned but twice in the Scriptures, and in each case reference is made to one act of his life. It seems

41

strange that such a father should be followed by a son of whom so little is recorded, but it is gratifying to notice that when the silence is broken, *it is to relate a deed of kindness*. In the first year of his reign he took from prison Jehoiachin, the former king of Jerusalem, a man now fifty years of age, who had languished in bonds since a boy of eighteen. The Jewish exruler was given clothing and a king's provisions, and exalted above other kings in Babylon all the remainder of his days.

Evil-merodach had been raised in the Babylonian court, and had known of the Jews and their history from his youth up. It would not be an impossible thing that Daniel, made chief of the Chaldean wise men by Nebuchadnezzar, had been the instructor of the prince. While details are omitted, triae it is that for some reason the destruction of Babylon was delayed beyond the reign of Evil-merodach. His brief reign of two years was followed by an unsettled period, a most dangerous experience in a monarchy.

Finally Nabonadius, the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, was seated on the throne, and about the year 541 he associated with him his son Belshazzar. The two reigned conjointly until the destruction of the kingdom in 538 B.C. This youth, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar, soon proved himself to be headstrong, wayward, cruel, and dissolute.

Daniel was no longer retained in the court. The time of his dismissal is not stated, but in the third year of Belshazzar's reign, he was living at Shushan, the capital of Elam, some distance east of Babylon, and it was at that place that he saw the vision which the eighth chapter of the book of Daniel relates.

During the reign of Nabonadius and Belshazzar, events of the greatest importance occurred. To the Jews who accepted the words of the prophets whom God sent, rising up early and sending, the downfall of the kingdom in the near future was well known. In spite of their own oppression there was a world to be warned, and as the host of the redeemed gather about the throne of God, made up, as it will be, of representatives of every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, there will be some souls from ancient Babylon, who, having heard the proclamation of the message, separated from her sins, and were saved.

As the knowledge of God was lost by the ruling monarchs, and God-fearing men were no longer among the counselors, the oppression of the Jews became almost unbearable.

42

On going into Babylon they had been instructed by the Lord to build houses and plant vineyards, to marry and increase in numbers, and to pray for the peace and prosperity of Babylon, for their captivity would last seventy years. The people of God had the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment to preserve their peculiarity and keep them from mingling with the heathen. The time came when the Babylonians, who were sunworshippers,

mocked the Jews because of the Sabbath. They were forbidden to celebrate their feasts; priests and rulers were degraded and persecuted. The Babylonians often demanded songs from the Jews. "*They* that wasted us required of us mirth, saying. Sing us one of the songs of Zion;" but their hearts were mournful. "*Israel* is a scattered sheep," wrote Jeremiah; "the lions have driven him away;...Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones." The Babylonians boasted that it was no sin to oppress the Jews, reasoning that God had placed the Hebrews in bondage because of their sins.

It is little wonder that the yoke was hard to bear and that the king was unrelenting. It was a time of trouble, a foretaste of the great time of trouble through which the people of God will pass before the second coming of the Saviour. Both periods are called by the same name,—the time of *Jacob's Trouble*,— by the prophet Jeremiah. Under these trying circumstances the Jews were obliged to preach the gospel which they once had the opportunity to give with power from Jerusalem.

Groaning beneath oppression, they had taught of the coming Messiah, the deliverer; they taught righteousness by faith, and the everlasting gospel, the hour of God's judgment, the fall of Babylon, and the destruction of those upon whom was found the mark of Babylonian worship. The spirit of prophecy, as belonging to the Jews, was known to the Babylonians throughout the period of captivity. Daniel, in the presence of the king, had, more than once, received divine enlightenment. Ezekiel was sending messages broadcast from the Lord, and Jeremiah had received word from God with the command to make it known to all the nations round about. There was no hiding the fact that the God of the Jews had prophets among his people. It was in this way that not only the Jews, but Moab, Edom, Tyre and Sidon, Ammon, Egypt, Arabia, and even Media and Persia knew that the fall of Babylon was decreed. Many of these nations, and the Persians among the number, knew just what kingdom would be used to destroy Babylon, and the name of the man whom God had chosen to accomplish the overthrow.

43

Such are the messages which God sent, and thus it was that he made use of his people. Those whom he could not use when granted peace and prosperity and a city of their own, he used when slaves under the iron heel of Babylon. Babylon was like a city on the edge of a volcanic crater, but she believed it not. In the year 539 B. C., the general of the combined forces of the Medes and Persians started toward Babylon. The news reached the city that the enemy was on the march. Then it was that the message came to flee from the city and be as goats upon the mountainside. Jews who heeded the word of the Lord, then withdrew from Babylon. But the Persian army did not come. History says that Cyrus was stopped by the death of a sacred white horse, which was drowned in crossing a river. Cyrus set his men to digging channels for the river, spending one year in this way. Prophecy says, "*The walls of Babylon shall fall. My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul... And lest your heart faint, and ye*

fear for the rumor that shall be heard in the land; a rumor shall both come one year, and after that in another year, shall come a rumor."

And so it was; one spring the rumor came, but the army failed to appear.

The careless and unbelieving scoffed, but to the believing this was an opportune time. The next spring the rumor came again, but there was no time then to sell or prepare to leave, for the army came also, and the Babylonian and Medo-Persian forces met in open battle. The Babylonians were defeated, and returned within the fortifications of the city.

The gates were closed and the siege began. Those who were now in Babylon must live or die with the Babylonians, except God stay the hand of the destroyer.

The climax was reached by the greatest of earthly governments. All heaven was alive with anxiety. Only man was asleep to his impending destruction.

44

CHAPTER VI

The Handwriting On The Wall (Chapter 5)

IT was the last night of a nation's existence, but the people knew it not.

Some slept in unconscious peace; some reveled and whirled away in thoughtless dance. In the dens of Babylon, men steeped in vice continued their wild orgies; in the palace halls Belshazzar feasted with a thousand of his lords. Music resounded through the brilliantly lighted rooms. The nobles lounged about the tables sumptuously spread. Court women and concubines of the king entered those halls. It was a feast of Bacchus, and they drank to the health of the king on his throne. He ordered that the sacred vessels be brought from the temple to show that no being, human or divine, could raise a hand against him, the king of Babylon. The golden cup filled with wine was raised and the blessing of Bel invoked, but it never reached the lips of the half-intoxicated king. His hand was stayed. Those vessels had been molded by hands divinely skilled, and after heavenly models. Angels had watched them as they were taken from the temple at Jerusalem and carried to Babylon. Messengers divinely appointed had guarded them, and their very presence in the heathen temple was a witness of the God of the Jews. Some day the silence would be broken. The desecration of his temple would not always remain unpunished.

That time came when the king lifted the goblet filled with sparkling wine. His hand grew stiff, for on the opposite wall over against the lights was a bloodless hand, writing words of an unknown language. The winecup fell to the floor; the king's countenance grew pale; he trembled violently, and his knees smote together until the gorgeous girdle of his loins loosened and fell aside. The loud laughter ceased, and the music died away. Terror-stricken, a thousand guests looked from the face of the king to the writing on the wall. The Chaldean astrologers and soothsayers were called, but the writing was meaningless to them. They who taught all earthly languages failed to recognize the language of heaven. The four strange characters remained as at first seen, emblazoned in letters of fire on the wall.

For days the siege of Babylon had been on. The gates were closed and her

walls were considered impregnable, while within the city were provisions for twenty years. But however strong she might seem, God had said,

45

"Though Babylon should mount up to heaven, and though she should fortify the height of her strength, yet from me shall spoilers come unto her."

The strongest strongholds which man can build are crushed like a dying leaf when the hand of God is laid upon them. But this was a lesson which the rulers of Babylon had not yet learned. The father of iniquity, who was urging these rulers forward into deeper sin, had not yet owned the weakness of his cause. Heaven and unfallen worlds watched the progress of affairs in this great city, for it was the battle-ground of the two mighty forces of good and evil. Christ and Satan here contended.

Angels, unseen by human eyes, as they gathered the animals into the ark before the flood, had mustered forces against Babylon. God was using men who knew him not as God, but who were true to principle and wished to do the right. To Cyrus, the leader of the Persian army which was now outside the city walls, God had said that he held his hand to make him strong.

Before you "I will loose the loins of kings." I will open those two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut; "I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass and cut in sunder the bars of iron."

While Belshazzar and his lords drank and feasted, the army of Cyrus was lowering the waters in the bed of the Euphrates, preparatory to entering the city.

As the Chaldeans were unable to read the writing on the wall, the king's terror increased. He knew that this was a rebuke of his sacrilegious feast, and yet he could not learn the exact meaning. Then the queen-mother remembered Daniel, who had "the Spirit of the holy God," and who had been made master of the wise men in the days of Nebuchadnezzar as the result of interpreting the king's dream.

Daniel, the prophet of God, was called to the banquet room. As he came before Belshazzar, the monarch promised to make him third ruler in the kingdom if he would interpret the writing. The prophet, with the quiet dignity of a servant of the Most High God, stood before the gorgeous, terror-stricken throng that bore evidence of intemperate feasting and wicked revelry.

In Israel, children were named under the inspiration of the Spirit, and the name was an expression of character. When God changed a name, as in the case of Abraham, Jacob, or Peter, it was because of a change of character in the individual. True to the name given him by his mother, Daniel—God's

46

judge—again appears to vindicate the truth. Nebuchadnezzar had, called him Belteshazzar, in honor of the Babylonian god Bel, but to the last this Hebrew, who knew the Lord, remained true to his God-given name, as shown in the twelfth verse of this chapter. He did not speak with flattering words, as the professedly wise men of the kingdom had done, but he spoke the truth of God. It was a moment of intensity, for there was but a single

hour in which to make known the future. Daniel was now an old man, but he sternly disclaimed all desire for rewards or honor, and proceeded to review the history of Nebuchadnezzar, and the Lord's dealings with that ruler—his dominion and glory, his punishment for pride of heart, and his subsequent acknowledgment of the mercy, and power of the God who created the heavens and the earth. He rebuked Belshazzar for his departure from true principles, and for his great wickedness and pride.

"And thou, his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this; but hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven;...And the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified." Straightforward and strong were the words of Daniel.

Belshazzar had trodden on sacred ground; he had laid unholy hands on holy things; he had severed the ties which bind heaven and earth together; and there was no way for that life-giving Spirit of God to reach him or his followers. Day by day his breath had been given him, a symbol of the spiritual breath, but he praised and thanked the gods of wood and stone. His every motion had been by virtue of the power of the God of heaven, but he had prostituted that power to an unholy cause. "Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written." What he could not see written in his own breath and muscles, what he could not read in his own heart-beats, God wrote in mystic characters on the palace wall, over against the candlestick.

The people waited with bated breath as Daniel turned to the writing on the wall, and read the message traced by the angel hand. The hand had been withdrawn, but four terrible words remained. The prophet announced their meaning to be: "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin: ... God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it: ...thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting: ...thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.

In dealing with men God always uses a language which appeals forcibly to their understanding. This is illustrated in the handwriting on the wall. It is a common belief among idolaters that the gods weigh deeds in balances, and that if the good deeds outweigh the evil, the individual enters into his

47

reward; if the opposite result is obtained, punishment follows. The language, therefore, was familiar to King Belshazzar. "God hath numbered thy kingdom;... thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." To the magicians who stood within hearing, as Daniel gave the interpretation, the words came with peculiar force because of their familiarity with religious customs.

To the one who knows God, the attitude of the Lord toward the sinner is very different, and still the symbol of the weights and balances is applicable. That this subject might be understood, God had sent an explanation by the prophet Ezekiel. When man sins and dies without repentance, he is cut off from God, because our iniquities separate between us and God, and the man can not be saved. If a man loves Christ and accepts him and his righteousness, Christ's character is written opposite the name of that man in the books of heaven, and so long as a love of the truth

is cherished, the man hides in Christ and is known by the character of Christ. God deals with men in the present. We may have been the worst of sinners, but if *to-day* we are hidden in Christ, heaven takes into account only our present position.

So it was that God dealt with the nations, and this answers the question why Nebuchadnezzar might one day be in favor with God and the next day be in condemnation; why Zedekiah's course of action was condemned once, and then again he was told that it lay in his power to save Jerusalem.

God gave the Babylonian monarchs, and through them the entire kingdom, an abundance of time to accept him. He waited long. The Holy Watcher hovered long near the center of earthly governments; every blessing which Heaven could bestow was given to woo the kingdom to the side of right.

But at last the slender cord which connected earth and heaven snapped; there was no channel for the flow of the Holy Spirit; death and death only could result. That there might be no misunderstanding, the last word read, "*Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.*"

Scarcely had the scarlet robe been placed on Daniel and the golden chain hung about his neck, when the shouts from the invading army rang through the palace.

In the midst of their feasting and rioting, none had noticed that the waters in the Euphrates were steadily diminishing. The besieging army of Cyrus, which had long been held at bay by the massive walls, was eagerly watching the river. The river had been turned from its course, and as soon as the water had sufficiently subsided to allow the men a passage in the bed

48

of the river, they entered from opposite sides of the city. In their reckless feeling of security, the Babylonians had left open the gates in the walls which lined the river-banks inside the city. So the Persians, once in the river-bed, easily entered the city through the open gates.

Soon one post was running to "meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end." But the news was received too late to save the king. God had numbered and finished his kingdom. The enemy made a mad rush for the palace. The pen of inspiration describes the overthrow of the kingdom more vividly than any human historian. Of those guests at the banquet of Belshazzar it is said, "I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not awake...I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter." Then as if the eye of the prophet failed to separate Satan from the kingdom which he had so long controlled, he exclaims, "How is Sheshach taken! and how is the praise of the whole earth surprised! How is Babylon become an astonishment among the nations!" Fire raged through the streets, and as the people realized that destruction was upon them, a cry reached heaven. It was a hand-to-hand fight with fire and sword until men grew weary and gave up the struggle.

"In that night was Belshazzar slain," and the kingdom was given to Darius, the aged king of the Medes. Thus came to an end one of the proudest monarchies that has ever been upon the earth. When an individual or a

nation fills up the cup of iniquity, and passes the limit of God's mercy, they are quickly humbled in the dust.

The question naturally arises, Why did not the conquering army destroy Daniel, who was the third ruler in the kingdom, at this critical moment? The answer is simple and natural. When the kingdom was taken and Belshazzar slain, Nabonadius, the first ruler, at the head of an army, was surrounded by the enemy in another part of the kingdom. This left Daniel sole ruler in Babylon. He knowing that over one hundred years before, Isaiah had prophesied that Cyrus should take the kingdom, was ready to welcome him whom God had said should build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem. There is also good reason to believe that Daniel and Cyrus were not strangers. When excluded from the council of Belshazzar, Daniel had spent a portion of his time at Shushan, the capital of Elam.

Elam had revolted from Babylon, in fulfillment of the prophecy of Jeremiah.

49

Daniel may have formed an acquaintance with Cyrus, and showed to him, as the high priest did to Alexander on a certain occasion, the prophecy that pertained to himself, and also revealed to him the way God had said he should enter Babylon. It is evident from the wording of the decree given in the first chapter of Ezra, that Cyrus was familiar with these prophecies. God gives continual opportunities for his people to prepare the way for blessings to come to them, when they are walking in the light. God is never taken by surprise, but his Word is a lamp to the feet and a guide to the life. This illustrates the importance of God's people's "knowing the time" in which they live from the light of prophecy. There is a Witness in every scene of sacrilegious mirth, and the recording angel writes, "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." This same Witness is with us wherever we are. Although we may feel that we have liberty to follow the promptings of the natural heart, and indulge in lightness and trifling, yet an account must be rendered for these things. As we sow, so shall we reap. Nations to-day are repeating the history of the last years of the kingdom of Babylon. Medo-Persia was the instrument in the Lord's hands to punish Babylon. The next great overthrow of governments will usher in the kingdom of our Lord. For the final battle, nations are now mustering their forces. The cry has gone forth, "Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul; be not cut off in her iniquity; for this is the time of the Lord's vengeance."

50

CHAPTER VII

Daniel In The Lions' Den (Chapter 6)

THE first five chapters of the book of Daniel relate the history of the kingdom of Babylon. With the close of the fifth chapter, the government is transferred to the Medes, of whom Darius, known in history as Darius the Mede, a man of sixty-two years, is king. With him is associated Cyrus, the Persian, the leader of the army, and heir to the throne. The time represented

by the golden head of the image has passed, and a baser metal represents the rising power. The Medes were not, however, a new or unknown power, for they are mentioned in chronology as descendants of Japheth, and as early as the eighth century B.C., when Israel was taken captive by the Assyrians, they were scattered through the cities of the Medes. This had brought the Medes into contact with the Jews two centuries before the fall of Babylon. To their knowledge of the God of the Jews may be attributed the purity of their worship, for while they were heathens, they had never fallen into the gross forms of idolatry which were practiced by most of the nations of Western Asia.

The habits of both the Medes and the Persians, but more particularly of the Persians, brought them in close touch with nature, and in their worship they took the elements, fire, earth, water, and air as the highest manifestations of the Deity. They therefore sought a hill country, and kept a perpetual fire burning. They believed in the struggle between good and evil as represented by light and darkness, and doubtless the words of Isaiah, which are addressed to Cyrus, had this belief in mind, for the Lord says, "I form the light and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things." In these words he places himself above the gods of the Persians, and explains why he called Cyrus to his strange work.

The Persians at the time of the overthrow of Babylon were physically strong and rugged, due in great measure to the simplicity, of their habits and their temperance in eating. Such were the conditions which made it possible for the Medes and Persians to be the rod in the Lord's hand for the punishment of Babylon. The organization of the kingdoms as effected by the Babylonian monarchs is given in verse I of the sixth chapter, for Darius immediately placed one hundred and twenty princes over the one hundred and twenty provinces. This change in the administration of the government

51
of the provinces is highly important, since the strength of the ruling monarch is in proportion to the sympathy and co-operation of the subject princes. It was impossible to maintain a representative government where there were conquered provinces, and peace depended much upon the strength of the central organization. Over the one hundred and twenty princes were the three presidents, of whom Daniel was the first.

It was not after the order of the world that Daniel, belonging to a race held in bondage, should at once be given one of the highest positions in the newly organized government. It will appear still more unusual when it is remembered that Daniel had been made third ruler of the Babylonian kingdom under Belshazzar. Reference to the first and second verses of the eighth chapter of Daniel shows that Daniel was not a stranger to the new government, for before the death of Belshazzar, he had lived at Shushan, in the province of Elam. To the fact of acquaintanceship it may be added that the excellent spirit and unsurpassed business ability of Daniel brought him into prominence.

Here is recorded the case of a man who was a devout follower of God, one whose honesty, accuracy, and skill in every particular was a wonder to the

world. It is a powerful witness to the duties and privileges of every Christian business man. He was a noble statesman, but not a politician, an example for all office-holders. He fulfilled his duties under the Medes just as faithfully as under the Babylonians. He served the God of heaven, and not a man-made party. A business man does not necessarily have to be a sharp, policy man, but may be instructed by God at every step. When prime minister of Babylon, Daniel, as prophet of God, was receiving the light of heavenly inspiration. The usual type of a statesman, worldly, ambitious, scheming, is compared in the Scriptures to the grass of the field, and to the fading flower. The Lord is pleased to have men of intelligence in his work if they remain true to him. Through the grace of Christ, man may preserve the integrity of his character when surrounded by adverse circumstances. Daniel made God his strength, and was not forsaken in his time of greatest need. The very position which he occupied put Daniel to the severest test. As chairman or chief of the presidents over the princes, Daniel was obliged to deal with all the under-rulers of the empire. One by one they were obliged to render an account to him. This was that the king might receive no damage. The king, then, was in danger; not in danger of losing his life, but these officials were scheming politicians who were robbing the government in every possible way. If they had taxes to gather, they turned a large per

52

cent to their own account. There was bribery, cheating, wire pulling, and buying of positions in the Babylonian government, as there is in the world to-day. Dishonesty was found everywhere.

Inspiration does not describe the iniquity in detail, but it does say, "*The godly is perished out of the earth;...they hunt every man his brother with a net. That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward; and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire: so they wrap it up.*" The princes and men in power not only work mischievously, but they work with *both hands earnestly*. If details are wanted, study the governments of to-day. They are the off-shoots from that same root of Babylon, and by studying the iniquity of to-day, we can know the sins against which Daniel had to stand. Even in the best of earthly governments, hundreds of thousands of dollars are used annually in an unlawful manner. When \$3,500 is paid for a single vote, and the individual returns the money because he has an offer of \$3,700 from the other party; when a mayor of a city can afford to spend three or four times his salary to obtain an office, it must be known that money comes from some unlawful source.

Roman history, with its stories of trusts, monopolies, and corporations, its bribery in the senate and outside the senate, is the history of Babylon, for Rome was one of the governments which were built upon Babylonian principles. French history of the period of the Revolution repeats the story. The history of England, the continental countries, and the United States today repeat the same story. So in the current history may be read in detail what had to be met by the prime minister in the city of Babylon. The sixth chapter of Daniel is left on record to show how a man of God, when

elevated to such a position, can remain uncontaminated. It shows that attitude which any man of God must assume toward popular vice and corruption, and more than that, it shows what treatment a man who is true to principle must expect to receive from the hands of those who are corrupt. Because Daniel did guard the king's interests, Darius was about to set him over the whole realm. But the honesty of one man is like a thorn in the flesh of the unjust, and in their political meetings the princes and presidents sought to destroy the man who made accurate reports, and who was faultless in his dealings. "*Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's,*" is a principle of divine government, and from this principle Daniel could not be swerved.

53

One can imagine the language of the princes as they discussed the matter. Every scheme they had tried had been checked, and yet it was generally acknowledged that it would be useless to bring a complaint concerning the work of Daniel. There was but one possible way to condemn him, and that must be concerning his religion. Even on that point they dared not make open accusation, but must accomplish their end without revealing their object. Their contemptible, under-handed method of procedure brought them in conflict with the God of Daniel, not with Daniel as an individual. With manifest respect for the king, and with words which flattered him, a committee of the princes waited upon Darius. The first words they spoke afterward revealed that there was a plot on foot, for they said, "*All the presidents of the kingdom, the governors,*" and other officers had consulted together, when in truth they had held secret meetings, and the chief of the presidents was kept in ignorance of the matter.

The king placed great confidence in his prime minister, and anything purporting to have his approval was accepted without further investigation. The form of a decree was presented to the king. It exalted Darius above all earthly monarchs, and attempted to place him above God. King Darius placed his seal upon the document, making it a law of the land. For thirty days no man should bow down or worship or ask any petitions, save of the king.

The heart of God was drawn toward Babylon. Heaven was bound very close to earth, notwithstanding the iniquity, for God's chosen people were there, and the time of their deliverance drew near. While the Medes and Persians knew *about* God, they did not know him. An actual experience was needed, and God would manifest his power through that same faithful servant who had witnessed for him sixty-eight years.

Daniel was true, noble, and generous. He was anxious to be at peace with all men, but would not permit any power to turn him aside from the path of duty. He was willing to obey those who had rule over him; but kings and decrees could not make him swerve from his allegiance to the King of kings. He realized that compliance with Bible requirements was a blessing to both soul and body.

Daniel was aware of the purpose of his enemies to destroy his influence and his life; he knew of the decree, but it made no difference in his daily life. He

did nothing unusual to provoke wrath, but in a straight-forward manner he performed his accustomed duties, and three times a day at his usual times for prayer, he went into his room, and with his windows open toward

54

Jerusalem, he earnestly pleaded with the God of heaven to give him strength to be faithful.

Daniel had a special meeting place, and an appointed hour when he met the Lord, and these appointments were kept. There is a beauty in the thought of the soul connection between Daniel and heaven. His spiritual life was an actual thing, a life which he lived as real and as true as the physical life. The only life which his enemies knew or could comprehend was the physical life. To sever the intercourse with God would be as painful to Daniel as to deprive him of natural life; and as Christ withdrew to the mountains after days of soul-harrowing labor in order to be refilled with that life which he constantly imparted to the hungry multitudes, so Daniel sought God in prayer. It was only by these frequent times of spirit filling, as it were, that he had strength to meet the nervous strain of his official duties. When the outward pressure was greatest, then he had the greatest need of being filled, that the equilibrium might be maintained. He who balances the clouds will so balance outward pressure with inward power if we but let him, that we never need be disturbed. Fifteen pounds to every square inch of surface on the body is the pressure under which we live physically. Why does it not crush us? Because the pressure is equal on all sides, and thus we are unconscious of it. It is but a type of the spiritual life. If trials are great, open the soul to heaven, and equalize the pressure by being filled from above. Daniel did not and could not deny his Saviour by concealing himself in some corner of his room to pray. He knelt by the open window, toward Jerusalem. He did not pray in his heart, silently. He prayed aloud, as had been his custom before the decree was issued. Noble and true is the one who has God ruling in his heart. Underhanded and mean are the actions of those who yield to the influence of Satan. All that is noble in man is lost forever when such a leader is chosen. Satan was in the councils of those officials as they plotted against Daniel, and after the decree was signed, they set spies to catch him. They saw him kneel in his usual place of prayer; three times each day they heard his voice raised in earnest supplication. It was enough; the accusation was made against *"that Daniel which is of the children of the captivity of Judah."*

For the first time the design of the counselors flashed across the mind of Darius. A decree signed with the king's seal was unalterable in the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, yet the king spent the entire day pleading with those in high authority, and searching for some way of escape; but with Satanic smiles those princes met every argument with the words, "*Know, O*

55

king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed."

When the hands of men are tied; when there is no power on earth to help; then is God's opportunity. And Daniel's prayer still ascended: "It is time for

thee, Lord, to work. Keep me in perfect harmony with thee." And while his own heart was in sympathy with heaven, there was no power on earth which could deprive him of his life, if God desired him to live.

Daniel and Darius met at the mouth of the lions' den, but there was not another man in the realm so fitted to go inside as this same Daniel. Pressing the hand of his esteemed minister, Darius said, "Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee." Daniel passed into the midst of the wild beasts of the forest, and a stone was brought and laid upon the mouth of the den. Probably some feared that friends and sympathizers of Daniel might come to the rescue, so the seal of the king was placed upon the stone, that the purpose might not be changed.

Satan exulted as he did years later when he saw the Son of God in the sepulcher, with a stone before the door, and the stone sealed with the Roman seal. But there was no more power to hold Daniel in the den of lions than to keep Christ in the grave. The angel came, not to the stone, but into the den, and one of the most precious times for Daniel was when he sat in the center of the cave, and those lions couched at his feet or fondly licked his hands.

There was a time when the lion and the lamb played together, and man was given dominion over the beasts of the earth. It was only after sin entered, and man took the life of the beasts, that they in turn sought to destroy man. Harmony with God will finally restore man to his God-given place as king of the beasts. Daniel's heart was beating with the heart of God, and when he entered the den, the beasts were at peace with him. The unity of feeling is shown in the fact that an angel was visible, and Daniel talked face to face with the heavenly visitor.

The king's heart was sad, and he spent the night in fasting and prayer. Hastening to the den in the early hours of the morning, he called: "O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?" And from the recesses of the den came the words of cheer, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths."

56

"He is not here, but risen." "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" said the angel, as the women came to the sepulcher of Christ. So no manner of hurt was found upon Daniel, the representative of Christ, "because he believed in his God;" because innocence was found in him.

When Daniel's accusers were cast into the lions' den, they were crushed and devoured at once. Again the nations of the world saw the power of Israel's God to preserve his faithful people. Darius had his belief in God confirmed and Cyrus had received a lesson he could not soon forget. It was a fresh token to the Israelites that God was in their midst to bless them. To Daniel came the voice of God promising patience and strength to perform his duties as a servant of God. Greater light came to Daniel, for it was after this experience that a large portion of the prophecies were given to him.

Darius published to "all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth,...that in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before

the God of Daniel." Thus God not only honored Daniel by a most miraculous deliverance, but his integrity was the means of publishing the truth throughout the world. From this time Daniel prospered—during the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus, who issued the wonderful decree for the deliverance of the Jews.

If sick at heart because of the seeming prosperity of the wicked and the increase of wickedness among men in high places, learn their fate from the sixth chapter of Daniel.

If oppressed because of adherence to the Word of God, remember that Daniel represents all such, and what was done for him will be done for all whom Heaven favors to-day. Though death claim the body, the promise of God is a speedy resurrection; and whether in death, in prison, or the den of lions, Satan has no power over Christ. "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly."

57

CHAPTER VIII

The Prophecy Of Daniel Seven The Judgment Scene

THE first half of the book of Daniel deals with questions pertaining particularly to the kingdom of Babylon as it existed in the days of the prophet. The last six chapters are devoted entirely to the history of the world as a whole, and in visions given at various times, the prophet is shown the great events till the end of time. Looking into the future, he sees, as it were, the mountain peaks lighted with the glory of God, and these striking features are noted with unerring accuracy to serve as guide-posts, not to the Jews only, but to all people, that they may understand the times in which they live, and know what is about to come on the earth.

To the student of prophecy, the seventh chapter of Daniel is a most important record. By a continuous chain of events, the prophet gives the history from the days of Babylon to the great investigative judgment, which is the central theme of the chapter.

The fact that God could open the future to a heathen king was remarkable. To Nebuchadnezzar the future of earthly governments only was shown, because he himself was earthly, and was incapable of grasping higher things; but to Daniel God opened scenes in heaven. Although the prophet was shown the history of nations, the angel of revelation touched briefly on those subjects, but lingered on the soul-thrilling description of the investigative judgment.

The seventh chapter of Daniel reveals the future of God's people; not only the Hebrew nation, but the true, the spiritual Israel. This vision was given to Daniel in the first year of the reign of Belshazzar, about 540 B.C. The mere giving of this view bears the strongest testimony to the results of Daniel's education when a youth, to his steadfastness of purpose, and his growth in spiritual things. At the age of eighty-five, after sixty-seven years of court life, with all its allurements, and the natural tendency of human nature to sink to a purely physical existence, his eye of faith was so undimmed that at the bidding of Michael, Gabriel could carry Daniel into heaven itself, there

to behold the Father and Son in the final work of the sanctuary above. Moses once saw these things from the top of Mount Horeb when the tabernacle was to be built, and so great was the glory that he veiled his face before the common people could behold him. Daniel's heart was with God,
58

hence things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, could be revealed unto him by the Spirit.

God said by the prophet Hosea, "I have spoken by the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the prophets." The kingdoms which have ruled the world were represented before Daniel as beasts of prey, which arose when the "*four* winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea." Winds are, in prophecy, a symbol of war and strife. The after-scenes of war and revolution, by which kingdoms come into power, are represented in Daniel seven by the four winds of heaven which strove upon the great sea. Sea or waters denote "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." The beasts referred to represent kings or kingdoms. Four great beasts came up from the sea; that is, they arose into prominence from the midst of the multitudes of earth. Babylon, the first of these kingdoms, was represented to Nebuchadnezzar as the golden head of the great image. To Daniel the same power appeared as a lion, having eagle's wings. The strength of the monarch of the forest, to which is added the swiftness of the king of birds, is taken to represent the kingdom of which the city of Babylon was the capital. Before Babylon was known as an independent kingdom, while it was still a subject province of Assyria, Habakkuk, a prophet of Israel, had been given a view of its work which shows the force of the symbol of a lion with eagle's wings. Speaking to Israel, he tells them of a work so wonderful that they will not believe it when told. "Lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that *bitter* and *hasty* nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land, to possess the dwelling places that are not theirs. They are terrible and dreadful...Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves...They shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat. They shall come all for violence;...they shall gather the captivity as the sand. And they shall scoff at the kings, and the princes shall be a scorn unto them; they shall deride every stronghold."

This is Babylon as Habakkuk saw it. While Daniel watched the same kingdom in his vision the noble lion with its wings, denoting power and rapidity of conquest, had been lifted up from the earth into an unnatural position and made to stand upon its feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. Man's heart without Christ is simply sin. The wings were shorn, and then Babylon was represented as it existed at the time of the vision, bereft of its strength, abandoned by God, with Belshazzar standing at the head of the government.

59

The prophet Habakkuk gives the reason for this sudden weakening of the mighty power of Babylon. He says, "Then shall his mind change, and he shall pass over, and offend, *imputing this his power unto his god.*" The

history of the kingdom as given in previous chapters shows how and when this was done. Babylon committed the unpardonable sin, imputing the power and Spirit of God to the gods of the heathen, and by this act the lion was shorn of its strength, the wings were plucked, and a man's heart was given to it. Two years after the vision, in the year 538 B. C., Daniel was a witness to the complete overthrow of the kingdom.

The Medo-Persian kingdom was bloodthirsty and cruel in its nature, and is represented by a bear. Darius was a Mede; and Cyrus, the leading general, a Persian. Darius the Mede took the Babylonian kingdom, and ruled for a short time. Cyrus the Persian was the leading spirit in the government after Darius had passed away. The bear, as well as the other beasts which followed the lion, represented kingdoms yet in the future at the time Daniel saw the vision. The bear of Daniel seven symbolizes the same power as the ram of chapter eight, which the angel there tells the prophet represents the Medo-Persian empire. The history of this empire given in the eleventh chapter of the book of Daniel, and the study of that chapter together with the thirteenth and twenty-first chapters of Isaiah, will reveal the bear-like character of the nation which arose and devoured much flesh. The history of the second great kingdom covers the years from 538 to 331 B.C.

After the Medo-Persian kingdom arose and fell, there came forth another entirely different from that represented by the nature of a bear. The Grecian kingdom, which followed the Medo-Persian, is compared to the sprightliness of a leopard in its natural state. This not being sufficient to represent the rapidity of the conquest of Alexander, the first king, the leopard had on its back four wings of a fowl. It also had four heads, which symbolized the division of Alexander's empire after his death, when his four generals took his kingdom and dominion was given to them. This power is represented by the goat with the notable horn, which stamped all beneath its feet, as described in the eighth chapter of Daniel.

The history of the first three kingdoms is but lightly touched upon in this chapter, but when the fourth beast, "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly," appeared, Daniel "would know the truth," and the angel explained that power minutely.

The three preceding powers were symbolized by three of the mightiest beasts of the earth, but when the fourth beast was considered, there was no

60
animal with a character to represent its terrible nature; so a beast without name, having iron teeth, brass nails, and ten horns, was presented to the prophet.

The angel had said to Daniel, "As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged." Each one, before being destroyed, was merged into the succeeding one. The same truth was represented in chapter four when the tree representing Babylon was cut down, but the roots remained in the ground. The roots represented the foundation principles upon which Babylon was built, and they have remained in the earth ever since. When Medo-Persia fell, she left her principles of government, education, and religion still alive, transmitting

them to her posterity, the nations of earth. Greece did likewise, and with each succeeding empire, those foundation principles which were so clearly portrayed in Babylon, which were placed there by the prince of the power of the air, instead of appearing in a weakened state, sprung into life with renewed vigor. So it was that when the fourth kingdom appeared, those principles of government which were the counterfeit of heaven's underlying principles were so strong that no natural beast could symbolize even pagan Rome.

Rome in religion renewed all the religious errors of Babylon, and in education she followed in the footsteps of her great mother. But as the prophet watched, things still more wonderful appeared. The fourth beast, Rome, which succeeded Greece in 161 B.C., had ten horns, which, said the angel, "are ten kings that shall arise." This fourth beast is identical with the legs of iron in the image shown to Nebuchadnezzar, and the ten horns correspond to the mixture of iron and clay in the feet of that image. Each of the preceding kingdoms had fallen into the hands of some strong general who took the rule, but with Rome the case was different. The details of this history are given in the eighth chapter of Revelation under the symbol of the seven trumpets. Barbarian hordes from the north of Europe and Asia swept over the Roman empire between the years 351 and 483 A. D., crushing the government into ten parts.

There was a time when the Roman empire had a most wonderful opportunity to accept the true God. Rome was the universal kingdom during the life of Christ. To Babylon God sent his people, the Jews, to scatter the truths of his kingdom and lead men to repentance. The Medes and the Persians received the gospel from this same people, and representatives from Greece came to Jerusalem, into the very temple, in touch with the

61
priests, in order that there might be no excuse for their refusing Christ. But to the Roman kingdom, heaven itself was poured out in the person of the Saviour, and it was Rome that nailed him to the cross. It was a Roman seal on his tomb, and a Roman guard at his grave. The early church suffered persecution at the hands of this same power. Judgment came to Rome when these barbarians overran the empire with fire and sword, and the kingdom was divided into ten parts.

But Roman history did not end with the division. Daniel watched, "And, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before which there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." A new power, a power outside the empire is here represented by the little horn. The three divisions which were plucked up were the Heruli in 493, the Vandals in 534, and the Ostrogoths in 538 A.D. Justinian, the emperor, whose seat was at Constantinople, working through the general Belisarius, was the power which overthrew the three kingdoms represented by the three horns, and the reason for their overthrow was their adherence to Arianism in opposition to the orthodox Catholic faith. The details of the overthrow, and the religious controversy which was the root of the trouble, are fully given by Gibbon in the "*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*," by Mosheim in his church

history, and by others.

The little horn which was in power on the plucking up of the three, was diverse from all the others. It had eyes "like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things;" his look also was more stout than his fellows.

Rome was dropping into ruin; her cities had been sacked, her government broken. As from the decaying log of the marsh the mushroom springs up in a night, gaining its life from the decay, so there arose in the Roman Empire a power which was nourished by this national decay. This power was the little horn known as the papacy.

It is written that Babylon, the mother of harlots, fell because of imputing her power unto the gods of the heathen. Pagan Rome fell because she presumed to hold authority over the person of Christ and his followers. Then arose the little horn, and it "*made* war with the saints and prevailed against them."

"*He* shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws."

Rome in the days of Christ was the center of the world. Paul and others preached the gospel in that city. A church was organized, and for years this church of Rome ranked with the churches of Jerusalem, Constantinople, and others. Gradually but surely, worldliness took the place of the spirit of

62

Christ, and Roman bishops became exalted. The mystery of iniquity of which Paul wrote in his letter to the Thessalonians, was at work in Rome. At the time of the division of the empire the bishops were greedy for civil power, and in the time of national distress the church grasped the reins of government; the little horn had received power. This was A. D. 538, when the last of the three horns was plucked up and the decree Justinian made in 533 went into effect. (See Gibbon, chapter 41.) Paganism on the throne had been cruel enough, but when those pagan principles which had lived since the days of Babylon took the name and outward form of Christianity, the power which bore sway was still more cruel. Not only would the little horn speak stout words against the Most High, but it would "*presume* to change the appointed times and the law." (Spurrell's trans.)

Unholy hands had been laid in years past upon the temple of God and the consecrated vessels in the temple, and upon God's people, but the little horn laid hands upon the very law of God, attempting to change the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. The little horn had all the power of Babylon. In government it was an absolute monarchy, holding authority over all the thrones of Europe. Kings rose and fell at the dictates of Rome. From a religious standpoint, it was the ruling power dictating to the consciences of men, bringing them before her tribunal and peering into their very thoughts. The rack and the inquisition were her instruments, and no man escaped the scrutiny of the man's eye in the little horn. The means by which this power was maintained was its system of education, which kept Europe in darkness for over one thousand years.

This was a long-lived kingdom. "They [the saints, the times, and the laws] would be given into his hands for a *time and times* and the dividing of times." The reader is referred to chapter 11:13, margin; to the seventh verse

of chapter 12, and to Rev. 12:6; 13:5, and Num. 14:34 for different expressions giving the same time and referring to the same power. This time, three and one half years, or forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty years, as it is variously designated, began in 538, when three horns were plucked up to make way for the establishment of this one power, the little horn. It continued until 1798, when his dominion was taken away. His power, however, is not yet destroyed.

Daniel in his vision was shown not only earthly kingdoms and powers, but after listening to the voice of the little horn, which spake great words against the Most High, his attention was called to scenes in the heavenly

63

court which would transpire simultaneously with the fulfillment of the prophecy concerning the nations of the earth.

It was during the time when the fourth beast had dominion and power that the Saviour was crucified. He was the Lamb slain in the outer court, and on his ascension he entered the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There he was seen by John as described in the fourth and fifth chapters of Revelation. But this work in the holy place was only a part of the Saviour's ministry for mankind. The time came when he must perform in heaven that service of which the day of atonement in the earthly sanctuary was the type. Spurrell renders the ninth verse: "I beheld till the thrones were *pitched* [Revised Version, *placed*], when the Ancient of Days was enthroned [or did sit] in judgment. His raiment was white as snow, the hair of his head like pure wool, his throne was flames of fire, his rolling wheels the ardent flame." Here within the holy of holies is the abiding place of the King of kings, God the Father, where thousands and tens of thousands of angels minister before him. This, the throne of God, is the center of all creation; about it revolve the solar systems throughout the whole extent of space. Worlds circle about their suns, and suns with their attendant planets in turn circle about the throne of God. It is the wheel within a wheel which Ezekiel describes. Daniel said, "A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him," for there all is life, a living, constantly moving throne.

God's power pervades space in every direction. Like beams of light, there radiates from him a force which holds worlds in their orbits. The power man calls gravity is but a portion of the drawing power of God. It holds the orbs of heaven in their places, it balances the clouds, weighs the mountain, and measures the waters of the sea. The same power notes the fall of every leaf on earth, the death of the tiniest sparrow, and the pulse beats of every man. From him comes all life: "In him we live and move and have our being."

We are a part of that great center of light that is our God of love, and it is that power which the prophet vainly tried to express in human language that converts the soul. The Son was one with the Father, and it was from this glory that he stepped when he offered himself at the foundation of the world. He was the Lamb slain, and the heart of God was broken in that offering. Every time the knife was plunged into a victim at the altar of the earthly sanctuary, the flowing blood touched afresh the heart of the eternal Father.

Every time a broken-hearted man or woman approaches the throne in penitence, the wound in our Father's heart bursts open and bleeds again.

64

"The broken and the contrite heart thou wilt not despise, O God." Never, never, through all eternity, will that Son resume his former condition. What he assumed for fallen man he will retain forever. He is a man still in the heavenly court, touched by every human woe. The universe beheld the gift, and bowed in adoration. The temple is filled with the glory. There seraphim and cherubim with their shining glory, as guardians, stretch their wings above his throne, veil their faces in adoration, and bow before him.

"Oh, instruct us what we shall say of Him; we can not do justice because of our ignorance. ...If a man venture to speak, surely he shall be overwhelmed. "We can not even now gaze upon the light of the sun when it shineth forth in the heavens; and the wind passing along hath cleared the sky. But what splendor from the holy of holies shall appear! With God is insufferable majesty! The Almighty! we can not comprehend him!"

—*Spurrell's Translation.*

The door into the holy of holies was opened in 1844, and "Behold one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him."

No words could be framed which give a more vivid view of the opening of the judgment which occurred at the time of the announcement, "The hour of his judgment is come." In Daniel seven is the only description found in the Bible of the judgment scene announced by the first angel of Revelation fourteen. The message itself is the only announcement in the Bible that the time had arrived; and the fourteenth verse of the eighth chapter of Daniel is the only prophetic period given in the Bible which marks the time of the beginning of God's judgment. That period is the twenty-three hundred days or literal years which began in the year 457 B.C., with the decree to build and restore Jerusalem, and expired in 1844, A.D. It was at this latter date that the first angel of Revelation fourteen proclaimed the hour of God's judgment. The message went to all lands, and the island of the sea heard it. When God had taken his position over his law in the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary, then Christ came in to plead before him for his people. This coming could not be when he ascended up on high; for then he ascended to the Father, and the judgment was in the future. It can not refer to his second coming to this earth; for then he comes *from* the Father: It was his coming before the Father when he took his position in the judgment at the end of the twenty-three hundred days. He came before the Father

65

surrounded by the clouds of heaven; that is, with thousands of angels who, as ministering spirits, have watched the lives of men, recording their every word and deed and thought. Characters have been formed, and whether they are good or ill, they have been mirrored in the books of heaven. When Christ came before the Father, the books were opened and the cases of the dead were investigated. The deeds may have been committed in the light of day, or in the darkness of night, yet they are all open and manifest before

him with whom we have to do. Heavenly intelligences have witnessed each sin, and have faithfully recorded the same. Sin may be concealed from friends, relatives, and our most intimate associates. None but the guilty actors may have the least knowledge of wrong deeds, but these things are all laid bare before the angels and the inhabitants of other worlds. The darkest of all dark nights, the deepest-laid plot of individuals or nations, can not hide even one thought from the knowledge of the heavenly intelligences. God has a faithful record of every crooked dealing, of every sin and unjust practice. If the inward heart is full of hypocrisy, an outward appearance of uprightness can not deceive him.

As one by one these names are read, the Saviour holds up his hands, still bearing the imprints of the nails of Calvary, and he cries, "My blood, Father, my blood, my blood." Above his throne is the rainbow; mercy and justice mingle there. God's heart is touched by the pleadings of his Son, and pardon is written opposite the name. Then through the arches of heaven, a shout of triumph resounds. The angels cast their crowns before the throne, crying, "Holy, holy, holy." For nearly sixty years the work of the investigative judgment has been in progress. It is fast drawing to a close. Before it closes, it will settle the case of every living man and woman. Day by day we are making the record which will determine our future for weal or woe. How solemn the thought that words once uttered, actions once performed, can never be changed. The atoning blood of Christ is offered today. "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts."

The life of the fourth beast, especially of the little horn, is prolonged beyond the time of the investigative judgment. Even after the thrones were set and the work in the holy of holies was begun, the great words of the little horn attracted the attention of the prophet. The greatest word ever spoken against God was the decree of infallibility issued by the ecumenical council in 1870. This was an attempt to seat a man on a throne beside the Son of God. While Christ stood as a slain Lamb before the Father, pleading for the salvation of the world, poor, frail man was exalting his throne above the stars of God.

66

Babylon fell because she imputed her power unto the gods. Of the fourth beast Daniel says, "I beheld till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." Thus at the end, instead of being conquered by some other power arising on earth, this one goes into the lake of fire. The other beasts which represent kingdoms, had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a time and a season; that is, they were merged into the succeeding kingdom. But not so with the fourth kingdom; its destruction is complete.

The fifth kingdom, which is the heavenly, the kingdom of God, is not in human hands. God himself establishes it under the whole heaven, and it will exist forever and ever. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Those who are accounted worthy in the investigative judgment will come forth in the first resurrection, or will be

translated without seeing death, and will reign with Christ forever and ever. Sin, with all who have clung to it, will be forever destroyed. The pride and arrogance of Babylon of old, her iniquity of every form, which has been repeated by all the nations of earth, together with the instigator of all evil, will at last be blotted out. The end of the controversy is reached. The triumph of truth is witnessed by all created beings. The scar which sin has made is gone forever. The discord which for six thousand years has marred the universe will be forgotten. The music of the spheres will be taken up anew, and man will reign with his Creator. "Hitherto is the end of the matter." What wonder that the vision troubled Daniel, and that his countenance changed! The matchless love of Christ, who can understand?

67

CHAPTER IX

The Eighth Of Daniel

A PERIOD of two years had passed since the vision recorded in the seventh of Daniel. The prophet's mind had dwelt often upon the scenes which his eye then beheld, and the subject of the judgment had been pondered again and again. He kept the matter in his heart, he himself says, for in the days of Daniel, as at the present time, only the few could comprehend and appreciate spiritual topics. Many changes of a material nature had taken place during those two years. Wickedness increased in the kingdom of Babylon, and no reverence whatever was shown for God or his people. This condition saddened the heart of Daniel. He who for years had been chief counselor in the empire, now no longer dwelt in the capital, but had his residence in the palace at Shushan. Shushan was the capital of Elam, which was formerly a subject province of the kingdom of Babylon, but as that empire began to weaken, and the strength of Cyrus, the Persian general, was recognized, Elam, under Abradates, the viceroy or prince, had revolted from Babylon, and joined the forces of the Persians. Years before this, the prophet Isaiah had said that Elam and Media would join forces in the conquest of Babylon. As Daniel lived in the palace of Shushan, he saw the way opening for the fulfillment of this prophecy. If Babylon was not already undergoing a siege at the hands of Cyrus and Darius, her downfall was so imminent that in this vision the history of nations begins with the rising kingdom of the Medes and Persians.

Daniel was transported to the river Ulai, by the side of which stood a ram having two horns, one higher than the other, and the higher came up last. In his previous vision the second kingdom had been represented by a bear which raised itself on one side and had three ribs in its mouth. Both symbols apply to the double nature of the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, but the uneven horns of the ram give a more specific description; for while the Median kingdom was the older of the two, the Persian excelled it in strength, and its position in history must be attributed to the line of Persian kings which began with Cyrus the Great. The definiteness with which this symbol is interpreted is an illustration of the fact that the Scriptures are their own best commentaries. Said the angel, "*The ram which thou sawest having*

two horns are the kings of Media and Persia."

68

As the ram pushed westward, northward, and southward, and no beast could stand before it, so the Medo-Persian empire extended its dominion in these directions. At the fall of Babylon one hundred and twenty provinces recognized the authority of Cyrus and Darius. These were held in subjection, and others added, so that in the time of Ahasuerus of Esther, the kingdom controlled one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, and extended from India on the east to the Mediterranean on the west, and from the Caspian Sea to Ethiopia. It was then called a glorious kingdom, and the monarch was spoken of as "*his* excellent majesty." The same facts are made prominent in the eleventh chapter of Daniel, where Xerxes, the fourth from Cyrus, stirs up all the Eastern nations to war with Greece: "He did according to his will, and became great."

Nevertheless, the greatness of the second kingdom did not insure length of life, and the prophet was shown a he goat coming from the west, and, as Spurrell's translation gives it, "rushing over the face of the whole earth, without touching the ground." The goat had a notable horn between his eyes. In the interpretation the angel said, "The rough goat is the king [or kingdom] of Grecia, and the great horn...is the first king." The kingdom of Greece was described in the previous vision (chap. 7, vs. 6), but at the time now under consideration, the details of its rise are given. The eleventh chapter states that the fourth kingdom after Cyrus should stir up the nations against Greece. This was done when Xerxes crossed the Hellespont with a large army in 480 B.C. His army is said by Herodotus to have numbered over a million and a half. It was a gathering of nations, and so vast was the army that seven days were required to pass from Asia to the Greek soil. But in spite of all preparations, the Persian army was defeated at Thermopylae, at Salamis, and at Plateae, and Xerxes, discouraged and disheartened, gave over the attempt to invade Greece. Prophecy had foretold that when Medo-Persia and Greece should contend, Greece would be the aggressive power. Later, the he goat, Greece, came toward the ram, Medo-Persia, "and rushed upon him in the heat of his strength. And I saw him coming up close to the ram, and he was exceedingly embittered against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns, so that there was no strength in the ram to stand before him, for he threw him down to the ground, and trampled on him; neither could any one deliver the ram from his grasp."—*Spurrell*.

No historian has ever given a more graphic account of the contest between the Greeks under Alexander the Great and the Persians under Darius. That kingdom which before had shown such wonderful strength, crumbled and

69

fell, and there was none to help. She had passed her probation and filled the cup of her iniquity. Michael, the Lord of heaven, had stood at the right hand of the Persian monarch on the throne to persuade him, and yet he had resisted the divine influence, and that kingdom which had been a rod in the hand of God to overthrow Babylon in its wickedness, repeated her sins, and in turn met the same fate. Although the Persians restored the Jews to

Jerusalem, that could not save them. It is only as nations or individuals continue in a love of the truth, only as they partake constantly of the leaves of the tree of life, that their existence is prolonged.

The ram and the goat met on a river. The first successful battle fought by the Grecians against the Medes was on the banks of the Granicus, a stream of Asia Minor. This was in the year 334 B.C. Already the victory of Greece was recorded in the books of heaven. The battle at Granicus was soon followed by the defeat of the Medo-Persian force at the pass of Issus, and the third and overwhelming defeat was on the plains of Arbela. None could deliver the sinking cause of the Medo-Persian empire from the hands of the victorious Alexander.

Alexander stands without a rival for the rapidity of his conquests. He was but a young man of twenty when, by the death of his father, Philip of Macedon, he fell heir to a small dominion. He united the Greek states, placed himself at the head of affairs, and led her armies in a series of wonderful victories. In the space of a few short years he was the recognized master of the world. He who rose to the highest position the world could offer, fell equally as suddenly. He had conquered kingdoms, but was not master of his own passions. His love of praise led him to have himself proclaimed Son of Jupiter Ammon in Egypt, and his love of drink caused his death at the age of thirty-two years, after a universal reign of only two years. Such was the fate of one who feared neither God nor man. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men."

"Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south, but God is judge. He putteth down one and setteth up another."

"By strength shall no man prevail." There is no restraint of the Lord to save by many or by few.

"There is no king saved by the multitude of an host: a mighty man is not delivered by much strength. An horse is a vain thing for safety: neither shall he deliver any by his great strength. Behold the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him, upon them that hope in his mercy; to deliver their souls from death, and to keep them alive in famine."

70

Truly the Lord "increaseth the nations, and destroyeth them; he enlargeth the nations, and straighteneth them again. He taketh away the heart of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way. They grope in the dark without light, and he maketh them to stagger like a drunken man." "When he was strong, the great horn was broken, and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven." Alexander left no heir capable of ruling the kingdom, and in less than twenty years of strife, his four leading generals succeeded in dividing the empire among themselves.

Ptolemy had Egypt to the south; Seleucus took Syria and the eastern division; Lysimachus had Asia Minor and territory to the north; while Cassander had Greece or the western division. These four had not the power of Alexander. The history of these four divisions is given in the eleventh chapter of Daniel.

In the division under consideration, the prophet sees a little horn coming forth from one of these divisions. Here is brought to his view the power symbolized by the fourth beast of Daniel seven. In his first vision the fourth beast was so terrible and had such a strange appearance that Daniel asked for a clearer explanation of its work. In this second vision the little horn is not named, but its work as a kingdom is still further portrayed. One feels when reading both the vision and the interpretation that he is coming into the presence of a power greater and more terrible than any which had hitherto existed. The accumulated forces of the evil of past ages is concentrated in this rising power, which waxed exceeding great. It is in truth the masterpiece from Satan's workshop. Four thousand years of trial had not passed in vain. As heaven was about to be emptied in the gift of the Saviour, so all the fiendishness of the lower world was brought into play to counteract the love of God and destroy the effect of the sacrifice. There is a world of meaning in the words of the angel.

Said Gabriel, "*His* power shall be mighty, but not by his own power." No merely human power could do what this kingdom would do. As light and love and power come from above to those whose eyes are directed heavenward, so a power from beneath takes possession of individuals and nations which resist the love of God. This kingdom waxed "exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Rome extended her territory around the Mediterranean; there was no place where her arms were not victorious. Some of the greatest battles which history records were fought by the Roman armies. The pen of inspiration says, "*He*
71

[the little horn] shall destroy *wonderfully*." Cities which dared resist the power of Rome were blotted out of existence. In describing the government, the angel said, "He shall prosper and practice," and "through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." But aside from the strong central government which was built up by Rome, which brought every other nation to her feet, and made slaves of the noblest of races; which was robbing men of God-given rights, and violating every principle of equity and justice—aside from all this, the great arrogance of Rome was displayed when the nation magnified itself against the host (church) of heaven, "*Yea*, he magnified himself even against [mar.] the prince of the host." "*He* shall also stand up against the Prince of princes."

God's people are precious in his sight, and he who touches them touches the apple of his eye. Rome first deprived the Jews of the right to worship, grinding that nation beneath the heel of oppression. Then Christ came, when the oppression was the most severe, that Rome might see God in human flesh. He came to identify himself with that downtrodden people, and to show to men that God is always with the oppressed and enslaved. He came to illustrate the workings of the Spirit in the human heart, and to prove that it is possible to have a heaven within, although outward circumstances are to the contrary.

But Rome crucified him whom Heaven sent. The dragon was wroth, and made war with the seed of the woman—Christ—who had been promised when

sin entered the world. This was paganism in its greatest strength. It was in its dying throes, and with the agony of death it smote the truth.

What Satan could not accomplish through open opposition, he sought to accomplish by policy and strategy. Silently, stealthily, the principles of evil crept into the church of Christ, which had grown up in spite of the pagan opposition. The humility of the Son of God at first characterized the body of Christians, and therein lay the power of the early church. Christian mothers gathered their children about them as the Jewish mothers had done in the days of their prosperity. From infancy the truths of God's word were implanted in their hearts; sacred songs were on their lips; the Word of God was the text-book from which all lessons were learned. Parents dared not allow their children to remain in the pagan schools, for the very atmosphere breathed of the heathen worship; the air was heavy with the odor of sacrifice to idols. They dared not sit at the table with those with whom they had once been familiar, for the food had been consecrated to idols. In the

72

most careful way the rising generation was educated, and Christianity took the place of paganism.

But Satan could not see his power overthrown without making a desperate struggle, and by stealth he insinuated his principles into the new church. Wrangling, disputes, theological controversies drove out the spirit of life. Self-exaltation put men in power; the equal rights of all fell before the rising power of a hierarchy. The principles of trusts and monopolies, of unions and leagues, which had always characterized pagan society, twined its tendrils about the new organization of Christians, and choked its life. Paganism—the *"daily"* of Dan. 8:12—was taken away, it is true. Rome became nominally a Christian empire. Her emperor professed the name of Christ, and carried before his army the banner of the cross. Decrees were issued causing men to worship according to the dictates of Rome. Then it was that man—the emperor—and the empire attempted to exalt themselves above the God of heaven. The principles of Lucifer himself had crowded out the truth of Christ, and, as was shown to Daniel, the truth was cast down to the ground.

To John this transfer from paganism to the papacy is represented as a transfer of power from the dragon to the beast. Rev. 13:7. The eleventh and twelfth verses of Daniel eight are parallel with the twenty-first and twentyfifth verses of the seventh chapter, where the little horn makes war with the saints, and speaks great words against the Most High, attempting even to change his times and laws. Twice Daniel had been shown the twofold history of Rome: first as a pagan power, when it was more cruel than any pagan government before it; and later as a professedly Christian power, when its cruelty far surpassed all the workings of paganism.

The prophet was heart-sick as he beheld these scenes and the deep sufferings of the people of God. He was unable to grasp the idea of the time of the fulfillment of the events, and thought that his own people, perhaps the very ones who were at that time in bondage to Babylon, would be called to suffer these things. The investigative judgment had been revealed to him,

when the cases of men would be tried and the oppressor would be condemned. The end also of this oppressive power he had been shown was the lake of fire, when Roman authority should be broken without hands. In Nebuchadnezzar's dream the end would come when the stone cut out without hands should smite the image and finally fill the whole earth. As these scenes passed like a panorama before the eye of the prophet, angels also watched, for their interests are one with man's.

73

The universe has waited now six thousand years for the final issue between truth and error. No wonder angelic hosts wonder when the struggle will end, and when the song of songs can be taken up by the choir of heaven. These times are hidden with the Father, but man may understand some of the secrets of the Almighty. The interest heaven manifests at these scenes of earth is shown by the thirteenth verse. One angel called to Gabriel, asking, "*How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice [pagan Rome] and the transgression of desolation [the papacy] to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?*" And Gabriel answered, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Daniel longed for an understanding of what he had seen, and the close connection between human longing and Christ's heart is shown here; for Christ, appearing as a man, stood before the prophet, and to Gabriel he said, "Make this man to understand the vision." Gabriel drew near, and before his exceeding brightness Daniel fell upon the ground with his face to the earth. Then as if to lift the strain from the mind of him who carried Israel on his heart, he said, "*Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision...I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed shall the end be.*"

Gabriel took up the history of the kingdoms one by one, and when he came to the two thousand three hundred days, he said, "*The vision of the morning and the evening [see margin, vs. 14, same as the two thousand three hundred days] which was told is true. Wherefore, shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.*" Daniel fainted, for the crucifixion of the Saviour had just been revealed to him, and the view was more than he could endure. Further explanation was delayed until a later vision. The events which would take place during that period are noted in the following chapter of the book of Daniel.

In addition to the truth taught by the prophecy itself there are connected with the eighth chapter of Daniel some underlying principles of wonderful beauty.

The spirit of prophecy is a gift to be coveted. God never leaves himself without some representation on earth, and among his people certain ones are prophets. The study of Daniel's life reveals the character which makes it possible for man to understand the language of God. A clean, pure soul is necessary. Gabriel is the angel of prophecy, the messenger who bears the light of truth to men. To the father of John the Baptist he said, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God." To Daniel he said, "*There is*

74

none that holdeth with me in these things but Michael, your prince," Christ himself. Gabriel is then the personal attendant of the Son of God, holding the position as light bearer which Satan occupied before his fall. It was Gabriel who announced the birth of the Saviour to Mary in Nazareth. It was he who led the angel choir on the plains of Bethlehem; he with others, as the star, guided the wise men to the Babe of Bethlehem.

It was Gabriel who brought strength to the Saviour at the close of the forty days' conflict in the wilderness of temptation, and he who lifted the prostrate form of the Son of Man in Gethsemane and pillowed that aching head, wet with bloody sweat, upon his own bosom. Before Gabriel, the Roman guard fell like dead men, and his voice shook the earth as the Saviour came from the tomb. Taking his seat on the empty sepulcher, it was he who met the disciples and the women, and bade them seek their Lord among the living.

The Saviour ascended to heaven leaving his disciples alone, but not alone, for "Behold two men stood by them in white apparel." While heaven rang with songs of welcome to the returning Son of God, two angels stood on earth to comfort the lonely ones. One of these was Gabriel, Christ's attendant angel. Of all the angels of heaven none have been more closely connected with man than has Gabriel. Yet to John, who fell before him to worship, he said, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant." So bound up in the affairs of man is this mighty angel that he counts himself one with us. This is the one whom Christ has used to convey the light of future events to men upon earth. To every prophet, from Moses to John, the same angel came, and to the remnant church, Gabriel reveals truth through the person of the prophet.

Before his fall, Lucifer was the light bearer. Since that time he has used his power in bearing darkness to the sons of men. There always have been and will be to the end of time, false prophets and seers. Men who might be used by God, were their hearts given to him, often yield themselves to the influence of the counterfeit power. Herein lies the explanation of spirit manifestations. So great will be this power that before the end Satan himself, personifying an angel of light, will appear on the earth, deceiving, if possible, the very elect. The safety of God's people will lie in heeding the voice of Gabriel as he speaks through some chosen instrument. Christ speaks through Gabriel to his prophet.

Daniel, though living in the palace of Shushan, was carried by the angel to the river Ulai. On the banks of the river he witnessed the contest between

75

the ram and the goat; between the Medo-Persian empire and the Greeks. Ulai represents the river of time, which has its source in eternity. Time with which we have to deal is but an infinitely small fraction of eternity, as a drop in the bucket; as the stream to the ocean. But on the banks of this river all nations are located; there they rise and there they fall. Christ presides over the waters, and his voice was heard from between the banks of the river calling to Gabriel, "Make this man to understand the vision." Nation may contend with nation on its banks, but the "Holy Watcher" is ever near.

This river contains the water of life for all who will drink, but all nations have built river walls exceeding the height of those of Babylon, to keep men away from the waters and to break the influence of Him who calls from between the banks.

76

CHAPTER X

The History Of The Jews (Chapter 9)

A FEW months only expired between the vision of chapter eight and the events which the first part of chapter nine records. The parting words of Gabriel had been that the things seen concerning the two thousand and three hundred days were true. Daniel was unable to hear the explanation of this time, and while he went about the king's business he thought often upon the vision. In the meantime he had been called from Shushan into Babylon and into the king's court to interpret the strange writing on the wall. The fate of the nation had been read, and the words had scarcely died away. before the slaughter of the Babylonians began. That same night Belshazzar was slain, and the king of the Medes was proclaimed monarch of the world. By Darius, Daniel had been made chief president, and occupied a position in Babylon next to Cyrus, the associate of Darius.

During the turmoil and bustle of all the change in affairs, while Daniel's hands were filled with court duties and business cares pressed him, he yet had time for prayer and study.

Prophecy had foretold that Cyrus would restore to the Jews their freedom; the time of their deliverance drew near, and Daniel searched carefully for an understanding of the time. The prophecies of Jeremiah were the only ones which told plainly the length of the captivity. Doubtless the mind of Daniel was perplexed over the two thousand three hundred days, of which Gabriel had spoken, for to the Hebrews the temple in Jerusalem was God's sanctuary, and the cleansing, to them meant the removal of unholy bands from Mount Zion.

Twice in the book of Jeremiah the length of the captivity is stated. *"These nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished that I will punish the king of Babylon."* Again the prophet had said, *"After seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good work toward you, in causing you to return to this place."* Babylon had fallen, and Jerusalem had been desolate nearly seventy years. A crisis was near for God's people, and Daniel sought by prayer and fasting to understand the matter.

This is one of the instances in the Scriptures when a prayer is recorded. This one is given as an example of the fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous

77

man which availeth much. Daniel realized that sin had darkened the vision of many of God's professed people. Some who were in Babylon were careless and indifferent concerning the truth of God. Many had gotten them homes, and rested secure in the assurance that, when the captivity began, they were told to buy land and build homes. Some were content with

present surroundings, and dreaded the difficulties which must attend the journey to Jerusalem, which was in the hands of hostile tribes, and where there were no pleasant homes. Jerusalem should be built, they argued, but others should do it, not they.

A love of Babylon was strong in the hearts of many, for seventy years after the decree of Cyrus, when all were at liberty to return to Palestine, there were still hundreds of Jews in Babylon. In fact, but a small per cent of the Jews ever returned. The young, who had been educated in the city, had, many of them, like the daughters of Lot in Sodom, partaken so largely of the customs that they lingered among the heathen, though angels bade them hurry out. The spirit of prophecy was passed by with a few remarks, or fell upon ears entirely deaf; although in bondage, present conditions were preferable to freedom with the effort necessary to obtain it. Daniel knew of this condition, and he confessed the sins of the people before God. He identified himself with his people. His is one of the most wonderful prayers on record.

This man, whom heaven called "greatly beloved," in whom no fault could be found, even by his bitterest enemies, placed himself beneath the load of sin which was oppressing Israel. Bowed before God, he met the Father with the words, "*We have sinned and committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled; neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets.*" "*O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned;...we have rebelled against him; neither have we obeyed;...the curse is poured upon us;*" "*all this evil is come upon us, yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities; we obeyed not his voice; we have sinned, we have done wickedly;*" "*because for our sins and for the iniquities of our fathers, behold our desolations;*" "*we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses.*"

Before the Father we have one, even Christ, who "*hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,*" "*who his own self bare our sins in his own body.*"

Daniel was a representative of Christ, and he had lived so close to God, and
78

knew him so intimately, that the spirit which distinguished Christ from all others was manifest in Daniel also. He was a true shepherd in Israel, and his prayer is a rebuke to all selfrighteousness; a cutting rebuke to those who say by word or act, "I am more holy than thou."

"O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not for thine own sake, Only God, for thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

Such was the entreaty of a burdened heart. Such were the words with which Daniel approached his God. He was acquainted with the Father, and knew that his words reached the throne of heaven. Faith and prayer are the two arms which mortal man may entwine around the neck of infinite Love.

Christ stooped to listen, and bade Gabriel speed earthward. We let go of the arm of the Lord too soon in our prayers. We should press our petitions higher and still higher. God sometimes tests the strength of our desires by

delaying an immediate answer.

"Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation."

The very thing for which Daniel had asked, was first mentioned as Gabriel laid his hands upon the prophet. "O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the word (margin) came forth, and I am come to show thee." Heaven was more interested than man could be in the very thing for which Daniel prayed, and as soon as the channel was open, the Spirit flowed in. In the spiritual as in the natural world a vacuum is abhorred. As the air rushes into a vessel when a liquid is poured out, so the Holy Spirit fills the heart when it is emptied of self. If there were but more room made for Christ in hearts, the pentecostal experience would often be repeated.

God has many favorites among the sons of men. Indeed, every man is a special favorite, and highly honored by the King of heaven, but there are very few to whom angels have spoken the word, "*Thou* are greatly beloved." The marginal reading of the twenty-third verse gives the Hebrew rendering as "*a* man of desires." That man whose desire is heavenward, who longs for spiritual food as the heart panteth after the water brook, is greatly beloved of God, for God is in search of such to fulfill his will on earth. To such Gabriel can speak.

Beginning with the twenty-fourth verse the angel explains the period of time, the two thousand three hundred days of chapter 8:14. There are no preliminaries. Gabriel knows the thoughts of the prophet, and hence he

79

says, "Seventy weeks are determined upon [or allotted to] thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy." The entire future history of the Jews as a nation is contained in this one verse. No other history ever crowded so much into so few-words. Here is given the exact date for the beginning of the work of Christ; the time allotted Israel as a nation for repentance, the time when type would meet antitype in all sacrificial offerings; the period when probation would end for the Hebrew race, and everlasting righteousness would be preached to the world at large. In this interview with Gabriel only that part of the two thousand three hundred days which applied to the Hebrew nation was given. To Daniel had already been revealed the history of the nations of the world; the two thousand three hundred days has to do more especially with God's people, independent of national governments.

The period of seventy weeks [$70 \times 7 = 490$] or four hundred and ninety days of prophetic time, covers a period of four hundred and ninety years, during which Jewish history as such would continue. This four hundred and ninety years did not begin at once, for the angel said they should begin to reckon from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. The period of seventy weeks of Jewish history is thus divided by

the angel: Seven weeks for building the walls and streets of Jerusalem; threescore and two (62) weeks till the work of Messiah; and one week, which would cover the period of his ministry, and the time following, until the gospel should go forth to the Gentiles. This last week is devoted to the confirmation of the covenant.

For an understanding of the first division, the seven weeks or forty-nine years, we have the history as recorded in Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah. God raised up Cyrus and placed him on the throne, that he might restore the Jews to their native city. Long before the Babylonish captivity began, the prophet Isaiah (44:28) wrote of Cyrus, "*He* is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."

In the first chapter of the book of Ezra is recorded the decree of Cyrus. The fulfillment by Cyrus of the prophecy of Isaiah is striking:

In the first year of Cyrus king of Persia ...the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, the king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his

80
kingdom, and put it in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven...hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem." Then it was that every Jew in Babylon was at liberty to return to Palestine. If necessary, the expense of going would be borne by the government of Cyrus. There was ample provision for all the poor and the sick. Such a decree had never before been issued. Israel should have arisen en *masse*, taking with them all those of other nationalities, who, having heard the gospel, were willing to cast their lot with the people of God. The land should have rung with shouts of praise and with the songs of the ransomed. The exodus from Babylon should have been a mighty witness to the nations of the earth of the power of the God of the Jews. The exodus from Egypt, and the wonders attending the crossing of the Red Sea and the Jordan, and the feeding of the thousands in the wilderness, would have dwindled into insignificance had Israel taken advantage of the way which God had prepared.

What was the result of the decree? Daniel watched with anxiety the preparations which were made to depart, and at the end of the first year scarcely fifty thousand had journeyed from Babylon to Jerusalem.

Cyrus was discouraged and disgusted because of the feeble response, and relapsed into indifference. Later the angel of God with Michael's help pleaded with him for *three* weeks in order to touch his heart again.

The vessels taken from the temple to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar were returned to the leaders of the Jews, who carried them back to Jerusalem. In the second year of their coming into Palestine, the work of restoring the temple was begun. The site of Solomon's temple, which had been burned by Nebuchadnezzar, was hidden by rubbish, the accumulation of nearly seventy years. The work of restoration was soon stopped by Samaritans living in the country, and further progress was impossible until the issuing of a second decree by Darius, king of Persia, in 520 B.C. Work on the house of God stopped for fifteen years. Then the prophets Haggai and Zechariah

rebuked the people for their inactivity.

It would seem that the Jews while professing to be God's people, yet built their own houses, and delayed work on the temple, because there was no direct command from the king to proceed. But God wanted them to go forward, exercising faith, and when, in response to the word of the Lord by the prophet Haggai, they did go to work, the Lord stirred up the heart of the Persian king to help them. This will be further seen in chapter twelve. Men of the world, enemies of the Jews, openly complained to the king, but this, 81

instead of hindering the work, occasioned a searching of the royal records, which revealed the decree of Cyrus. Then Darius, instead of rebuking the Jews, issued a decree that the work should go forward, and further commanded that the work of building be helped forward by money from the royal treasury.

Jerusalem was subject to the Persian government until the days of Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes. In the seventh year of the reign of that king, 457 B.C., was issued the third decree concerning the rebuilding of Jerusalem. This decree (1) permitted all Jews who so desired to return to Jerusalem; (2) it allowed the taking of a free-will offering from all Babylon for the cause at Jerusalem; (3) it proclaimed perfect freedom to follow the commands of God in all the territory west of the Jordan; (4) it relieved all Levites and ministers from paying toll or tribute; (5) the walls of Jerusalem were to be rebuilt; (6) it arranged for the appointment of magistrates and judges in Palestine from among the Jews themselves, thus organizing a government of the people, a thing wholly foreign to the policy of an Oriental monarchy. This was in the year 457 B.C., and is the time from which the period of seventy weeks should be reckoned, according to the words of Gabriel to Daniel. That it required the *three decrees* to constitute the commandment of Dan. 9:25, is evident from the words of inspiration in Ezra 6:14:

"They builded and furnished it, according to *the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes*, king of Persia." The three decrees are thus connected.

The "troublous times during which the building should be carried forward are described by the prophet Nehemiah. Between fifteen and twenty years after the decree of Artaxerxes was issued, Nehemiah, who was a cupbearer for the king in Babylon, was mourning over the troubles in Jerusalem, and in answer to his petition he was permitted to go up to the city in behalf of the work. Under the direction of Nehemiah the people worked on the walls of Jerusalem with weapons fastened to their sides. "They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon.' So we labored in the work; and half of them held the spears from the rising of the morning till the stars appeared."

Nehemiah in these times of trouble was a wonderful leader for Israel. His lessons to the people on the taking of usury, wages, and rent should be followed by Christians to-day. The rebuilding of Jerusalem in troublous times is a fit symbol of carrying the gospel to all nations in the last days.

Israel brought this trouble upon herself by her sins and lack of faith; and what she should have done by way of warning the world in peace and quietude, had to be done in great distress. Furthermore, it will be noticed that a few years of rest always found sin and iniquity abounding in Israel. The nation was scarcely from under the hands of Babylon till the people held their own brethren as slaves because of debt. A proclamation of freedom must come from within their own borders before there could be peace and help from without. When it should come from within, God's word pledged the support of even their enemies. These principles are true in the body of Christians to-day. The spread of the gospel will be an easy work, and it will be as the voice of a mighty angel enlightening the world, when God's people proclaim liberty among themselves.

"From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks" ($7 + 62 = 69$ weeks, or 483 prophetic days, or literal years). Messiah, in the Hebrew, and Christ, in the Greek, are the same as "anointed" in English. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost. This anointing took place at the time of his baptism. The sixty-nine weeks, or four hundred and eighty-three years, reached to the baptism of Christ by John in the River Jordan.

From the decree of Artaxerxes, four hundred and fifty-seven years reach into the year 1 A.D., in the present dispensation. But twenty-six years remained of the sixty nine weeks ($483 - 457 = 26$), which terminated with the baptism of Christ. Twenty-six years added to the year 1 A.D. bring us to 27 A.D., in the fall of which year Christ was baptised. See Mark 1:10, margin; Luke 3:21, margin.

For years the Jewish nation had had the promise of a deliverer. The close of sixty-nine weeks found the Jews under the control of the fourth kingdom, the dreadful and terrible beast which Daniel has before described. The desire of every Jewish woman who was true to her God was to be the mother of the Saviour. At the family gatherings this was often talked; whenever a babe was presented to the Lord, it was with the hope that he might be the accepted One. The place of the birth of the Messiah had been foretold. Malachi had prophesied concerning John, is established by six historical facts. Israel and Judah flocked to the banks of Jordan, and among them came Jesus of Nazareth. John recognized him by a sign from heaven, and as he came out of the water the heavens opened; and he saw the

heavenly dove resting on his head, and heard the voice proclaiming him the Son of God.

The sixty-nine weeks had closed. Those who were at that time studying the prophecies of Daniel were looking for him, and believed the words of John when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Christ also said, "The time is fulfilled," referring to the prophetic period of the sixty-nine weeks of Daniel. But the nation as a whole was blind. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." They might

have known. The book of Daniel was for them to study. The same book, together with the book of Revelation, proclaims the hour of God's judgment, and his second coming, but men will be taken unawares because they heed not the prophecies.

As the baptism of Christ was one sign given by Gabriel by which the Jews might know the Messiah, so his death was a second token. One week – seven years–remained of the allotted time for the Jewish nation. During one half of that time–three and one-half years–the Son of God walked among the people. The sick were healed; he comforted the broken-hearted, and preached the gospel to the poor. High and low, rich and poor, alike came within the circle of his influence.

"In the midst of the week," said the angel to Daniel, "he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." At the time of the passover feast in the spring of 31 A.D., three and one-half years after his baptism, Christ was crucified by the very people whom he had tried to save. As his life went out, the inner veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom. The mercy seat, seen only by the high priest once each year, was laid open to the gaze of the multitudes. The knife fell from the hand of the priest, and the sacrificial lamb escaped. God had withdrawn his presence from the temple. The Lamb of God himself had been slain, and sacrifice and oblation were forever done away. Those ceremonies, which shadowed forth the death of the Saviour, ceased at the cross. This was in the midst of the last week of the prophetic seventy.

Mercy still lingered over the Jewish people; there was yet a little time in which to repent. What was not accomplished in the person of Christ, God, sending his Holy Spirit, sought to accomplish through his disciples. Humble fishermen imbued with the power of God taught the people concerning a crucified and risen Saviour. In one day three thousand accepted the message. But as many believed, the enmity of Satan was again aroused. In 34 A.D., Stephen was stoned, and as the result of the severe persecution

84

which followed, the believers were driven from Jerusalem and "went *everywhere* preaching the word." Israel had withdrawn from God, and his Spirit could no longer protect them. In less than forty years the city was captured by the army of Titus, the temple was burned, and the Jews were scattered to the ends of the earth, there to remain until the consummation of all things at the time determined.

There can be no question as to the accuracy of the date 457 B.C. as the beginning of the seventy weeks, for it is established by four events: The decree of Artaxerxes; the baptism of Christ; the crucifixion; and the spread of the gospel among the Gentiles. History established the date 457 B.C. as the seventh of Artaxerxes by more than twenty eclipses. The four hundred and ninety years can be reckoned backward from the New Testament history, or forward from the decree to restore and build Jerusalem.

Of the two thousand three hundred days of Dan. 8:14, the angel has given the events for the first four hundred and ninety years. Eighteen hundred and ten years remained, 2300-490=1810. The four hundred and ninety years

ended in the year 34 A.D. To this add eighteen hundred and ten years, and we have the year 1844 A.D. Daniel had been shown the event which would mark this year. It was the investigative judgment, and the giving of the message of the first angel of Revelation fourteen.

This message was given within the memory of many who are still living, and is known as the advent message. About twenty years before the expiration of the prophetic period of the two thousand three hundred days, the attention of some men was called to a study of the prophecies. Foremost among these students was William Miller, who became thoroughly convinced that the prophetic period of Dan. 8:14 would close in 1844. The expression, "unto two thousand and three hundred days then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," was interpreted to mean that at the end of that stated period the earth would be destroyed by fire at the second coming of Christ. Consequently between 1833 and 1844 the personal coming of the Saviour was preached throughout the world. Men were warned according to the wording of the first angel's message of Revelation 14, that the judgment was at hand, and thousands prepared to meet the Lord.

When the year 1844 passed, and Christ did not appear, many lost faith in the prophecies; but others, knowing that the word of God abideth sure, were led to search more diligently for the event which did take place at the close of the prophetic period. Further study corroborated the truth of the

85

interpretation of the time, and revealed also the light on the sanctuary question.

For the first time men saw that the "*sanctuary*" spoken of in Daniel's vision referred to the work in heaven rather than upon earth. An investigation of the typical service instituted in the wilderness revealed the work of cleansing on the day of atonement. It was seen that the work of the high priest in the earthly tabernacle was but a figure of the service upon which Christ, the great High Priest, entered in 1844. At that time he entered into the presence of the Ancient of Days, as seen in the vision of the seventh chapter, and began the work of the investigative judgment, at the end of which work he will appear in the clouds of heaven. William Miller and others who preached the second advent in 1844 were mistaken in the event, but not in the time of the period mentioned by Daniel.

The events which transpired between 34 A.D. and 1844 A.D. are described in the next vision, which was given to Daniel, four or five years later than the vision of the ninth chapter.

Since Gabriel explained with such care and minuteness the history of the Jews, that as a nation they were without excuse in the rejection of the Son of God, we may expect that this same angel of prophecy will set the waymarks high and clear, that men in the last days may know the time of Christ's appearing in judgment, and of his second coming in the clouds of heaven.

Let us watch and be ready.

86

CHAPTER XI

The Sanctuary

SINCE a misunderstanding of the sanctuary question led to the disappointment in 1844, it seems proper to devote one chapter to the consideration of this all-important subject.

Three sanctuaries, or temples, are brought to view in the Bible. The first is the heavenly sanctuary, where God reigns upon his throne, surrounded by ten thousand times ten thousands of angels. This temple was opened to the wondering gaze of the lonely seer on the Isle of Patmos, and also to Moses on Mount Sinai. The second, or earthly, sanctuary was a miniature model of the heavenly one, in which the priests served unto the example and shadow of the service in the heavenly temple. For more than fourteen hundred years, God designed that the service should be in the shadowy sanctuary. The time came when those following the shadow reached the substance. Two days before the crucifixion, Christ slowly and regretfully left the temple for the last time. The priests and rulers were struck with terror as they heard his mournful words: "*Behold* your house is left unto you desolate." The beautiful structure remained until A.D. 70, but it had ceased to be the temple of God. The Father showed by an unmistakable sign that the glory had departed. When the words, "*It is finished*," were pronounced by the Sufferer upon the cross, the veil of the temple was rent from the top to the bottom by unseen hands. Terror and confusion prevailed. The knife raised to slay the sacrifice fell from the nerveless hand of the priest, and the lamb escaped.

Henceforth the sinner need no longer wait for a priest to offer his sacrifice. The great Sacrifice had been made. Every child of Adam could accept his atoning blood. The way into the heavenly temple was now made manifest. The heavenly had taken the place of the earthly sanctuary. Hereafter man's faith was to enter within the veil, where Christ officiated.

The third temple brought to view in the Bible is the temple of the human body. The Jews had lost sight of the fact that their bodies were to be the temples of the Spirit of God; and when the Saviour said, "*Destroy* this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," they thought only of the massive structure of marble and stone, and replied that it had taken forty-six years to build the temple, not perceiving that "*he* spake of the temple of his body."

87

Glorious rays of light shine from the heavenly sanctuary upon those who study the typical work in the earthly. These rays, when gathered into the temple of the body, reflect the character of our great High Priest in the heavenly courts.

In the beginning the body of man was created to be a dwelling place for the Holy Spirit; but Satan gained possession, and man partook of an evil nature. Before the body could again become a fit temple for the Spirit of God, the evil nature must die. Christ offered his life for the sinner, and before the foundation of the world he was counted as a "*Lamb slain*."

That man in his fallen condition might comprehend this gift, and understand the work of redemption, the sinner that longed to crucify "*the old man*," the

evil nature, was directed to bring an innocent animal, and take its life, as an object lesson of the Lamb of God, and also to illustrate the fact that the evil nature of the sinner must die, in order that the Holy Spirit might dwell within.

Before the gate of the garden of Eden, Adam and his family presented their offerings. Their clear minds grasped by faith the promise of the Redeemer, who would again open to them the joys of the garden. Adam by faith looked forward to the time when the Saviour would lead him once more to the Tree of Life, and bid him pluck and eat of its life-giving fruit. As he took the life of the innocent lamb, and saw by faith the "one sinless Man," suffering death for him, his heart went out in love and gratitude to God for his wonderful love, and for a time he forgot the terrible sorrow that weighed upon his soul. Every falling leaf, while it taught the death of Christ, was also a constant reminder to him that his sin had brought death into the hitherto perfect earth.

While man lived near God, the altars were lighted by fire from heaven. But this perfect worship was marred. Cain's mind became so blinded by sin that he failed to grasp the infinite sacrifice. Satan convinced him that God was an austere judge, demanding service. The love and sacrifice of the Saviour were overlooked. Cain and Abel each brought an offering to the gate of the garden; but the desire of the two hearts was greatly different. Abel brought a lamb, and as he took its life, his faith laid hold of the Lamb of God. The lamb was laid upon the altar, and fire flashed from the shining sword of the cherubim guarding the way to the Tree of Life, and the sacrifice was consumed.

Cain brought an offering of fruits. There was nothing in his offering that typified the dying Lamb of Calvary. No innocent life was taken in exchange

88

for his forfeited life. He waited for the fire to consume it; but there was nothing to call forth the fire from the heavenly Watcher. There was no sweet love, no longing for deliverance from the thralldom of sin and death. Cain and Abel are a type of all worshipers from that time to the present. The followers of Cain multiplied ceremonies, and made offerings to the sun and various other objects. In it they overlooked the all-important principle that self must die, and that Christ must live in the temple of the human body. Anciently each family erected its own altars. The father was priest of the household, and was succeeded by the eldest son. At times sin separated the eldest from the family, and character, instead of age, decided who should act as priest.

Jacob knew the character of the one great High Priest; and as he lay with his head upon the stone in Bethel, and watched the angels ascending and descending upon that glorious ladder, he also saw the Lord above it. He beheld his glorious vestments, and in imitation of those garments he made Joseph a "*coat of many colors*." The other sons of Jacob could not comprehend these beautiful truths. Even the coat was an object of hatred to them. When the brothers sold Joseph, they dipped the coat in blood, and its beauty was marred. The future revealed that Jacob had read aright the

character of Joseph, for in the midst of Egyptian darkness he reflected the light of heaven. He was a temple for the indwelling of the Spirit of God. When Israel came out of Egypt, their minds were so beclouded by sin that they no longer saw the promised Saviour in the simple offerings. God then said: "*Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.*" Six days were spent by Moses on the mountain side in deep searching of heart; then the thick cloud of glory covering Mount Sinai broke forth like devouring fire in the eyes of all Israel, and Moses was ushered into the presence of Deity. Before his wondering gaze was spread out the beauties of the heavenly sanctuary. Forty days the Lord communed with him, giving minute directions in regard to building a shadow of that heavenly structure upon the earth. In the midst of the idolatry of Egypt, Israel had lost the spiritual truth that the body was the dwelling place for the Holy Spirit. Neither could they form any conception of the work done in heaven for sinful man.

To reach man in his fallen condition, God directed the building of the earthly tabernacle, that humanity might become acquainted with the nature of the work in the heavenly sanctuary. In this building, men divinely appointed were to perform in the sight of the people a shadow of the work

89

that would be done in the heavenly sanctuary by the Saviour of mankind, when he should officiate as our High Priest.

The whole Jewish economy was a compacted prophecy of the gospel. Every act of the priest in the shadowy service, as he went in and out, was a prophecy of the Saviour's work when he entered heaven as our High Priest. "*It was the gospel in figures,*" the Lord's object lesson or kindergarten for the "*children*" of Israel. They had become children in understanding, and in order to reach them God taught in a way that the senses could grasp the gospel.

Man finally became so depraved that he failed to see light flashing from the Levitical laws and sacrificial offerings, and when the antitype of all their offerings came, they rejected Him.

Let us in imagination go back to the wilderness tabernacle, and see if we can discern the glorious gospel of Christ shifting from the Jewish economy. A man enters the outer court with a lamb, which he brings to the door of the tabernacle. With solemn awe, and eyes raised to heaven, he lays his hand upon its head, while his moving lips, like Hannah's of old, betray the burden of his heart. Then he lifts the knife, and takes the life of the sacrifice. His faith lays hold of the bleeding Lamb of Calvary, and his sin rolls from off his burdened heart onto the great Sacrifice. The blood is carefully caught; every drop is precious, for by faith he views the *real* sacrifice. The priest meets him, takes the blood of the sacrificed life, and passes from sight within the first veil, while the worshiper awaits with anxiety his return. In childhood his father had told him of the "ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy seat;" that at times the bright glory

of the shekinah above the mercy seat shone out and filled the sanctuary. He had been told of that mystical table, with its twelve loaves covered with frankincense; also of the beautiful candlestick, whose seven lamps were ever burning; how the golden plated walls on either side reflected the light, and like great mirrors reproduced again and again the brilliant hues of the richly embroidered curtains with their shining angels. Before the second veil, which concealed the sacred ark, he pictured the altar, from which the fragrant incense constantly ascended. By faith he sees the priest place the blood of the atoning sacrifice upon the horns of the altar. His faith looks past the shadowy service to the time when Christ shall plead his blood in
90

the heavenly sanctuary. It is the gospel of a crucified and risen Saviour that he beholds in the object lesson he himself is helping to carry out.

Soon the veil is lifted, and the priest returns. The offering has been accepted. The priest has made atonement for him, and he is forgiven. In the joy and freedom of forgiveness he prays: "O that the *influence* of all my sins might be forever wiped away!" when lo, he sees the priest go to the brazen altar in the court, and "pour out all the blood at the bottom of the altar." As he sees that blood, precious to him, because it represents his own ransomed life as well as the sacrificed life of the Saviour, poured upon the ground, his heart bounds with joy. He grasps the fact that the decree, "*Cursed* is the ground for thy sake," is met in Christ, and that the promised Saviour will finally cleanse the earth from all the effects of his sins.

The body of the lamb still lies near the door of the sanctuary, where the life was taken. He next turns to it, and with a sharp knife separates from the meat every particle of fat—"All the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards," etc. "All the fat is taken away, and the priest burns it upon the altar of burnt offering for a sweet savor unto the Lord." The fat is burned as a type of the final destruction, when "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Ps. 37:20.

Every sinner that clings to sin will be destroyed with the sin. God has made provision for every one to separate from sin, that he may destroy the sin and save the sinner. The burning fat upon the altar came up as a sweet savor before God, for it represented sin that had been separated from the sinner and destroyed, while the sinner lived a new life through Christ.

The sinner separated the fat from the sacrifice; the priest received it and burned it, illustrating the truth that we must co-operate with the Lord; and through Christ who strengthens us we can do all things.

As the man carefully searched for the fat, he realized more fully that his body was to be a temple of the Holy Spirit, and that when his past sin is forgiven and he is accepted, it is that he may become a dwelling place for the Spirit of God. When that Spirit enters a man, it, like a sharp knife, reveals one sin after another, and separates them from the sinner until the soul temple is cleansed. His faith grasps the promise of the "One" who dwells in the hearts of his people by faith. As he goes from the shadowy temple court, he realizes that he is a temple, not "*empty*, swept, and

garnished," ready to be again entered by the power of evil, but a temple in which the Spirit of God rules and reigns.

91

Another man brings an offering; and as the priest takes the blood, instead of entering within the veil, he pours it at the base of the altar of burnt offering. Then a portion of the flesh, which represents sin, is prepared and eaten by the priest in the holy place. In this act the priest taught the children of Israel the wonderful truth that Christ bore our sins *in his own body on the tree*. Each separate offering presented some different phase of the work of Christ. The incense constantly ascending from the altar was an object lesson of the inexhaustible fund of perfect obedience accruing from the sinless life of our Saviour, which, added to the prayers of all saints as they are offered upon the golden altar in heaven, makes them acceptable before God. The perfume of the incense filled the air far beyond the temple court. Likewise the sweet influence of Christians who live a life of faith in God, is felt by all who come in contact with them.

The fire was replenished morning and evening, representing the morning and evening worship in the family. "*The whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.*" The lamps were a type of the seven lamps of fire before the throne of God in heaven, which are the seven spirits of God. These "*are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.*" Seven denotes the complete Spirit of God that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world. Its life-giving rays lead the Christian to the celestial city.

The golden table held the "*bread of his presence,*" which represented man's dependence upon God for both temporal and spiritual help and strength. The ark was the center of all worship; it was the first article mentioned in describing the sanctuary. The law hidden in it was the great standard of judgment, and a perfect copy of that heavenly law before which the character of every child of Adam will be tried in the tribunal on high. If that law witnesses to a character cleansed from sin by the blood of the atoning sacrifice, then the name will be confessed before the Father and the holy angels.

The continual burning of that which typified sin pointed forward to the time when sin and sinners would be consumed in the fire of the last day. As the ashes accumulated upon the altar of burnt offering, they were carefully collected by the side of the altar; and at a certain time the priest laid aside his priestly robes, carried the ashes without the court, and deposited them in a "*clean place.*" They were not thrown carelessly to one side, but put in a *clean place*. These ashes represented all that will be left of sin and sinners after the fires of the last days. "*For behold, the day cometh that shall burn*

92

as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But to you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise, with healing in his wings, and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the

wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 4:1-3. In that day the real ashes of the wicked will be left upon a "*clean* earth."

As the Jewish father walked to the sanctuary with his child, the mind of the child would be attracted by the ashes in the clean place. He would ask, "*Why are those* ashes put in a clean place, when you throw the ashes from our fire upon the dunghill?" The father's answer would explain the beauties of the new earth, when it will be made like Eden, and sin and sorrow will be forever removed. With it would come the gentle admonition to separate from sin, and keep the body temple pure, that in the great burning day the sin may be consumed without the sinner, and he be among the ransomed of the Lord.

Much of the service and many of the customs of ancient Israel were designed to call out questions from the children, that the spiritually minded parents might instruct them in the ways of God.

After speaking of the peculiar manner in which the passover should be eaten, God adds, "*Your* children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service?" showing that he intended that it should call forth questions from children of all ages, and thus the children become acquainted with the saving blood of the great Passover Lamb.

The sight of the pile of stones by Jordan was to arouse inquiries in the minds of the children of future generations, which, if answered properly, would acquaint them with the mighty power of God. The same was true of the whole Jewish service.

The leper that sought cleansing was to bring two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood and scarlet and hyssop. The priest commanded that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel, over running water. The live bird, cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop were all dipped in the blood, and the leper was sprinkled with the blood; then the live bird was let loose in the open field. It flew through the air, bearing on its feathers the blood, which was a type of Christ's blood that will purify the air, and remove from it all the germs of sin and death. Now death comes in at our windows, but the blood of Christ will give us a new atmosphere.

93

Earth, air, and water are the elements which compose our planet. All are tainted by sin. The earthen dish containing the blood held over the running water typified the time when earth, air, and water would be freed from the curse of sin by the blood of Christ. The cedar wood and hyssop represented the two extremes in vegetation, from the giant of the forest to the hyssop on the wall. They were dipped in the blood, thus teaching Israel that Christ's blood would free the entire vegetable world from the curse, and again clothe the earth in Eden beauty.

It might seem to man that the curse was so deeply marked upon the earth, air, and sea that it could never be removed; but the little piece of scarlet wool, dipped in the blood with the live bird, the cedar, and hyssop, was a pledge that the blood of Christ would remove the deepest marks from the sin-cursed earth.

We have the real sacrifice to study as well as the shadow. Type met antitype. The blood of Christ has been shed; the price has been paid that will restore the purity of earth, air, and sea. The sin-cursed earth received the blood of Christ as he prayed in the garden. "*From his hands and feet the blood fell drop by drop upon the rock drilled for the foot of the cross.*" Thus through the air passed the precious blood. From the wound in his side "*there flowed two copious and distinct streams, one of blood and the other of water.*" The blood of Christ was brought in contact with earth, air, and water. The two extremes in vegetation also met at Calvary. The cross was made of wood taken from the trees of the forest; "*and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth.*"

Was there an antitype of the scarlet while his blood was trickling from those cruel wounds? –Yes. In Jesus as he hung upon the cross, bruised, mocked, and bleeding, the thief beheld the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. Hope kindled in his soul, and he cast himself upon a dying Saviour. With full faith that Christ would possess the kingdom, he cried, "Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom." In a soft, melodious tone, full of love, the answer was quickly given: "Verily I say unto thee to-day, Shalt thou be with me in paradise." As these words were spoken, the darkness around the cross was pierced with living light. The thief felt the peace and joy of sins forgiven. Christ was glorified. While all thought they beheld him conquered, he was the conqueror. They could not rob him of his power to forgive sins.

Type has fully met antitype; the price has been paid; the blood of the world's Redeemer has been *poured upon the ground*. It has dropped *through*

94
the air from the cruel cross. It *has flowed* with water from the wound of the cruel spear. The extremes of vegetation also came in contact with it, and he whose sins were as scarlet, experienced the peace of having them made white as snow by the precious blood, even while it was flowing from the open wounds.

The various feasts throughout the year typified different phases of the gospel. The passover was a type of Christ in an especial sense. Christ is our Passover. The first fruits offered the third day after the passover lamb was slain, taught the resurrection of Christ. Type met antitype, and was fulfilled when Christ, the first fruits of them that slept, came forth on the third day, and presented himself before the Father.

Throughout the varied service of the year, everything pointed forward to the Lamb of God, while it also taught the lesson of cleansing the body, and keeping the temple pure for the Spirit of God.

In the autumn, on the tenth day of the seventh month, came the crowning service of the year. All other services were a preparation for this. Day by day the sins of the people had been transferred in type and shadow to the priest and the sanctuary, and once each year these were to be cleansed, and the sins forever removed.

Gabriel revealed to Daniel the antitype of the time of cleansing the earthly sanctuary. "*Unto two thousand three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary*

be cleansed." This period of cleansing, we have found in the study of the ninth chapter of Daniel, began in 1844. The cover of the ark in the heavenly sanctuary was then lifted, and the law of God was seen by the people, not broken, but entire. In the midst of the law they traced the words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." They awoke to the fact that they had been resting upon the first day of the week instead of the seventh. As they gazed at the law, a halo of light seemed to encircle the fourth commandment, which for so many years had been trampled underfoot. Reverently they listened to the words, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." Isa. 58: 13,14.

They thought on their ways, and made haste, and delayed not to keep the commandments. The period of the investigative judgment opened in 1844 when every character would be measured by the standard of God's law. As 95

the work opened in heaven, it was the will of God that on earth his people should test their lives by the law of God, and come into harmony with its holy precepts. The day of atonement was the type of the judgment. This was the most solemn day of the year to ancient Israel.

When the sun gilded the western hills of the land of Judea, on the ninth day of the seventh month, the trumpet was blown throughout Israel. The solemn warning of the trumpet produced a marked effect in every home. All work was laid aside, and quiet reigned. It was not the ordinary rest of the weekly Sabbath, for no evening meal was spread. There was not the usual baking and seething customary on the preparation for the Sabbath. No food was prepared, for this was not a feast, but a fast day. The father of the household gathered his family about him, and read from the Sacred Scroll: "Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls." With prayer, fasting, and deep searching of heart the day was spent by the Israel of God. With solemn awe they repeated, "Whatsoever soul shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people."

In the Gentile homes around them were eating and drinking and all the busy activities of daily life, but quiet reigned in the homes of Israel. In the temple court all was activity. The bullock without blemish was brought, and the high priest laid his hands on its head, confessing his sins and the sins of his household. Then it was slain, and with the blood he made an atonement for himself and his household, that he might be prepared to perform the solemn service of the day.

When he came out, after presenting the blood of the bullock before the Lord, two goats were brought, lots were cast, and one was chosen for the Lord's goat, while the other, Azazel, the scapegoat, represented the evil one. The Lord's goat was slain. With its blood and the golden censer, the priest

entered within the second veil of the sanctuary As he neared the mercy seat with the glorious light of the shekinah shining above it, he sprinkled "*much incense*" upon the coals in the censer, "*that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that he die not.*" Then with his back toward the sun rising, he sprinkled the atoning blood seven times above and before that broken law within the ark. He paused in the holy place, and made atonement for it, and for the tabernacle of the congregation. The golden altar, that had so often during the year witnessed to the sins of Israel by the scarlet spots upon its horns, was now cleansed from all defilement by the

96
blood of the Lord's goat. The people without listened attentively to the sound of the bells on his robes, as he moved about within the sanctuary. "When he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat." The work of reconciliation ended, God and man were one. The at-one-ment had been made in figure. The separating sins had been removed. The people rejoiced in God that he had accepted them, and that their sins were all removed from before the Lord.

As they beheld the high priest lay his hands on the head of the scapegoat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and sending him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness," their hearts filled with the peace that passeth understanding. They praised God for the wonderful gift of his love in giving his Son to die for sinful man, delivering him from sin and death. It was not until the goat was sent away into the barren wilderness that this peace filled the hearts of the people, and they felt that they were forever free from their sins.

That was the type. What does the antitype mean to us? Since 1844 the world has been living in the great antitypical day of atonement. The investigative judgment has been in session in heaven. In the type the people were to control their appetites, and to hold their own business interests secondary to the worship of God. This was shown by the day of atonement in the type being a rest and fast day.

We are living in the time when our great High Priest is cleansing the heavenly sanctuary, removing the sin records. We are admonished to repent and be converted, that our sins may be blotted out "when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." When the reconciling is completed, and the last case is decided in the final judgment of heaven, the Saviour will pronounce the decree: "He that is unjust let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still; and he that is holy let him be holy still." Every case will be decided for eternity. Satan, the great instigator of all evil, the antitypical scapegoat, will then come in for his part of the service.

In the type the sins were laid upon the scapegoat in the presence of the congregation; in the antitype, the Saviour, in the presence of the Father, the angels of God, and all the redeemed host, will lay the sins of the righteous upon the head of Satan, and a mighty angel will lead him away to the

desolate earth, where he will remain a thousand years. At the end of the
97

thousand years, he will go into the fire which destroys the earth. Type will fully meet antitype when all the sins of the righteous are burned up, with Satan, and nothing remains but the ashes in "a clean place." It will then be seen that "Satan bore not only the weight and punishment of his own sins, but also the sins of the redeemed host, which had been placed upon him; and he must also suffer for the ruin of souls which he has caused."

The sins of Israel will never again be found. The former things will not be remembered nor come into mind. Throughout eternity joy and peace will forever reign. The prophet says, "He will make one utter end; affliction shall not rise up the second time."

Type must meet antitype. The great High Priest in heaven is now performing his service. Are you performing your part? In homes scattered all over the earth faithful children of God *will* carry out the antitype in the way God directed the Israelites to spend the typical day of atonement. The priest might have performed his part of the service perfectly in the temple; but unless the people in their homes fasted, rested, and prayed, the work was of no avail for them. Every Israelite who ate and conducted himself like the Gentiles around him on the day of atonement was cut off from among the people of God.

Is your home a place where the appetite is controlled? Do you hold your business interests secondary to the work of God? Are you heeding the Saviour's words, "*Take heed lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting [eating to excess], and drunkenness [partaking of improper food], and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares*"?

There will be one hundred and forty-four thousand who will heed the warning, and in the fear of God will fulfill the antitype. While Christ in heaven is faithfully interceding for them, they will present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, that God may be glorified.

98

CHAPTER XII

Introduction To The Last Vision

(Chapter 10)

THE last three chapters of the book of Daniel are inseparable, for they relate the last recorded vision of the prophet. The tenth chapter is preliminary to a detailed history of the world, and is valuable because of the important spiritual lessons which it contains. Daniel was an old man, and nearing the end of a long and eventful career, but his last days were full of anxiety for his race, and he still carried the burden of their captivity on his heart. Since the events recorded in the ninth chapter, he had been in the lions' den, thrust there because of the cruel hatred of men in high positions. His godly life was a constant rebuke to the corruption of men in office, and they sought to destroy him, but God put these men to confusion, and witnessed to the purity of Daniel's life. The prophet had been held in high esteem by Darius the Mede, and on his death and the accession of Cyrus, Daniel had remained

in the court, a counselor of the king.

Cyrus, in the first year of his reign, had issued an emancipation proclamation to the Jews. The Spirit of God had pleaded with the heart of the king, and he felt that he was brought into power for that purpose. When, after every provision had been made for the return, but a small fraction of the Jews took advantage of it, Cyrus began to doubt the wisdom of the decree. It was with the Jews as with sinners to-day. Pardon is granted and freedom offered, but they choose to remain in sin until they receive the penalty—death. The sins of Babylon dazzled the eyes of the Jews who beheld them, and the voice of their God was but faintly heard. (Comp. Eze. 33:30-32.)

Daniel could not understand the situation. The spiritual condition of his own people weighed heavily upon him, and the changing attitude of the king worried him. He thought upon the previous vision, and wondered if it could be that his people—the Jews—would cling to the sins of Babylon until they were overtaken by the persecutions described as belonging to the latter days. He could not understand the times, although the words spoken by Gabriel seemed clear of comprehension.

Two years after the decree of Cyrus, Daniel determined to humble his heart before God by prayer and fasting until he should understand the matter, He

99
did not practice total abstinence from food, for this fast was not the fast of a day. But he withdrew from the king's table and partook of the plainest kinds of food, spending much time in prayer and study. It was his purpose to have his appetite so in subjection that physical wants would not crowd out his desire for spiritual insight. The spiritual life of man too often partakes of the earthly mold of his body by overindulgence of appetite. the soul should control the body, and not be burdened by the body. This condition Daniel sought to attain, He sought also to strengthen the mind by retiring to a quiet spot on the banks of the river Tigris. He took with him a few men as companions. Doubtless these were Jews who also felt a burden for Israel. The solitude of the spot, the swiftly flowing waters of the river, the lofty trees, and the clear sky above, led the prophet's mind out after his God. For three weeks he thus sought for light and truth. Then it was that he looked up and beheld the Son of God by his side, the same who appeared to John on the Isle of Patmos. The brightness which shone round about Michael was too great for the eyes of the companions of Daniel, and they hastened to hide themselves. The countenance of Christ was like lightning, and as he gazed upon the prostrate form of Daniel, the other men fled for their lives. But what would have been death to those who harbored sin, was life to the one whose character was pure. The dross had been consumed before, and the light shone upon the prophet as sunlight on a mirror. So full of life is the Son of God that his eyes appeared as lamps of fire, flashing light. He it is who says, "*I will guide thee with mine eye.*" Daniel could bear the gaze, but his companions felt that those eyes burned into their very souls, and they laid from his gaze.

To the ears of Daniel, accustomed by long experience to heavenly sounds,

the voice of the "*One Man*" was as the voice of the multitude, or as the sound of many waters, clear and beautiful. To human ears, dull of hearing, it is like thunder. The Jews at the time that the Greeks came to Christ had a similar experience to that of the companions of Daniel. Sitting in the temple court, the lightning played about the head of Christ, and a voice which to him was the voice of God, to them sounded like the crash of a thunder bolt. Daniel was left alone in the presence of the Son of God, and as he compared his own condition to that of Christ, he seemed but a lump of clay, a broken vessel, uncomely and useless. "My vigor was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength." He clung close to the cold earth, his face to the ground in a deep sleep, helpless in the hands of his God. "*What* is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?"

100

Then Gabriel, the angel who had so often talked with Daniel, touched him with his hand, and lifted his prostrate form. He said, "O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright; for unto thee am I now sent." There was power in the touch of the angel's hand. There was power in the touch of the Saviour's hand. When on earth, virtue, life, the healing power of God, constantly radiated from him. He could touch the leper, and a life-current flowed from him to the diseased one.

So it was with Gabriel's touch. He who stood in the presence of God was so filled with life that as he laid his hand on man, a thrill of life was felt in every nerve. It may be so with beings today. the follower of Christ should have the life-current so strong within him that sin is rebuked, and disease driven from him. "A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee," is the promise. Christ came that we might have an abundance of life; the cup full to overflowing. We do not half realize our privilege.

It was three full weeks since Daniel had begun to pray, and Gabriel explained the cause of the delay. From the first day of the fast his words had been heard, but their answer required the co-operation of Cyrus, the Persian king. So while Daniel waited, ignorant of the work of heaven in his behalf, and little dreaming of the strivings in the heart of the king, Gabriel had been at the Persian court pleading with Cyrus.

One may wonder how Gabriel worked. Details are not given, but one thing is sure: until the moment of a nation's rejection, angels are always in the midst of their councils. Men will be led to take positions for the truth, not knowing the real reason for their own decisions. The Holy Watcher is a constant witness in legislative halls to-day, and every just decree is the result of an impulse from the throne of God. This influence was at work in the heart of Cyrus, and so pressing were the petitions offered by Daniel that Christ himself came in person to help Gabriel. To Daniel doubtless it seemed that his prayer was unheard, but God was working out the answer in a way unknown to the prophet. Had he ceased to make intercession at the end of one week, or at the end of two weeks, the history of an entire people would have been changed. The promise is, "Before they call I will answer,

and while they are yet speaking I will hear." God is often testing the strength of our desires when he withholds an immediate answer to our prayer.

101

"Knowest thou wherefore I am come unto thee?" asked Gabriel. "I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days." Daniel fell to the ground, and the breath went from his body. This was his condition when in vision, He was unable to speak until Christ touched his lips. Then he spoke to Gabriel, who stood by his side to strengthen him, and to explain to him the history of the latter days.

God has had many prophets. The effect of the Spirit upon a human being when in vision is unexplainable. There is an overpowering presence which so overcomes the physical being that it has no strength to act of itself. The breath leaves the body, and the voice of God speaks through the human instrument. The eyes remain open, as Balaam described his condition, but the person sees things outside the world. He is often taken far beyond the bounds of earth as was the case of Ezekiel, John, and Paul. Earth's attraction is broken, and with an angel guide the prophet visits other places, or beholds the future, reading there the history of men and nations. When the living coal from the altar is laid upon those lips, they speak words of heavenly wisdom. Isaiah had this experience.

For the third time Gabriel expressed the love of God for Daniel, adding, "*Peace* be unto thee; be strong, yea, be strong." By word and by touch Gabriel strengthened the gray-haired prophet. He was ready for the revelation, and said, "Let my Lord speak; for thou hast strengthened *me*." The things which are noted in the history of truth were related by this great revealer. Man sees not as God sees, and in his shortsightedness he often emphasizes the unimportant, and passes lightly over events of universal interest. But when history is given in God's Word it is a chronicler of those things which are "*noted* in the Scripture of truth." This fact is noticeable in the history of the Persian kings, which is contained in the next few verses. In the most abbreviated manner, Gabriel touches the events of hundreds of years, but he brings into prominence things which are noted elsewhere in the Word of God, and which can be understood only by a careful study of other books of the Bible.

For an understanding of the history of Persia, it is necessary to study carefully Ezra, Esther, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah. These books carry the history to the time of Persia's greatest strength, and through the time when that nation worked for God and his people. Then, and not till then, is the record silent.

102

CHAPTER XIII

The History Of The Decrees

(Chapter 11:1,2)

THE angel began with the history of the Persian kingdom, for at the lime of

the vision the Babylonian monarchy was entirely gone. It was the third year of the sole reign of Cyrus, and the fifth year since Darius the Mede had taken Babylon. It will be remembered that Daniel had seen the various nations, as they rose one after another on the stream of time. God is the only perfect authentic historian; the only unbiased record of national events is found in the Scriptures. Men record acts, but only God can give those acts their proper setting in the great drama of life. There is one unbroken chain of events, a silken thread in the web of life, a perpetual spring in the tide of human affairs. This is the record of God's dealings with his chosen people. Egyptian history is noted in the inspired record of the world, but only as it played some part in connection with Jehovah's people. Likewise Assyria, Babylon, Greece, and Rome; whatever the nation and whatever its place in time, its history is noted by the divine historian only during the time when it has been an instrument in God's hand to spread his truth, or to protect his people.

It was for such a purpose that the Medo-Persian kingdom came into existence, and when it had fulfilled that work, and the Spirit of God was withdrawn, it passed from the stage of action.

The Medo-Persian empire was born when the time was ripe for Israel's deliverance from the bondage of Babylon. The first king of the united empire was Darius the Mede. He was a man well advanced in life when he came to the throne; threescore and two years old, the record states. But throughout his reign, Gabriel stood by him *"to confirm and to strengthen him."* To Darius was given an opportunity to liberate the Jews. The Spirit of God pleaded with him, and it brought Daniel into his favor, so that he placed the prophet in the third position in the kingdom. Darius knew of God and his power, for it was he who spent the sleepless night in prayer while Daniel was in the lions' den. Darius, however, did no great work for the Lord. He reigned but two years, when Cyrus took the kingdom.

From the accession of Cyrus to the end of the history of Medo-Persia, Gabriel worked with the kings. His first words to Daniel in this last vision

103
are to this effect: "I will return to fight with the prince of Persia; *and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.*" When, therefore, the influence of God should be withdrawn from the king of Persia, no power on earth could help them. This thought was made emphatic when the rough goat was seen to meet the ram on the banks of the River Granicus. Wealth, arms, and influence were without avail.

Of the seven years of the reign of Cyrus, the third was already entered at the time of the vision. His first recorded act on taking the kingdom was to issue the proclamation of freedom to the Jews. Throughout the length and breadth of the land the tidings were heralded. It did not take over twelve months for the message to reach the most remote corners of the empire where the Jews might be found. Every inducement which monarch could offer was held out to that people. The slow movement on the part of a few, and the utter inactivity with the great majority, surprised Cyrus beyond measure. It is one of the saddest commentaries in the whole Bible on the perverseness of the

human heart, and its desire to cling to sin.

When it is remembered that Babylon was the personification of all vileness; that injustice and oppression abounded, and that the decree of Cyrus was a call from God to liberty and purity of life, the effect of living long even in the sight of sin ought to appall one. This is a picture of the way the calls of God have been treated over and over again. Here is seen the exact counterpart of what people are doing to-day when asked of God to forsake modern Babylon.

One reason why the Jews were slow about withdrawing from ancient Babylon was because the children and youth had been neglected during the seventy years' captivity. Jewish homes should have been schools, training these children for the city of Jerusalem. Instead, Jewish children attended Babylonian schools, mingled with Babylonian society, wore Babylonish apparel, talked, ate, and acted like the Babylonians; and consequently, when the time came to leave Babylon, they had no desire to do so.

Had the Hebrew race been true to its privileges, they might have established schools of the prophets, from which light would have radiated to all parts of the kingdom. This opportunity was offered in the first days of the captivity, when Nebuchadnezzar was witness to the fact that all the Chaldean learning was not worth one tenth what God could teach. Daniel and his companions were brought into favor because of their knowledge of true educational principles, and had schools been established at that time, Chaldean youth would doubtless have been educated by the Jews, and in the religion of the

104
Jews. God had always intended that Israel should be the teachers of the world, and even after sin had led them into slavery, he gave them an opportunity to teach their captors and their captors' children. Did Israel do so? The end of the seventy years and the response to the decree of Cyrus answer, No. They did not teach others; they failed even to teach their own children. As a result, thousands perished with Babylon.

Those who did go up to Jerusalem were halfhearted in their service, and ready to give up before the least opposition. When the foundation of the temple was laid, the old men wept because it did not equal in splendor the temple of Solomon, and there was little influence exerted to bring others from Babylon. There is little wonder that after waiting two full years to see results, Cyrus was perplexed and astonished at the outcome. What wonder that Daniel had to wait three weeks for an answer to his prayer, while Gabriel and Michael pleaded with the disheartened Cyrus! Cyrus was ready, had the Jews done their part, to make Jerusalem the glory of the whole earth. As it was, we do not find any record of further work by this king. He died, the work he might have done but partially accomplished because of neglect and inactivity on the part of God's chosen people.

Satan had witnessed the workings of the Spirit of God on the hearts of men at the very center of the government he claimed as his own. It was due to his influence that the Jews did not make a grand entry into Jerusalem. Cyrus struggled between two influences, but was restrained by Gabriel from doing any act of violence. Cambyses, his son, reigned nearly eight years, but most

of his time was spent in useless and expensive warfare in Egypt and Ethiopia. Cambyses is the Ahasuerus of Ezra 4:5. To him the Samaritans wrote letters of complaint against the Jews at Jerusalem. But Cambyses was too busy with his foreign wars to give heed to this matter, and hence no action was taken either for or against the work at Jerusalem. The Jews were still at liberty to leave Babylon, but such a time of national quiet was not conducive to great activity on their part, and they remained where they were. The time came when they wished with all their hearts that they had gone out during those peaceful years.

Cambyses was slain while in Egypt; and before the report was circulated throughout the Medo-Persian empire, an impostor took the throne which belonged to Smerdis, the son of Cambyses. The impostor, known in history as Pseudo-Smerdis (the false Smerdis), is the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:7. He reigned but seven months, but that gave him time to consider complaints from the Samaritans, and the tribes about Jerusalem, and to issue a

105
commandment for the building of Jerusalem to cease until further word should come from the throne. This letter of the false Smerdis is found in Ezra 4:18-22. This is the only act which the divine historian mentions in the life of this Persian monarch.

Although very little is said about him, God knew every move he made. This is seen as we follow the history of the decrees. As soon as the Jews at Jerusalem heard the reading of the letter from the false Smerdis, all work ceased. "For," reasoned they, "*how* can we go on?" After they ceased to build, God raised up two prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, and from these we gain a knowledge of how matters then went in Jerusalem.

The people ceased to build the temple, and turned to building houses for themselves. When urged to continue the Lord's work, they complained that money was scarce. They sowed seed, but the harvest was less than the amount sown; their trees bore little or no fruit; there was drought, and the cattle died; men could not pay their rent or taxes, and became slaves because of debt, and sold their children into bondage. Then they complained to God. But all the time God was working for them, and they knew it not. This is the way he worked: In the city of Babylon, six of the chief men of the empire suspected that the reigning king was not the rightful heir, and they banded themselves together to find out. Forcing their way into the presence of Smerdis, they recognized the impostor, and slew him, and Darius, the chief of the band, was made king. This is the man in history known as Darius Hystaspes, and is Darius the Persian spoken of in Ezra 4:24.

Gabriel still guarded the throne of the Persians, and while the weak-hearted Jews left off building the temple because of a little opposition, God was bringing a man to the throne who would carry forward the work of Cyrus. Haggai and Zechariah gathered the people together and urged them to resume the work of building, giving the word of the Lord that their poverty was the direct result of their own refusal to build in the face of difficulties. The Jews took up the burden, but presently Tatnai and others, governors of

tribes in Palestine, came to Jerusalem and warned the Jews to cease. Haggai, Zechariah, Zerubbabel, and Jeshua quoted the decree of Cyrus. Tatnai then wrote to Darius, expecting, of course, that he would put an end to the work. Darius, however, caused a search to be made, and found the decree of *Cyrus*, with all its particulars concerning the building, the sacrifices, and the order for money for the same from the king's treasury.

106

Here is a manifestation of God's goodness and mercy. That which in the eyes of men looked like defeat was turned into a glorious victory. Darius issued a decree which covered all that was contained in the decree of Cyrus, and more also. Tatnai and the men who had entered complaint were commanded to help forward the work at Jerusalem by giving their own money to bear the expense.

Watch those men, Tatnai, Shethar-boznai, and their companions, who had raised such an outcry against God's work. When the decree of Darius was received, the accusers went with great speed to the Jewish leaders. Seeming defeat was turned into signal victory, because God was directing in the affairs of men. Bitter enemies became friends, or at least assistants, when the breath of Jehovah confounded their worldly policy. Again God especially favored Israel.

The warnings of Jeremiah were still heard: "Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul: be not cut off in her iniquity. ...We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed: forsake her, and let us go every one into his own country...The Lord hath brought forth our righteousness: come, and let us declare in Zion the work of the Lord our God."

"O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken."

Israel heeded not. For thirty-six years—think of it, over a quarter of a century—Darius reigned, and Gabriel stood at his right hand to keep his heart tender toward the chosen people.

The angels of heaven watched intently to see Israel return and build Jerusalem. To the prophet Zechariah, in the days of Darius, was given a wonderful view of the future history of the people of God. Jerusalem was given an opportunity in those days to build so as to become an everlasting city. Said one angel to another in the hearing of Zechariah, "*Run*, speak to this young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls, for the multitude of men and cattle therein." Instead of walls of stone, such as Jerusalem and the cities of the world had hitherto been accustomed to build, God promised to be a wall of fire round about. "*Ho*, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north... Deliver thyself, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon."

Abounding love, like the love of a mother for her firstborn, is heard in the words of Jehovah: "*Sing* and rejoice, O daughter Of Zion! for lo, *I come*. I will dwell in the midst of thee." Christ's first and his second coming were

107

both promised then, and would doubtless have followed in quick succession had Israel heeded.

Throughout all the world the glory of the Lord should be seen upon Zion, daughter of the living God. "I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and JERUSALEM SHALL BE CALLED A CITY OF TRUTH!" "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee."

To those who mourned because the new temple seemed less glorious than the former one, Christ, looking forward to the time when he himself should enter there with words of life for his people, said, by the prophet Haggai, "I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory." "*The* glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former...and in this place will I give peace." This he said referring to his personal visit in the form of humanity.

And again, by the same prophet, he asked them to witness to the fact that from the very day they began to build, the land yielded abundantly; the silver and the gold flowed in, and there was general prosperity.

By Zechariah the latter rain was promised to Jerusalem; great clouds of his glory should overshadow them. In Jerusalem the weak should be as David, and David as the angel of the Lord. All this he told them by the prophet Zechariah. Read the entire prophecy for its glorious promises. If we had lived in Babylon in the days of Darius, would he have hearkened? Hear the prophet as he looks still farther into the future, and sees the Lord coming and all his saints with him to crown Jerusalem, the City of our God, the bride of the Apocalypse. It should be an eternal city, with sin and iniquity blotted from the earth.

Zechariah saw these things in the days of Darius, king of Persia; and had the Jews come out of Babylon, and followed where God would have led, such would have been the history of the world. They heeded not his voice, and after a lapse of nearly twenty-five hundred years, the people of to-day find themselves heirs to exactly the same promises under precisely the same conditions. If the church of God to-day follows the instruction of the prophets, every promise of Zechariah shall be theirs. If not, the history of the Jews during the reign of the king who followed Darius, will be repeated.

108

XERXES

In giving this history to Daniel, these details were omitted, and Daniel did not live to see them carried out. To him the angel said, speaking in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, "*Behold*, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all."

The three kings who followed Cyrus were Cambyses, Pseudo-Smerdis, and Darius. These, and their part in the history of the Jews, we have already seen. The fourth king of Persia after Cyrus the Great was noted for his wealth, and the great army he raised against the Greeks. This king was Xerxes, who came to the throne on the death of Darius, in the year 486 B.C. Our interest lies in the record of his dealings with the Jews, and to that history one entire book of the Bible is devoted. Xerxes is the Ahasuerus of Esther I, and the book of Esther is the record of the acts of this king with reference to the people of God who were still living in the kingdom of

Babylon, over which Xerxes was sole monarch.

The Medo-Persian kingdom was at its height during the reign of this king. He held in subjection one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, extending from India to Ethiopia. His capital was at Shushan, in the province of Elam. Some estimate of the wealth at the disposal of this ruler may be gained from the fact that for six months the princes, rulers, and governors of all the provinces, representing the power of the Persian king in all parts of the realm, were entertained at the royal palace; and that when this gathering was over, the palace of Shushan was thrown open for a full week, during which time all the people were feasted in the gardens. There was drinking of wine and reveling. It was similar to the time when Belshazzar feasted with a thousand of his lords. The furnishings of the palace, with its marble walls and floors, its rich curtains and draperies of many colors, hanging by silver rings to the lofty pillars, told of the gratification of pride. The beds and couches were of gold and silver, and they drank from wine cups of gold. Truly Medo-Persia was the daughter of Babylon.

The story of Vashti is a familiar one. Ashasuerus commanded her to appear before his half-drunken company, and she refused. Then she was set aside, and a Jewish maiden, her nationality being unknown, became queen of the Persian kingdom. This was Hadassah, known as Esther, an orphan of the house of Saul, whose parents had been among the royal captives in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. She had lived always with a cousin by the name of Mordecai, who treated her as his own daughter. Little did Mordecai and his wife think when they took the helpless infant Hadassah that she would one

109
day stand for her people in the presence of the king. She was an obedient child, and consequently became an obedient woman. She was simplehearted and unassuming, requiring little and demanding nothing. She loved her own people, although to be true to them meant that she must look death in the face.

Daniel was no longer living, and there were few if any to represent the worship of the true God in the court of the godless king. Mordecai sat at the king's gate, it is true, and in time of a conspiracy he reported the matter to the king; but there were few occasions when he could mingle with those in authority. Wickedness and injustice abounded, and Mordecai refused to countenance such principles, and would not bow before the haughty Haman, one of the king's counselors. This was pretense enough for the enemies of the Jews to work upon, for they were now a hated race throughout the empire. They had failed to take advantage of the time of national favor, and Persia had turned against them.

For about forty years mercy had been extended to Israel, and that people had turned a deaf ear to all entreaty. Forty years has often been called the allotted time for a generation to settle its destiny either for or against the truth. Moses was forty years in the wilderness, unlearning the things of Egypt, and being taught in the things of God; Israel wandered forty years in the wilderness, when only eleven days were necessary to make the journey from the Red Sea to the border of Canaan; forty days Christ endured severe

temptation as a figure of the time before the destruction of Jerusalem; forty years sealed the fate of the Reformation in Germany; and it was forty years from the preaching of the sealing message until the time of the loud cry. So Israel was given forty years in Babylon while angels held the winds of strife. At the end of that time Xerxes yielded to the suggestion of Haman, and issued a decree against that "certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces." If entreaty would no longer attract the attention of the Jews, God would in his mercy let persecution come, that they might be compelled to flee to his side for protection. But when persecution and hardship are approaching, the love of God is so great that he prepares the deliverer beforehand.

The angel of God had guarded Hadassah, and directed in her education. He had brought her to the kingdom "*for such a time as this.*" When there was no man to represent his cause, Jehovah used a woman, and she, a young woman. Her very beauty was consecrated to the Lord, and he made use of that. God loves the young people, as the history of the Jews certifies.

110

Messengers were sent by post to carry the king's decree to every province in the vast empire. It was sealed with the king's signet, and the laws of the Medes and Persians were unchangeable. On a set day every Jew in the kingdom was to be put to death by the sword; old, young, men, women, and little children, none were excluded. Satan triumphed in the thought that at last Israel was in his hand, and the cause of God should fall. "*The king and Haman,*" two of Satan's servants, "*sat down to drink.*"

The city of Shushan first heard the decree, and consternation filled the hearts of the Jews. There was distress in every home. "The city of Shushan was perplexed." Scarcely one year from the date of the decree and death would be their lot. There was seemingly no way of escape. Years before they might have gone up to Jerusalem, but now it was forever too late. A bitter wail of agony reached heaven, and as those messengers of the king sped on, the cry grew louder. The voices of the Jews at Shushan were strengthened by sounds of mourning from thousands of Jews in all the provinces. ·

Esther, in the king's palace was ignorant of the decree, but Mordecai made known to her the universal distress, and sent her a copy of the king's command. The crucial moment had come to her. Should she, could she, be true to her God? The Hebrews of Shushan put on sackcloth, and for three days fasted for the queen. Then she came forth in the strength of her God. Queenly, beautiful, trusting, she stood in the inner court over against the king's house, awaiting the recognition of the monarch of earth, to cross whose will meant death. On one hand she saw death at the hand of Xerxes; on the other, the approval of her God. "*If I perish, I perish,*" she said, and God accepted her sacrifice.

God had prepared from afar for her deliverance. The very act of kindness done years before by Mordecai wrought in the deliverance of his people. Who says there is no record kept of man's acts, or that man performs any deed of kindness unprompted by heavenly beings? God used Esther to save

his people; he also used Mordecai.

Haman, the one who proposed the decree, was hung on a gallows built for Mordecai; Mordecai was promoted to the position of chief counselor of Xerxes; and a decree issued that on the day appointed for the slaughter of the Jews, every Jew should bear arms and defend himself against the Persians. And the fear of the Jews fell upon all the people. Again God had defeated the schemes, not of men only, but of the archenemy. Truth triumphed in spite of the waywardness of his people. This decree of

111

Ahasuerus, or Xerxes, is the counterpart of the decree which will soon be issued by the beast of Revelation thirteen against the followers of God. It will find a people situated as were the Jews in Babylon; it will find others who have withdrawn from Babylon, and as the enemy rushes upon this latter class to slay them, the swords will fall like broken straws, for the angels of God will fight for his people.

This record, given in the book of Esther, is preserved in Bible history that men may know the future. God's dealings with the Jews reveal the principles of his government, and in this history is a graphic description of the sins and deliverance of spiritual Israel.

Xerxes was a cruel, arrogant man, and his character is shown not only in his dealing with the Hebrew race, but with other peoples as well. Not content with the extent of territory under his control, he mustered an immense army—over five million, historians state—and crossed the Hellespont to subdue Grecia. Defeat and disaster accompanied the effort, however, and he returned unto his own kingdom.

The Spirit of God was not yet withdrawn from the Medo-Persian court, and although Xerxes is the last king mentioned in the vision which Daniel saw, yet God was still holding out mercy to the Israelites; and it was during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the successor of Xerxes that the final decree for the return of the Jews was issued. In like manner the grand jubilee will immediately follow Satan's last effort to destroy the people of God.

In the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, the heart of Ezra was stirred by the Spirit of God, and he appealed to the king for assistance. In response to the appeal Artaxerxes issued the commandment recorded in Ezra seven. This is the decree of the year 457 B.C., mentioned in chapter ten, page 126, and is the date from which to reckon the beginning of the two thousand three hundred days of Daniel 8:14, and the seventy weeks of Daniel 9:24. The decree of Artaxerxes included all that was contained in the decrees of Cyrus and Darius, and gave further commandment to build the wall and establish a government.

Eighty years had passed since the decree of Cyrus—eighty years of forbearance; but even after the experience of the days of Esther and Xerxes there was little interest manifested in the rebuilding of Zion, and the company who went with Ezra was small compared with what it should have been. The condition in Jerusalem was discouraging, for there the Jews had intermarried with the Canaanites, bringing in iniquity and confusion. The

Sabbath was desecrated, and the services of the Lord's house were neglected. It was not until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, after Ezra had labored for Israel thirteen years, that Nehemiah came from Babylon and stirred the people into activity. Then, and not till then, were the walls rebuilt. Even then it was fighting with one hand and building with the other, because of a multitude of enemies. It was only then that they began to pay tithe, and to cease from ordinary traffic on the Sabbath; it was then that they put away their heathen wives; but they did it only because threatened by God's wrath.

Truly Israel was stiffnecked and rebellious. A remnant was saved from Babylon, but it was only a remnant; and that remnant, after years of struggling and much halting, was as a brand snatched from the burning. Jerusalem, which might have been the glory of the earth, fell a prey to each succeeding kingdom. Daniel's mind turned to the rising power of the kingdom of Grecia, and Gabriel next spoke of the mighty one who should rule with great dominion. Medo-Persia sank into a state of weakness, and the angel withdrew his sheltering wings; probation was passed for another nation. It, too, had been numbered and found wanting; and its name is dropped by the inspired penman.

The history of the Persian empire, until it passed its zenith, is the history of the decrees; and when that nation ceased to help forward the people upon whom God was still bestowing light, it is lost sight of by the divine historian.

Time waits for neither man nor nation. The life of each individual may be read in the history of the years of Medo-Persian supremacy. Let us hasten our steps toward the New Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XIV

The History Of Greece (Chapter 11:3-13)

"The Greeks Seek after Wisdom." I Cor. 1:22.

THE first two verses of the eleventh chapter of Daniel outline the history of the second kingdom, Medo-Persia. That portion of the chapter included in verses three to thirteen records the history of the third kingdom, Greece. Those things which are "*noted* in the Scripture of truth" concerning Greece are the things which Gabriel made known to Daniel. The prophet had found it difficult to grasp the full significance of the symbols used in previous visions to represent the kingdoms of the world, and so in this last interview between the servant of God and the angel of prophecy, symbols are laid aside, and the history is repeated in plain language.

Notwithstanding the fact that Gabriel gives a plain narrative, the very words he uses, and the facts which he selects from the multitude of events which actually transpired, have a significance. In reading God's Word in any of its parts there is first to be found the story which lies on the surface, and secondly the deeper meaning which is just as truly there, but which must be sought for as with a lighted candle. It is hoped that the reader may at least

catch a glimpse of the deep spiritual lessons while reading the plain narrative of events.

God had a purpose when he gave the history of the four kingdoms, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. There is an incentive to understand these prophecies in the very fact that each nation is represented in a variety of ways, revealing different characteristics. And since Daniel is a prophet for the latter days, there is an increased desire to read not only the history but God's purpose in tracing the history with such unerring accuracy. Babylon, as a nation, as has been seen from the study of Daniel in connection with Revelation, represents a condition of things which will exist in the church of the last days. Great was the splendor of that kingdom, but she was a harlot, and a mother of harlots. Above the city Heaven saw the words, "Mystery of iniquity," for she made all nations drunk with the wine of her fornication. Medo-Persia was a daughter of Babylon, and she played the harlot also; that is, she partook of the sins of Babylon, and departed from the living God. The principles of the religion of Babylon were carried out by the daughter, though the wickedness was in a measure checked by the constant presence

114

of angels in the court, who labored in behalf of the chosen people of God; but the constant tendency toward tyranny and oppression in the government are revealed in the decree of Ahasuerus in the days of Esther.

As Medo-Persia had an important part to play in connection with God's people, and while her part differed from the dealings of Babylon with that same people, so the Greek nation was called of God to do a work—a specific work. She, too, was a daughter of Babylon, partaking of her sins; but these sins, while the same, led to different outward manifestations than in Medo-Persia. Like children of the same family, each reproducing the character of the parents, yet differing widely from one another, so Greece, Medo-Persia, and Rome are three sisters, daughters of the same mother, but each endowed with special features and strong peculiarities.

Greece spans the gulf between the Old and the New Testament. Its telling work as a nation was done during the time when there was no prophet in Israel, the period between Malachi and Christ, hence the book of Daniel is the only portion of the Bible which deals with this nation. The history of Greece can be traced to Javan of the family of Japheth, who, with his sons, settled in the islands of the Mediterranean. The natural divisions of the country by the bays and mountains developed many independent or semi-independent tribes, but they had one common language and one religion.

It would seem that the principles of the worship of Jehovah, as known to the sons of Noah, were carried into the isles of Greece, for throughout the entire system is traceable a close resemblance to the ceremonial law with its types and shadows, as carried on in Jerusalem in the days of Solomon. Again, when it is remembered that the kingdom of the Jews, in the days of its prosperity, was visited by representatives from all nations, it is easy to understand how the forms and ceremonies of the worship of Jehovah were adopted by the Greeks. Even the architecture of Palestine, especially the temple of Solomon, became a model to the Greeks, who were lovers of the

beautiful. Everything that is good and beautiful in the world has its origin in the mind of God.

The gross idolatry of Babylon and Egypt was replaced in Greece by a more refined worship, if there can be said to be degrees of refinement in licentiousness. At any rate, Greek customs were less revolting on the surface, and hence more subtle and ensnaring. the aesthetic taste of the Greeks was developed by being in close contact with nature. They studied nature, and not having God's Word as an interpreter, they worshiped the forms instead of the Creator. They recognized the power of life, but not

115
knowing the source of life, they were led into licentious practices, known as "*the mysteries*," where things which are sacred were defiled with drinking and passionate indulgence.

There is a pathetic strain throughout their history. They came so close to the God of nature, and yet not knowing him, they wandered in such utter darkness. There is a constant reminder of the fate of those students of today who seek to understand natural phenomena, but do not interpret nature by the word of its Creator. They, too, worship Zeus and Demeter, Pluto, or Poseidon, instead of the Christ. The fact is that the children of to-day are fed upon the myths and traditions of this very people, who were groping in darkness, worshiping the gods of Olympus, and ignorant of the God whose voice shook the mountains in every storm, whose smile was in every sunbeam, and whose rivers watered the fields.

The Greeks offered sacrifices, but of what value were they when they accepted not the sacrifice of the slain Lamb of God? the spirit of prophecy was cherished, but while God's prophets mingled with the people, the Greek prophetess was a maiden of questionable character, secluded from the people, who received her inspiration from a vapor which poured from a rent in a rock over which the temple of Delphi was built.

There was a priesthood, the duties of whose members were to reveal the will of the gods. The sacred feasts of Jehovah's people were replaced by the national games of the Greeks. As the passover and the feast of tabernacles called the Hebrew race together, and promoted unity and a love of God, so the Greek games gathered that people together, promoting one common language, religion, and law. God's people met for spiritual worship; the Greeks for physical or intellectual enjoyment.

The history of Greece is the history of physical and intellectual culture. The people admired grace and beauty, and her literary minds worshiped the intellect. Plato, the greatest of Greek philosophers, lived four hundred years before Christ, and his teachings have led the thoughts of writers in every age since then. The Jews mingled the teachings of the Bible with the philosophy of Plato, and that formed the traditions of men, against which Christ so often warned his followers. The false philosophy, and the "science falsely so called" of Paul's time, was Greek teaching, which breathed the spirit of Plato and his students.

Plato's writings have replaced the Bible with many, and a large number of modern writers, both of prose and poetry, recognize him as their intellectual

leader. The philosophy of this man was often good, and he admired truth;
116

but the error lay in admiring or assenting to truth, and failing to live it out. His followers came under the condemnation of Christ, together with the Pharisees, of whom he said, "*They say, but do not.*"

Here, in Greek religion and Greek learning, was the most subtle form of that mixture of truth and error which Satan offered at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which existed from the days of Eden to the time of Greece. Babylon enslaved the bodies of God's people, Medo-Persia made laws to slay them, but Greece captured their minds, and enslaved them to her ideas. She counterfeited so neatly, so adroitly, the spiritual teachings of the Old Testament; and so quietly, yet so surely, wound her tendrils about God's people, that her slavery was far worse than that of Egypt or Babylon. It is this influence which must be taken into consideration while following the history of the Greeks as given by Gabriel. The angel had said, "*When I am gone forth [from Persia], lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.*" And of Greece, he says, "*A mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.*" It is in this language that Alexander is introduced in the divine records. He was not a Greek, but a Macedonian, the son of Philip of Macedon. He stands in history as one of those strong characters whom God uses in spite of the fact that they are unacquainted with him, and know not his manner of working. Alexander, in Greek history, corresponds in some ways to Cyrus, the Persian.

Alexander, as a boy, showed an indomitable will, and as he grew to manhood the trait strengthened. He was educated by Aristotle, the illustrious pupil of Plato, in the wisdom of the Greeks. When twenty years of age, Philip, king of Macedon, died, leaving the government to Alexander. This was the year 336 B.C. Alexander united the independent states of Greece, and placed himself at the head of their amphictyonic council. The Greeks were ambitious, and the new general organized an army for foreign conquest.

The third kingdom was represented by a leopard with four wings on its back. This symbol covered the time not only when Alexander was king, but during its divided state, as well. The swiftness of conquest is well represented by the wings of a fowl; the cunning, insinuating nature by the lithe form of the leopard, and the mingling together of truth and error in its doctrines and practices by the spots. "*Can the leopard change his spots?*"

No more could Greece give truth without a portion of the false; no more can
117

truth and error be separated in that system of education founded upon the wisdom of the Greeks—her philosophy, her myths, and her nature teaching. Again Daniel saw the progress of this third nation, as a rough goat coming from the west without touching the earth. This marks the rapidity of the conquests carried on by Alexander. It was Granicus, Asia Minor, Issus, Tyre, Gaza, with the surrender of all Egypt; Arbela, Babylon, Susa, Bactria, and India—all in the space of eight short years. Having conquered those who

opposed him, he planned to unite the extensive territory over which he bore sway. He was an organizer and diplomat as well as a general. By marrying a princess of Babylon, and giving several members of the royal family of Persia in marriage to his generals, he sought to win the favor of the conquered races. It was while in Babylon, directing affairs in that ancient Eastern capital, that Alexander died, probably as a result of intemperance and excess. He was still a young man, but the nations of the world bowed at his feet.

In following the rapid conquests of Alexander,—symbolized by the goat which touched not the ground,—no mention has yet been made of the Jews. As God brought Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus in direct contact with his people, that they might know the God of heaven, so he permitted Alexander to learn of him. While that conqueror was passing from Tyre, after its surrender, toward Gaza, which guards the entrance into Egypt, he stopped at Jerusalem. Josephus states that great consternation filled the city when it was known that the Greek warrior was coming. But the high priest, Juddas, had a dream in which he was bidden to go out to meet Alexander, arrayed in his priestly garments, and accompanied by the temple officers clad in white. When Alexander met this company, much to the surprise of his army and generals, he bowed to the ground to worship the God whose name was on the miter worn by the high priest. He then accompanied the priest to the temple at Jerusalem, where the sacrifices were explained. Moreover, the prophecies of Daniel concerning the rise and fall of Babylon, the conquests of Medo-Persia, and its subsequent fall and the rise of a third empire were explained. Daniel, who had witnessed before Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, was then quoted to Alexander. The mighty conqueror was in the presence of the Spirit of God, and was given the message that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. Would he bow in submission, and let God conquer for him? This was the opportune moment in his life.

118

Alexander acknowledged God, but left Jerusalem and pushed forward in battle. Gaza fell. Egypt was entered, and there, in order to gratify a selfish pride, he had himself proclaimed son of Jupiter Ammon. He who might have become a son of God chose rather to be called the son of Jupiter. The result of Greek education and learning is fully exemplified in this one act. The outcome of such a choice—a fit consummation of all Greek teaching—was met at Babylon when the king, at his very prime, laid down and died with no hope for the future. It is sad but impressive commentary for those who seek the ways of the world in preference to the truths of God.

One thing which the inspired historian notes, is, that he would do "according to his will." When man makes such a resolution, it means that he has been offered a choice between God and Satan, and has chosen the latter. There are but *two* minds in the universe, and he who rejects God may claim that he exercises his own mind, but it means that he is swayed by the mind of the enemy of God. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus," for it brings liberty. The spirit which wishes to exalt self is imitating

the philosophy of the Greeks, and its result is death; for Greek philosophy is but a continuation of the philosophy used to deceive Adam and Eve in Eden at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Alexander left no heirs to the throne who could hold the reins of government. His eldest son was a child of five. A number of strong men had acted as generals of the army during the march through Asia, and on the death of the emperor eight of these contended for supremacy. None, however, were strong enough to subdue all the others. For about twenty years there was war and contention. Finally in 302 B.C. it was settled that Ptolemy should hold Egypt; Seleucus should take Syria and the east; Lysimachus had Thrace and Asia Minor, and Cassander was located in Greece. The territory of Alexander was divided, but "*not* to his posterity;" neither was the strength of these four equal to that of Alexander, and the four partitions lasted but a few years. Greece, which was under the rule of Cassander, was taken by Lysimachus, thus uniting the western and northern divisions.

In 281 B.C., after intrigues too numerous to mention, Seleucus met Lysimachus and slew him in battle. This reduced the four divisions to two, the rulers of which were afterward distinguished as kings of the north and the south. Seleucus, the king of the north, now held territory which had formerly belonged to three generals, while Ptolemy retained the southern division. This agrees with the words of Gabriel to Daniel. The fifth verse, 119

according to Spurrell, reads: "*Then* shall the king of the south, even one of his [Alexander's] princes be strong; yet shall another exceed him in strength and have dominion; a grand dominion shall be his dominion."

The Ptolemy who gained Egypt was surnamed Soter, or Saviour, and on his death he was succeeded by his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus. The Seleucus who gained the three divisions was succeeded by his son Antiochus Soter, who was killed by the Gauls in Asia Minor. The third in the line of Greco-Syriac kings was Antiochus Theos, who was reigning in Syria while Ptolemy Philadelphus was on the Egyptian throne.

There is, however, something aside from the mere succession of kings which is worthy of notice. Gabriel gave Daniel the framework of the history of Greece. We have in the inspired record something which corresponds to the skeleton in the human body, and the flesh and organs of life need to be put in. These nations which were then in existence were a shelter, perhaps, a scaffolding, built about God's people, offering them another opportunity to work. The Spirit of God was working in the courts of monarchs as faithfully as ever. At the same time the controversy between truth and error never for a moment abated.

It might seem to the casual observer that Greece was not in reality a ruling power in the sense that Babylon and Medo-Persia were universal monarchies. Let us see: From the first it has been noted that Greece was an intellectual ruler rather than a power which held the bodies of men in slavery. If we may personify Greek *intellect* in an abstract way, we may say that Alexander was the tool in its hand for building up a kingdom where it

might hold sway. He did this work well; and while he individually fell, the Greek language, learning, and customs were introduced into all countries where his arms had opened the way. The Greek religion, with its mysteries, was accepted in Syria and Asia Minor; Greek games were celebrated in the eastern provinces. But Greek education took a position ahead even of her religion, and Greek teachers and scholars followed in the wake of the conqueror. Greek was the language most used, and Greek books were in demand. The city of Alexandria in Egypt was founded by Alexander, and it became the center of Greek learning. Egyptian idolatry and Greek philosophy sat enthroned beside each other. As the Encyclopedia Britannica states it, "*In Egypt a Greek aristocracy of office, birth, and intellect existed side by side with a distinct native life.*"

Israel had once been miraculously delivered from physical bondage in Egypt. They had been warned against fleeing to Egypt for protection in the 120

days of Nebuchadnezzar at the siege of Jerusalem. They may have escaped the bondage of those earlier times, but they were captured by the learning of the Greeks. In the days of Ptolemy Soter, many Jews flocked into Egypt, and those who remained in Jerusalem and Palestine imbibed many of the ideas of the Greeks.

It has been stated that the history of Greece fills the time between the prophecy of Malachi and John the Baptist. We are now ready to appreciate the reason why Israel was so long without the sound of the prophet's voice. God gave Israel a system of education, separate and distinct from the system of all other nations; a system which, if followed, would forever make it impossible for the people to go into captivity. But Israel often gave up her God-given system for the teaching of heathen nations.

When the Jews returned from Babylon, they were strongly tinctured with Babylonian ideas of education and religion. This prepared them to accept with readiness the teachings of the Greeks. The rabbis of Jerusalem mingled the principles of Greek philosophy so thoroughly with the statutes of Jehovah, which they were commanded to teach the children, that from the death of Malachi to the birth of John the Baptist, there was not a family in Judah to whom the education of a prophet could be intrusted.

The Greek games were performed in Jerusalem itself, and Jewish youth, dressed only in the scarf and broad hat in imitation of the god Hermes, wrestled like the Athenian athletes. It is stated by Dr. Mears that the priests, when the signal was given for the sports, left their work in the temple to watch the games. Greek names replaced the Jewish in many instances, and even priests intermarried with the Greeks. It is no wonder that Gabriel gave specific instruction concerning the name to be given the babe of Zacharias and Elizabeth, for although there was once a time when every child in Israel was named under the inspiration of the Spirit, the Israelites had now chosen Greece in place of God.

The whole Jewish teaching was Hellenized; and when John the Baptist was born, his mother and father were commanded to leave the city of Jerusalem, and educate the child in the desert, away from the influence of the schools

and society of the Jews. Christ himself never entered the schools of his day because of the mixture of the truth of God with heathen philosophy. Greek teaching exalted nature; but the Son of God could not hear the voice of the Father in the teachings, of the schools, and he wandered through the woods alone, or in company with his mother. Then it was that nature, the great object lesson of the Creator, was opened to his expanding mind. Other

121

Jewish youth sat at the feet of the rabbis, learning what the spirit of the Greeks taught, and they crucified the Lord of life.

It is a wonderful thing to man, who is so limited in means, to watch the workings of God, who is so limitless in resources. When the Jews fled to Egypt, then God took advantage of their presence there, and turned it to his glory. Ptolemy Philadelphus founded the Alexandrian Library, and it was he who encouraged the translation of the Old Testament into Greek. It was thus that the prophecies concerning the promised Messiah were put into the universal language nearly three hundred years before the birth of Christ. The world might become intoxicated with Greek philosophy, but God left man without excuse by placing the word of life in the household tongue of the nations. Satan may scheme, and his agents on earth may be wise, but they can do nothing against the truth without in that very act promoting the truth. While the dark wings of paganism were drawing closer and closer about the world, to shut out if possible the very light of heaven, the word of God, as a lighted candle, a torch among the sheaves, was shining under that darkness, and proclaiming the advent of the Desire of all ages.

The first verses in the history of Greece (Dan. 11: 3-5) bring the student face to face with that country as an intellectual power, and reveal the secret of her strength to be in her language and philosophy. She conquered the world by bringing all minds under her control. It was the plan of the enemy of truth to subjugate minds to a false philosophy; and since this was the scheme upon which he worked in Greece, it was under this same national influence that the truth which frees the mind was given to the world. How far-reaching then were the purposes of God.

Another great principle lies side by side with the one given in those first verses. This second, which is hidden in verses six to thirteen, has to do with the working out of those same principles through the government as a channel. The kingdom of Alexander resolved itself into two divisions, a northern and a southern. Both were Hellenized, but the northern represented more truly Greek principles, while the southern division was strongly tinged with the old Egyptian ideas both of government and religion. It was the northern division which carried forward the work of the prophecy as symbolized by the leopard and the rough goat, and it was from the northern division that the little horn of Daniel 8 proceeded. Consequently it must be right to conclude that it is the Greco-Syriac division, rather than the Egyptian division, which will do the work of which Alexander was the forerunner. Nevertheless there will be throughout the ages until the end of

122

time a strength rising from the south and opposing the northern power. This

will again be seen in the Mohammedan work of the Middle Ages during the supremacy of the fourth beast. But we must watch the working out of the principle during the life of the third kingdom, as that is introductory in itself to the future work.

History reveals the fact that the greatest strength in government is found in those powers whose territory extends from east to west, and that nations which try to govern territory extending far to the north and the south have trouble. It is in recognition of this fact that each universal empire has progressed mainly from east to west, and each succeeding kingdom has gone farther to the west than the preceding ones. This continues until the globe is encircled, and all the kings of the earth finally meet in the great battle of Armageddon.

In spite of this controlling principle among nations, and in face of the decree of the Holy Watcher, the north and the south attempted to unite. Worldly policy of intermarriage was followed, and as Spurrell renders verse 6, "*After* some years they [the kings of the north and the south] shall be associated; for the daughter of the king of the south [Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus] shall come to the king of the north [Antiochus Theos] to make agreements." Antiochus put away his lawful wife, Laodice, in order to marry Berenice, and the results of this transgression of God's law are given by the pen of inspiration. "*The* arm shall not retain its strength, neither shall their offspring be established; but she shall be given up, and her attendants, and her child, and her supporters at those times." Human pen can not make the history any plainer than did Gabriel in relating it to Daniel nearly two hundred years before it occurred. Berenice lost favor in the eyes of Antiochus Theos, who thereupon recalled Laodice. The jealous wife then caused Antiochus to be poisoned, and placed her own son on the throne. Through her influence, also, Berenice, her child by Antiochus, and her Egyptian attendants and supporters, were all murdered.

This aroused the royal house of Egypt, and a brother of Berenice, a shoot from her roots, advanced into the territory of Antiochus with a large army. "He shall rule within the fortifications of the kings of the north, and shall war against them and shall prevail." Ptolemy Euergetes, son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, is here described. He not only invaded Syria, but went to Babylon, where he found some of the Egyptian gods and molten images which Cambyses had captured during his war in Egypt. These Ptolemy returned, and for this was named Euergetes (benefactor) by his grateful

123

people. It is said that he carried to Egypt forty thousand talents of silver and many vessels of silver and gold. Ptolemy Euergetes then returned to his own kingdom, where he outlived Antiochus Callinicus, the son of Laodice. But trouble did not cease then. There was a natural jealousy and antipathy between the north and the south. Ptolemy Euergetes held much of Syria on the death of Antiochus Callinicus. Two sons of Callinicus undertook to regain the lost territory, and redeem the honor of their father. The first was weak and inefficient; the younger, Antiochus Magnus, who took the throne in the course of a few years, was stronger. He is the "*one*" who advanced

speedily, regaining much of the lost territory.

About the time of the accession of Antiochus Magnus to the Syrian throne, Ptolemy Philopater took the throne in Egypt. He manifested no disposition to invade the territory of the king of the north, being indolent, and a great lover of luxury and ease, but he was aroused by the prospects of an invasion of Egypt, his own throne being threatened by Antiochus Magnus. Antiochus was supported by an immense army, which fell into the hands of Ptolemy Philopater, who, elated by his victory, returned to his capital to feast.

Although he had cast down ten thousand soldiers, yet he did not profit by the victory. Nothing was gained; it was but a merciless slaughter of human beings; a contest for brute supremacy which is hateful in the sight of God and man. The difference is striking between such warfare and the progress of mighty generals whom God used to establish kingdoms and punish kings. Ptolemy Philopater did even worse things, for in self-esteem he entered Jerusalem, and attempted to profane the temple by himself offering sacrifice. The restraint offered by the priests so incensed him that he began war against them, and history states that between forty and sixty thousand Jews, who then lived in Egypt, fell by the sword. Those Jews who sought Egypt, either for protection or for the advantages of her schools and libraries, withdrew from the sheltering hand of their God, and the time came sooner or later when they felt the wrath of the enemy. Through all these struggles the nation whom God had chosen might have stood as a beacon on a hill, instead of being trampled upon by every army in its marches between Egypt and Syria. Nay, more, the location of the Jews in Palestine and her capital was by divine appointment. They were at the gateway of the nations, and might have held the balance of power. Had they held aloft the sword of the Spirit, all nations would have bowed before their kings and paid tribute into their treasury. It was so in the days of Solomon; it might have been repeated in the days of Greek history.

124

Alexander's act of reverence when he met the company of priests at Jerusalem should have been an object lesson to all Judea of what God by his Spirit would cause all nations to do. But so blinded by Greek teaching were those Jewish leaders, even at that time, that they failed to see this. Instead of flocking to Alexandria for the wisdom of Greece, nations *should* have sent their youth to schools of the prophets at Jerusalem, and scholars of the world *should* have sought wisdom from those who knew the God of wisdom. But it was not so. Israel then was as the church of to-day. Instead of leading by virtue of the spiritual life, she sought the wisdom of Egypt and Greece. Such things bring sadness to the angels of God.

Peace was finally concluded between Philopater and Antiochus Magnus, which lasted fourteen years, until the death of Ptolemy. Ptolemy Philopater was succeeded by his son Ptolemy Epiphanes, who was in his minority. Antiochus Magnus took advantage of this seeming weakness in Egyptian affairs, and made extensive preparations to invade Egypt with the design of swallowing the entire dominion of the Ptolemies, But the Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and Antiochus was brought to realize that there

was another power on earth as well as in heaven.

In verse 14 the voice of the fourth beast is heard; Rome placed itself on the side of the helpless king, and Antiochus found his ambition thwarted. The life of the Greek kingdom is spent. There were still many years of struggle, but it was a struggle for existence, not for added territory. But what Greece would not gain in territory she did gain as a teacher of nations, and although she finally lost all territorial supremacy, though like the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, the tree was cut down, yet the roots remain unto this day. More than once as an intellectual power Greece has arisen. Throughout the intellectual world she has votaries bowing before her shrine –the mind of man. Her philosophy is to-day studied under the guise of modern writers; her ideas are instilled into the minds of children, from the kindergarten to the universities, and students graduate from the schools of the land knowing much more of the mythology of Greece than they do of the religion of Jesus Christ; better acquainted with Greek heroes than with the Man of Calvary. Greek learning still rules the world, and it will until the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God–till the stone cut out without hands shall fill the earth.

As the Jews during the days of Alexander and his successors were without excuse, so the Israel of to-day has set before it the wisdom of the Eternal in contrast with the wisdom of Greece. And the message is, "Choose ye this

125
day" at which shrine thou wilt bow. Sitting at the feet of Jesus, learning of him, taking his word as the authentic history of the world, his truth as the interpreter of nature, will insure eternal life. Accepting the writings of men, human speculations regarding the history of the world, its creation, its age, placing a human interpretation upon the works of nature, and seeking to find out by experiment and speculation what must be known by faith,—this brings death; for it leads away from Christ, the center of the universe, the source of all wisdom—the great drawing power of creation. The first is the system of God, of which faith is the motive power; the second is the Greek system, which exalts human reasoning. One may not bow down to the idols of Egypt, nor drink of the wines of Babylon, but if he is entrapped by the more pleasing sophistries of Greece, his fate is the same in the end.

For this reason Eternal Truth has shone along the pathway of men in all ages to guard against the enemy. In these last days, when all the evil of the past is renewed and presented to man in all its varied forms, then it is that Greek philosophy and skepticism come forth in full force. A heart filled with truth is the only safeguard against error.

126

CHAPTER XV

The Fourth Kingdom (Chapter 11:14-22)

THE fourteenth verse of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, as we have seen, introduces a new power. Gabriel, in narrating the events connected with the history of Greece, brought that empire down to the time when the southern division was in the hands of a child, Ptolemy Epiphanes, and when two

men, Philip of Macedon and Antiochus of Syria, although jealous of each other, were willing to unite their strength in order to subdue Egypt. From a political point of view a general weakness prevailed in the once mighty empire of Alexander. Without noticing the details, the angel of prophecy speaks of the first appearance of the fourth kingdom as it comes in contact with the divisions of the third kingdom, Greece. This fourth kingdom is thus introduced: "The violent opposers of thy people shall exalt themselves that the vision may stand." (Spurrell.)

Since every word is divinely given, there is a significance in the very introduction of what is about to become the mightiest kingdom of the earth, and at the same time the greatest enemy which the people of God ever had to meet. Daniel had seen this kingdom before. In the vision of the seventh chapter, Rome was represented as a beast too terrible to name. Its characteristics were to devour, to stamp in pieces, and to break. During a part of its history it should speak great words against the Most High; it should wear out the saints of God, and think even to change his laws. So troubled was the prophet over the view in his first vision that he sought for a special explanation of this fourth kingdom.

In his next vision the fourth kingdom was again shown under the symbol of a little horn, which sprang from one of the divisions of Alexander's kingdom. In this view Rome was presented in no milder form than in the previous vision. It was as a king with a "fierce countenance,"

"understanding dark sentences," having mighty power—a power even more than human. It was to be a scheming, underhanded government, and its most cruel practices were seen to be against God's chosen people. Yea, against Christ, the Prince of princes, the Prince of the covenant, this power should stand up. Gabriel spoke of the robbers who should exalt themselves to establish the vision—that is, to fulfill the description just given.

127

Putting all these thoughts together, it will be seen that Rome, the fourth kingdom, the successor of Greece, would be noted for the decisive policy which it maintained. Each nation in the prophetic chain had some strong feature, and its history is recorded as an object lesson to the world, as in the days of its life it had been an object lesson to the watching multitudes of other worlds. Babylon was an example of Satan's power to establish a *religion* which counterfeited the heavenly worship. The result was the basest form of idolatry, a fornication which makes her the personification, among Bible writers, of all vileness. Medo-Persia was a type of Oriental despotism. *"The law of the Medes and Persians changeth not;"* this was a proverb among the nations. But it was with the kings of this nation that Gabriel and Michael wrought; it was the heads of this despotism who were kept in check by the power of the King of kings.

Greece was altogether different from the preceding two, and instead of gaining recognition because of the form of religion or government, she gained control of the world by the power of her intellect. With her education and philosophy she gained a foothold which no other nation ever held. When Babylon was overthrown and Medo-Persia was no more,

Greece lived on in the *minds* of men.

But the fourth kingdom was "*diverse* from all the others." As represented to John, Rome, the beast of Rev. 13:2, combined the characteristics of the leopard, the bear, and the lion. There was united the false system of the religion of ancient Babylon, the governmental tyranny of Medo-Persia, and the mixture of good and evil in the intellectual culture of Greece. When the religion and educational system, or intellectual statutes, and the governmental history of a nation is given, there remains little else worth relating. So in the one nation, Rome, is embodied the strength of all previous nations. What wonder that it was a terrible and dreadful nation, and that except the time of its supremacy should be shortened there should be none left to witness for the truth! It is to this power that we are introduced in the fourteenth verse of Daniel 11.

It was in the year 201 B.C. that the child, Ptolemy Epiphanes, fell heir to the throne of Egypt, and the kings of Macedon and Syria planned his overthrow and the division of his empire. It was then that Rome arose to prominence before the prophet's eye. But Rome had already been in existence for years, and during those years had been accumulating strength to enable her to enter the arena with a bound when the proper time should come. The traditional history of Rome dates as far back as the middle of the eighth
128

century before Christ. That was before the days of Nebuchadnezzar and the glories of Babylon. In the days when Isaiah began to prophesy then Rome was founded. It was said to be the home of a band of robbers and outlaws, and one of the first acts was the theft of the women of a neighboring city as wives for these early settlers. So if Romans are called the children of robbers, the character can not be denied. The Romans were a stalwart, sturdy race, and from the first began the development of a strong central government. In this undertaking men were aided by the prince of this world, the devil himself; for the dragon, that old serpent, called the devil and Satan, gave the fourth beast "*his* power and his seat, and great authority." The force of all history is lost unless the student recognizes each nation as an actor in the great plan of redemption—one of the participants in the great controversy between Christ and Satan. As the plans of the arch-enemy had failed to carry in the history of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece, he now attempted with redoubled vigor to thwart the plans of God. He chose for this purpose the seven-hilled city. His plans were deep laid, and the structure that he reared was builded on a firm foundation. Like a lighthouse off some rocky coast, the great planner hoped it would stand the mighty dashings of the waves of truth. It was his last, his supreme effort, for it is this kingdom in one of its manifestations which stands until the end of time. In its earliest days Rome was ruled by kings, but it was impossible for a Western king to imitate the customs of the Oriental monarchies. Greek governments spanned the gulf between early despotism and the liberality of more modern Western nations. There were two classes of men in Rome, and they demanded representation in the government. At the end of two hundred and fifty years the kings were dethroned, and the rule of consuls substituted.

This provided that two consuls from the wealthy class, the patricians, should hold the reins of government. For the next two centuries there was a struggle between patricians and plebeians for equal rights. The principles of republicanism were struggling for birth. Gradually the patricians lost power, until at last the government rested in the hands of the people—that is, citizens of Rome. But there were conquered cities, especially in the peninsula of Italy. "Roman dominion in Italy was a dominion of a city over cities." Finally rights of citizenship were granted to most of these.

God's government is a representative government, and while he sits as King of kings, he bears sway by common consent, and his subjects from all the worlds have representatives in the councils of heaven. Satan, as prince of
129

this world, was a representative in those days in that council. In Rome he attempted to counterfeit that phase of the divine government.

It was as a republic that Rome began her career as a conquering nation. Her constitution was the result of a gradual growth of two centuries, Having her authority recognized throughout Italy, of which Rome was the center, she began acquiring territory by force of arms. Carthage, a rival city on the south of the Mediterranean, was the first point of attack, and for one hundred years Rome fought for supremacy. It was a bitter struggle, which could end in nothing less than the annihilation of one of the contending parties. Ridpath aptly expresses the policy of the government when he says, "*They* [the Romans] took what they could and then took the remainder."

During the years when Rome hovered over Carthage, like an eagle ready to descend upon its prey, she was also carrying on wars of aggression in other directions. Both the West and the East were invaded. Spain was made a subjected province; all the citizens were taxed; the silver and gold mines, the wealth of that country, were confiscated as state property, and no city was allowed to fortify itself without the consent of Rome. This was so-called republicanism—the equal rights of men—as understood and practiced by Rome.

The inhabitants of Corsica and Sardinia were sold in the slave markets of Rome, and so numerous were these slaves, says Livy, that "*Sardinians* for sale" became a proverbial expression for anything cheap. This also was Roman republicanism! Macedonia and Greece were in a state of turmoil, and Rome interfered. After conferences and wars, independence was proclaimed to all Greeks. This was one of the policy schemes by which the republic worked, but liberty lasted for only a brief space. A few years later all those Macedonians who were able to govern themselves were carried to Rome, while those left were inexperienced men who soon played into the hands of the Roman senate. One hundred and fifty thousand Greeks were sold as slaves, and the treasures taken paid all expenses contracted during the war. So high was the tribute exacted from subjected provinces that it relieved Roman citizens of all taxes for future wars. This was independence as granted subjected provinces by the republic of Rome!

The family of andochus was still bearing sway in the Eastern world. It was andochus IV who proposed to unite with Philip V of Macedon against the

young king of Egypt when Rome interfered. But mild interference was never enough for Rome, although she sometimes assumed to play that role for a time. andochus the Great in the single battle of Magnesia (B.C. 190)

130

lost all his conquests in Asia Minor. He was obliged to pay three thousand talents, and an annual subsidy of one thousand talents, for twelve years.

Rome controlled Egypt because the education of the heir to the throne was in the hand of a Roman senator, and a Roman army stood ready to defend the country against all attacks from the north or east. Roman power thus encircled the Mediterranean.

The liberty granted to conquered nations was a myth. Rome was a republic only in name. It was as impossible for Rome to grant liberty to her dependencies as it would be for Satan himself to manifest the attributes of God. Any nation, it matters not what its pretensions, nor the wording of its constitution, nor the will of some of its people, that departs from the principles of liberty of conscience, will find it impossible to maintain a republic other than in name. This is true also in individual experience, and liberty is known only when Christ is enthroned in the heart.

There are always certain other results which accompany wars of conquest. For instance, this policy demands a large army. In the early days of Rome the army was made up of men who left the plow and the shop for the defense of their country, and when war was over, returned to their homes and their trades; but as war became a regular business, generals found it to their advantage to keep their soldiers in readiness. "*The* soldiery were not so much servants of the state as attached to the person of a successful general, whom they regarded as their patron." The way was thus open for military despotism, and Rome experienced that form of government more than once. The senate, supposed to represent the people, became a corporation greedy for gain and enriched by the spoils of war. Senatorial favorites received rich provinces to govern, and bribery was almost universally practiced. "*The* power of the purse" was in the hands of the senate alone. To their influence may be added the constant and steady growth of the cities, and the decline of the rural population, a practice always ruinous to republicanism, and one always encouraged by a false system of education and religion.

Tradition made the Romans the descendants of the god of war, Mars, the Bruiser, and they were true to the character. Said the inspired penman, "It shall break in pieces and bruise." Christ came to Rome as the Prince of peace, the binder up of wounds, the healer of the brokenhearted.

The religion of Rome was secondary to its government. That is, the state was the one all absorbing institution. A man in Rome was great, not because of any character he bore, or deed he may have done, but for the simple fact

131

that he was a Roman citizen. Name took the place of character. Here is seen the reverse of truth. With God it is character which gives the name; with Rome it was name independent of character.

Although religion was subservient to the state, yet the form of religion in Rome played an important part in its history, especially in the second or

papal phase. Since the papacy was a continuation of paganism, it is necessary to notice its leading features. There were no sweet singers as David the Bethlehemite; the nature study of the Greeks was also lacking. There were gods many and lords many, but a stern nature characterized all worship, Man was deified and canonized. The very name Augustus, which was applied to a long line of emperors, meant *divine*.

In the Roman temples a body of priests performed the sacred rites, but they were appointed by the state. The highest religious officer during the life of paganism was the Pontifex Maximus, the pope of paganism, and he was a civil officer. The religious hierarchy, consisting of priests, augurs, vestals and Pontifex Maximus, paved the way for the papal hierarchy of later days, just as the transition from republicanism to imperialism opened the gate for papal supremacy.

In literature and education Rome borrowed largely from Greece, so that the intellectual supremacy of that nation must be traced to Greece, although the man of learning was often a slave sold in the markets of his captors.

It was, however, the education which prevailed in Greece, and which was copied by Rome, that trained a class of citizens for warfare, from tyranny, and for the papacy.

Roman law is extolled as the basis of all civil law to-day. It was developed gradually as before stated, and the wheat of truth was mingled with the tares of error. It was good and evil, like the tree of which Adam partook in the garden. This is seen in latter-day applications of those laws. The Greek worship of mind or reason, applied to Roman love of law, made the lawyer of Rome the forefather of that class of reasoners who to-day sway the world by argument rather than by the rule of justice.

Satan has but one plan—that is the development of sin; God has but one—the unfolding of truth and love. All history is an object lesson, showing how God thwarts the thousand ways by which the devil's plans are unfolding, and national history is but individual experience on a large scale.

Students very often read the story of nations, forgetting that they have before them a picture of their own lives. National history, rather than

132

individual experience, is given in prophecy, because it is like a magnified view thrown on the canvas, revealing details that would be overlooked in the study of one man. It should be remembered that when principles are referred to, such as republicanism, Protestantism, monarchy, papacy, liberty, or oppression, each has an application in man dealing with man, in church members' dealings with one another, and in nation with nation.

With these facts in mind, the prophecies of Daniel concerning Rome may be understood. It seems that Gabriel called attention to the fourth kingdom, not at the beginning of its existence, but at the time when all the principles previously set forth were well developed, and in just the stage to grow rapidly when the proper environments should be offered. The republic was in reality dead, although its corpse was yet unburied, and men were unwilling to acknowledge that life had really departed. During the transition period between the republic and the fullfledged empire of verse 20, a

number of actors took a prominent part. It was a time of severe contest between men to see who could best serve the purpose of the controller of affairs who stood behind the throne of earthly monarchs. As the republic lost power, a corporation composed of Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus took the reins of government. Crassus controlled the money, Pompey had the army, and Caesar was the master mind.

The Roman army, with Pompey as leader, swept through Asia Minor and Syria, and the entire kingdom of the Seleucidae fell at his feet. Andoch and every fortified station of the Eastern empire crumbled as he advanced.

Pompey, called upon to decide between rulers of the Jews, entered Jerusalem, and, as in times past, the knowledge of the God of Israel was made known to the nation which was leading the world. Pompey, however, acted very differently from Alexander. He entered the city by force after a siege of three months; the walls were demolished and the Jews put under tribute to the Roman government. Rome now stood "in the glorious land which by his hand shall be consumed." This was in B.C. 63.

The wisdom of God in choosing Palestine as the home of the Jews is recognized more and more as history progresses. There was no mistake in the location, and there was no lowering of the standard set for that nation. In the days of Roman supremacy, as in the days of Solomon, it was the divine will that Israel should be the light of the world. They were intrusted with the sacred oracles of truth, and each nation was brought to them as to a fountain of living water. Had the Hebrew race been true to its appointed duty, the history of the whole world would read entirely different. Rome came to

133

Jerusalem came because sent of God, but the well was a cracked and leaky cistern, and the soul-thirst of the nation could not be quenched. As a result, Rome enslaved the Jews: the power of life which repels the enemy was *lacking*.

It was during the rule of the first triumvirate that Egypt, the kingdom of the south, was again entered by Rome. The Roman senate in whose charge Cleopatra and her brother, Ptolemy Dionysius, had been placed by their father, had requested Pompey to visit Egypt to settle difficulties. Pompey, however, was slain while crossing to the land in a small boat. Caesar entered Alexandria shortly after and espoused the cause of Cleopatra who had been obliged to flee from the capital. Caesar was victorious over the ruling faction in Alexandria, and before leaving the city, enthroned Cleopatra and graced his triumph in Rome with Arsinoe, a representative of the royal family of the Ptolemies. History states that Caesar spent some nine months in Egypt, which was unusual for this general, as his rapid movements from place to place were one secret of his success.

Caesar as a general stood in a position to accomplish for the fourth kingdom what Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, and Alexander had done for the former three, but we have no record that he even acknowledged God as a ruler of nations. He was fascinated and corrupted by the queen of Egypt. The seventeenth verse, while describing a particular event in history, also symbolizes the corrupting influence of Egypt whenever the north came in touch with the

south. Egypt was a blight to men and nations alike, from the days of Abraham to Caesar, and its influence still lives, a type of sin and bondage. Leaving Egypt, Caesar passed along the coast of Palestine and Asia Minor, receiving the submission of all peoples with such rapidity that he sent the famous dispatch to Rome, "I came, I saw, I conquered" (*Veni, Vidi, Vici*). He returned to Rome, where he altered laws, strengthened the senate, settled disturbances in the army, and later brought western Africa, which had revolted, into submission.

Caesar was an organizer as well as a warrior, and displayed greater liberality and breadth of ideas than any previous ruler. Roman franchise was granted to the citizens of many cities hitherto excluded, and all scientific men, of whatever nationality, were equally honored. Still greater plans for Roman improvement were found among his papers after death. He was nearing the pinnacle of earthly fame when he fell, pierced by a score of daggers, in the presence of the senate which he controlled. He "stumbled and fell," leaving no heir to the throne. Another great man had passed from

134

the scene of action. Heaven was watching, for the birth of the Son of man was near at hand.

It was the year 44 B.C. when the plans of Julius Caesar were cut short by his untimely death. Republicanism was so far gone that the government fell into the hands of the strongest men, those who had military support.

Lepidus, one of the second triumvirates, soon died; Antony, a second member, enamored by Cleopatra, entrapped in the net of Egyptian darkness, cast himself upon his own sword and died; Octavius, an adopted son of Julius Caesar, alone remained. Says Gibbon' "A marital nobility and stubborn commons, possessed of arms, tenacious of property, and collected into constitutional assemblies, form the only balance capable of preserving a free constitution against the enterprises of an aspiring prince." Rome had none of these; every barrier of the Roman constitution had been leveled by the ambition of Octavius, called Caesar Augustus. Furthermore, the provinces had so long been oppressed by the scheming ministers of the republic that they gladly welcomed a one-man power. Augustus restored the senate to its former dignity, it is true, but "*the* principles of a free constitution are irrevocably lost when the legislative power is nominated by the executive." So Octavius was proclaimed emperor of Rome by the unanimous vote of that same servile senate.

Thus was Caesar Augustus, the raiser of taxes, brought to the head of the fourth kingdom.

After centuries of strife and turmoil, wars, bloodshed, and oppression, the world lay passive at the feet of the Roman emperor. One government encircled the Mediterranean; from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean one power bore sway. It would seem that earthly government had achieved its highest ambition. Satan exulted and rested in the hope that at last victory was his. But the moment of his quiet resting was the calm preceding his greatest struggles. So quiet were the nations that the lifting of a hand in rebellion in any of its most distant parts would send a throb to the center,

which would be answered by the return of the legions.

Then it was that in the little town of Bethlehem Ephrath, where Mary and Joseph, peasants of the hill town of Nazareth, had gone to be taxed in obedience to the command of this same Augustus, was born a Saviour, even Christ the Lord. The very condition which caused Satan to exult were the conditions most favorable to Christ when he came to tabernacle among men. He whom Satan had opposed since the rebellion in heaven; he, the Prince of the worlds throughout space, "*was made in the likeness of man,*"

135

and came into the world a helpless babe. The simple shepherds on the hillside near Bethlehem, tending their sheep where David had often tended his flocks, heard the angel choir proclaim the birth of the world's Redeemer. Wise men in the eastern limits of the vast empire of Augustus, having read the prophecies, were watching for his star, and they, too, beheld a shining company of angels, and knew that God dwelt with men. But the rest of the empire slept on unconscious of his nearness.

Bethlehem, the place of his birth, was dear to the memory of every true Jew. It was there that God met their father Jacob as he left home, a fugitive and alone. It was named Bethel,—the house of God, for said Jacob, "Surely God is in this place and I knew it not." Jacob came to the same spot and paid tithe of his gain while with Laban. Deborah, Rachel's nurse, was buried there. It was in Bethlehem that Abraham pitched his tent when he first entered the promised land. David, the chosen of God, was anointed there. The well of Bethlehem was noted, a fit symbol of him who was born in Bethlehem and offers the water of life to all.

"*The story of Bethlehem is an exhaustless theme.*" In it is hidden "*the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God.*" But in spite of the sacred memories which clustered about the place, when the Christ was born but few men knew it.

All that the sacred record gives concerning Augustus, the man who held universal sway, is that he was a raiser of taxes when the kingdom was at the height of its glory, and that after a reign of a few days, or years, he should end his career in peace. He had unconsciously been instrumental in preparing the way for the Prince of peace, and having done that, he passed from the scene.

"As in old time Cyrus was called to the throne of the world's empire that he might set free the captives of the Lord, so Caesar Augustus is made the agent for the fulfillment of God's purpose in bringing the mother of Jesus to Bethlehem. She is of the lineage of David, and the Son of David must be born in David's city."

Most of the life of the Saviour was spent during the reign of Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, whom Gabriel described to Daniel as a "*vile person.*" History substantiates the description. He was not a direct heir to the throne, and he was never honored by his subjects. The tyranny of absolutism began again to manifest itself, and the principles of the Oriental monarchies were repeated. Popular assemblies entirely ceased, and the emperor usurped the right to put to death without trial. The governors of

Judah reflected the character of the general government. The Jews were bitterly oppressed, and as they knew the time was near for the appearance of a Saviour, they placed all their hopes upon a temporal king, one who should break the yoke of Rome and establish for them a separate kingdom. A few, perhaps, but only a few, divined the spiritual nature of the promise of a Messiah, for it was Satan's studied plan to blind men's eyes to all spiritual truth.

In Babylon he had sought to make men drunk with idolatry; working through Medo-Persia he had hoped to slay those who were faithful to their God; through the teachings of Greece he had so fascinated man with the powers of his own mind that by works of righteousness which he might do, and philosophies of his own conjecturing, he was led to forget any higher power than that which he himself possessed. But through it all a few had clung to the promise delivered to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The world was ignorant of the Christ, but John the Baptist called many to repentance. Christ's ministry was during the reign of Tiberius, and while that vile person worked, planned, mistrusted, and killed, the Man of God went about all the towns of Palestine, healing the broken-hearted, and dispensing light to all who would accept. Angels watched him, Gabriel attended him, and in times of special danger, shielded him from the enemy who tracked him incessantly. Finally they nailed him to the cross; the Jews were responsible for it, but the Roman law upheld them in the act; and had it not been done by his own people, the Romans would have done it; for they had reached a condition when the life of man was but lightly esteemed, and the spiritual kingdom which Christ came to set up could never have been understood by the reigning monarch. The officers of Rome nailed the Son of God to the cross. The Prince of the everlasting covenant was crushed by those who sought to confederate together; they placed him in the tomb; they joined hands with Satan, as nation had never done before; but he broke those bands, and came forth triumphant.

Representatives from the four quarters of the globe stood near him in his last hours. The Greeks met him at the temple at the last great day of the feast; the thief hung beside him on Calvary; Simon of Cyrene helped bear the cross, and the centurion, a Roman soldier, convicted, said, "Truly, this was the Son of God." The darkness which shrouded the dying form of Christ typified the condition of the Roman world. The light which shone about the tomb when the angels bade the Son of man come forth, typified

the power with which the truth should penetrate the empire as his followers went forth to preach salvation.

CHAPTER XVI

The Mystery Of Iniquity (Chapter 11:23-31)

THE strength of paganism had been tested. Truth, eternal truth, had dwelt in the person of the Man of Nazareth. With the death of Christ, Satan lost

hope. Looking forward to his crucifixion, Jesus said, "*Now* is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." Satan, after his fall, had met from time to time with the representatives of other worlds. Some in that assembly, not comprehending the hideous nature of sin, had felt to question God's wisdom in expelling Satan from the heavenly courts, but when Christ's life was over, and they had seen the taunting of the enemy and his final act of murder, "the accuser of the brethren" was forever cast from the council of worlds. "*And* when the dragon saw that he was cast to the earth," he knew that his time was short, and with renewed energy he sought to overthrow the truth of God, and crush those who adhered to it. The remaining portion of the eleventh chapter of Daniel clearly reveals the truth of these statements.

After the ascension of Christ, his disciples spread the gospel throughout Judea and all Palestine, and many who heard the word spoken with power on the day of pentecost went into their own countries to proclaim the truth as it was in Christ. In less than thirty years the world was warned. But the Jews were exclusive, and the disciples had not yet lost the idea that Christ was the Saviour of the Hebrew race, not the healer of all mankind.

Persecution in Jerusalem scattered the believers, and then they went everywhere preaching the salvation of God. Quietly, yet steadily, the lifegiving current of the stream of Christianity penetrated to the remotest corners of the vast Roman Empire. All nationalities were for the first time in all history united in Him, for with him and his followers there was neither "Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ was all, and in all."

As the truth spread, it was the growth of an empire; a spiritual kingdom within the confines of earth's strongest monarchy. It was with the whole church as with each individual within the church, a spiritual life, a new man, circled about by a human form. Well would it have been for the progress of truth if all oppression of the spiritual by the temporal had been only when the state opposed the church! Instead, the greatest, the only

139

effectual drawback to the spread of the truth has been caused in individual experience when the physical man has limited the development of the spiritual, the abiding spirit, the Christ in you, the hope of glory.

The early church was zealous; their first love was strong, and the greatest difficulties were met and surmounted. Sometimes it meant an entire household, but oftener only one or two members of the home circle who stepped out of the darkness of paganism to stand against all attacks, for the truth of God. Mothers watched their children with the greatest care, for every custom and practice of the people from their waking moment to the time when they committed themselves to sleep, from birth to death, was associated with the worship of some god.

One peculiar thing about the new sect, as they were viewed by the pagan worshippers, was the absence of images and forms which the senses could comprehend. When Christians gathered for worship, there was no altar, no god, no incense. When the Christians prayed, there was no priesthood, no

vain repetition of words, no offering, but a simple petition in the name of Christ. An invisible power seemed to have taken control of the new converts, a power which never quailed, and which no pagan votary could gainsay. The life which God had so long searched for among the Jews was found among the early Christians.

The enemy of truth had sought by every means to blind the eyes of the Jews to the love of God; he had worked through every government for their destruction, and when their nation was at its lowest point, when spiritual vitality was almost exhausted, Christ came in person to revive their fainting hope. Then Satan used every device to deceive the Son of man. He tempted him in all points where human nature can be tempted; he sought to ensnare him with petty trials; he sought to induce him to accept high worldly honors; but he failed in all, and when he thought he had gained the victory by his crucifixion, he found it was only the physical form which could be thus bound, and that only for a time. An eternal spirit dwelt in mortal day, and the bands of death were broken by his resurrection. Now from the midst of that downtrodden people, that despised race, from the very foot of the ignominious cross, God chose a people and sent them forth to conquer the world. "*Such knowledge is too wonderful; it is high, I can not attain unto it.*" What wonder that the world awoke with a start, and that Satan sought new devices for the overthrow of truth.

Outward pressure, though tried again and again, had proved unavailing in stamping out the truth. In the fiery furnace was seen the form of a fourth;

140

from the lions' den came forth a prime minister; from Joseph's new sepulcher arose a conqueror. Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome had attempted the overthrow of truth, but there had been a constantly increasing grandeur in place of defeat. A new plan was devised by Satan. If paganism could be placed in the heart, while Christian principles were acknowledged outwardly, the overthrow would be certain; for destruction worketh from within, outward. It was a repetition of Balaam's plan.

Paul, the great teacher of righteousness, as he visited from place to place among the saints, wrote thus to the Thessalonians: "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." "*Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.*" This is Paul's description of the mystery of iniquity, the fourth beast of the vision of Daniel seven. Then it was that into that church, noted for its purity, crept the life of paganism. Sheltered in the folds of the Christian garb lay the serpent, the old dragon. As the birth of Christ, the incarnation of God, was a mystery, and is to-day a mystery which none can fathom, it was met by another mystery, a mystery of iniquity whose machinations are too strong for the human mind to understand. It will deceive if possible the very elect. Only he whose eye is lightened by truth, whose heart is the abiding place of the Son of God; in other words, only he who has within his own being the

mystery of godliness, will stand against the mystery of iniquity. In Paul's day, that is, in the first century A.D., that power was at work. Hitherto the history as recorded in the book of Daniel dealt with earthly kingdoms, but from this time on history handles this "mystery of iniquity" which worked through the various governments. The distinction between the kingdoms of the north and the south remains as it was in the past, but we pass from governments as governments to a power which is swaying these governments. On one side in this controversy is the church of God; on the other side is the mystery of iniquity, which often lays hold of earthly governments for the purpose of destroying the church. The expression "*Church of God*" does not refer to denominational names or lines. From the days of Christ, until the present, there has been a true church. Its members have often been scattered as far as human eye could discern, but on the record books of heaven they have been recognized as a single company.

141

The characteristic which marks the true church is adherence to the commandments of the God of heaven. Wherever a people has been true to these, God has honored them with his presence. Moreover, to each denomination which has arisen, there have been offered the same opportunities which were offered to the four succeeding nations as they arose; that is, the privilege of walking in all the light, and by that very act becoming an everlasting company. As truth was rejected by the nations and they fell, so truth has been rejected by one denomination after another, and they have fallen, another people taking the vacant place. This succession will be kept up until a remnant people who will keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus will be made up. They will enter the eternal city to reign with Christ. It is this struggle which was revealed to Daniel in the latter part of his last vision. The history of Rome becomes the history of religious controversy, and the struggle between truth and error is greater than ever before.

The history of the church, as given to John, contains more details than the words of Gabriel to Daniel. To his followers of the first century, God says, "*Thou hast left thy first love. Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works.*" Of the church in the second and third centuries, he says, "*I know thy works, and tribulations, and poverty (but thou art rich)...Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulations.*" Christianity and paganism were in open conflict for three centuries following the birth of Christ, and at times the serpent reared his head to smite the truth to the ground. Some of the followers of Christ were persecuted, and others grew cold and indifferent. But there was a power in the gospel which the pagans could not withstand. As its followers increased, their influence was felt even in political circles. The close of the third century of the Christian era found the government of Rome greatly weakened. The evils of the empire, its oppression and cruelty, made it almost impossible for the emperors to control affairs. Authority was

in the hands of the army, which seated and unseated rulers at will. Barbarian hordes pressed the empire on all sides, and the downfall of Rome was imminent. Some radical change was necessary to prevent complete disruption, and Diocletian, the reigning emperor, conceived the idea of partitioning the territory. Consequently he associated with himself a man by the name of Maximian, giving him the title of Augustus. Each of the two emperors then chose an assistant, called a Caesar, whose duty it was to guard the frontiers. According to the plan of Diocletian, the Caesars should

142
become emperors on the death of the Augusti, and then other Caesars would be appointed. For a while the four who stood at the head of the Roman empire worked together in harmony, but through a variety of complications war broke out.

Constantine was a Caesar in the western division of the empire, and marching toward the East, he subdued, one by one, all rivals in the government. It was about the year 312, when, confronted by bitter foes, whose strength he recognized, this rising light assumed a policy never before followed.

There were many Christians scattered throughout the empire who refused to fight under the banner of paganism. With these Constantine made a league. The story of his conversion is variously told, and perhaps the details are unimportant. The fact remains that he acknowledged the God of the Christians, proclaimed himself a follower of Christ, and immediately Christians from all over the empire flocked into his army, devout followers of the general who now fought in the name of Christianity.

Speaking of the use of the cross, Gibbon says: "This same symbol sanctified the arms of the soldiers of Constantine; the cross glittered in their helmets, was engraved on their shields, was interwoven into their banners; and the consecrated emblems which adorned the person of the emperor himself were distinguished only by the richer materials and more exquisite workmanship." The standard which was borne before this (Christian) army *"supported* a crown of gold, which inclosed the mysterious monogram, at once expressive of the figure of the cross, and the initial letter of the name of Christ."

The humble followers of Christ, who immediately after his ascension had gone forth "conquering and to conquer," carrying with them his words, the sword of the Spirit, had been replaced by an army with helmet and sword, led by a commander who bound together the emblems of the cross and his own name.

The clothing of paganism in Christian garments was never more complete than in the days of Constantine. The mystery of iniquity was hard at work. Constantine conquered the Roman world; he sat as sole monarch of the empire which was tottering in the hands of his predecessors. The Praetorian guard, which had been the terror as well as the protection of other emperors, was forever suppressed by Constantine. The dignity of the senate and people of Rome received a fatal blow, and they were thereafter subject alike

to the insults or neglect of their master who resided in the new capital, Constantinople.

The character of Constantine, that first Christian emperor, is aptly described by Gibbon. In discussing the reason why he delayed baptism until he was on his deathbed, he says: "*The sublime theory of the gospel had made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the understanding of Constantine himself. He pursued the great object of his ambition through the dark and bloody paths of war and policy; and after the victory, he abandoned himself without moderation to the abuse of his fortune. Instead of asserting his just superiority above the imperfect heroism and profane philosophy of Trajan and the Antonines, the mature age of Constantine forfeited the reputation which he had acquired in his youth. As he gradually advanced in the knowledge of truth, he proportionately declined in the practice of virtue; and the same year of his reign in which he convened the Council of Nice, was polluted by the execution, or rather murder, of his eldest son...The gratitude of the church has exalted the virtues and excused the failings of a generous patron, who seated Christianity on the throne of the Roman world; and the Greeks, who celebrate the festival of the imperial saint, seldom mention the name of Constantine without adding the title of "Equal to the Apostles."* These words alone offer a sad commentary on the decline of Christian virtue since the days of Christ. He who claimed the power of Christianity was less virtuous than the heroic pagan Trajan, and such pagan philosophers as the Antonines.

The first religious laws ever passed by Christians were edicts of Constantine. In 312 the edict of Milan granted universal toleration; in 321 the first law for the worship of Sunday was published; in 325 was convened at Nice the first ecumenical council which formulated a creed for the world. Then began the conflicts which tore the church asunder and exposed it to open shame. About the reign of Constantine cluster events of the greatest interest, not to Rome only, but to the church of God and to the world. It was the first and perhaps greatest object lesson illustrating the effects of the elevation of Christianity in name to the throne of the world. In the wake of this reign follow the years of darkness for all Europe, when the antichrist reigned supreme.

He indeed performed that which neither his father nor his father's fathers had performed. He left to his heirs "a new capital, a new policy, and a new religion." No one had before dared to think that Rome could be quitted. Constantine selected the site of Constantinople with more than human

144

wisdom. It is formed by nature . to be the center and capital of a great monarchy. It has been the contested point among the nations of Europe since the continent has had nations to contend, and according to the prophecy of Daniel, it will be the bone of contention to the end of time. It is a fact worth noting that the city was founded in the year 330 B.C., exactly three hundred and sixty years, "a time," after the victory of Octavius over Antony at Actium, which placed him as sole ruler on the Roman throne. The new policy was the outworking of a union of church and state. The

kingdoms of the past had followed a policy somewhat similar to one another. Government was with them the central object. This was seen in its strongest light in pagan Rome, but with Constantine the policy changed. Paganism as paganism was laid low, and the "mystery of iniquity" was enthroned. The world was given Christianity, not as it came from the life of Him whose name it bore, but as it was corrupted and polluted by human and satanic minds. Gibbon says that hereafter the historian will describe "political institutions" before relating wars, and that "he will adopt the division unknown to the ancients of *civil* and *ecclesiastical affairs*." That is, future history must deal with church and state, not with kingdoms such as Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece.

History has changed. The devil is going about seeking whom he may devour, and the calm, determined plans for conquering the world which marked the nations before the days of Christ, have been replaced by a desperation which means the utter destruction, if possible, of all who serve the God of heaven. Any means is lawful in the hands of the prince of this world, and the greater the number who fall, the lighter the burden which he, the archenemy, must bear in the days of the final reckoning. The acts of Constantine started a series of movements which developed rapidly into the antichrist of the Dark Ages. .

The council held at Nice was an important gathering alike to the church and the nation, for since the two have joined hands, whatever affects one affects the other.

The Christian world was torn asunder by theological factions. Alexandria, the center of all philosophical study, was also the center of theological activity. Here is where the Greek influence was most forcibly felt.

Athanasius, the leader of one faction, was archdeacon, and afterward bishop of Alexandria, and his opponent, Arius, was presbyter in the same city.

Paganism and Christianity met on the battlefield when Constantine contended for the throne of Rome; paganism and Christianity met in more

145
deadly conflict in Alexandria, where Christian and pagan schools stood side by side. Here it was that such men as Origen and Clement, recognized Fathers of the church, adopted the philosophy of the Greeks, and applied to the study of the Bible the same methods which were common in the study of Homer and other Greek writers. Higher criticism had its birth in Alexandria. It was the result of a mingling of the truths taught by Christ and the false philosophy of the Greeks. It was an attempt to interpret divine writings by the human intellect, a revival of the philosophy of Plato. These teachers, by introducing Greek philosophy into the schools which were nominally Christian, opened the avenue for the theological controversies which shook the Roman world, and finally established the mystery of iniquity.

So from this false teaching of the Word in Alexandria came two leaders—Athanasius and Arius. Each had his following, and yet no man could clearly define the disputed point over which they wrangled. So great was the controversy that the Council of Nice was called to settle the dispute, and

deliver to the church an orthodox creed. The emperor Constantine called the council, and was present in person. At this council the creed of Athanasius was recognized as orthodox, and Arius and his followers were pronounced heretics.

But announcing a creed is one thing, and having it adopted is another. The orthodox creed was published to the world, and then began the fight. In this strife armies fought and much blood was shed. But in spite of the fact that Arianism was heresy, the doctrine spread. It was popular among the barbarian tribes who invaded the western division of the Roman empire. The Vandals, who settled in Africa, were among the followers of Arius, and so also were the Heruli and Ostrogoths who settled in Italy. But while Arianism spread through Africa, Sardinia, and Spain, and was present at times in Italy, the recognized religion of the Roman emperor and the empire itself, the northern kingdom, which now had its seat at Constantinople, was the Catholic faith, as proclaimed at Nice. As Constantinople was the representative of this northern division in his day, so later, between 527 and 565, Justinian became champion of the Catholic cause.

According to the vision of Daniel 7, the Roman kingdom would be divided into ten parts, represented by the ten horns of the fourth beast, and three of these kingdoms should be plucked up by another power. It is this part of the history of the fourth kingdom which is related in Daniel 11, beginning with verse twenty-five.

146

Justinian's reign was the most brilliant period of Byzantine history after the death of Constantine, and historians agree that among his greatest military achievements must be classed his exploits against the south. The success of Justinian was due to the services, throughout the greater part of his reign, of the celebrated general Belisarius. He was the tool in the hands of the emperor for crushing out heresy.

The Vandals were Arians, but Hilderis, the grandson of their chief warrior, the noted Genseric, favored the Catholic faith. The disaffection of his subjects made it possible for Hilderis to be dethroned by Gelimer, who had some title to the Vandal throne. Under pretense of protecting the dethroned Hilderis, the emperor Justinian prepared for a war in Africa. While still undecided as to the advisability of making the attack because of the weakness of the Roman army, and the cost of the undertaking, his purpose was confirmed by the words of a Catholic bishop. Said he in prophetic tones, "*It is the will of Heaven, O emperor, that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battles will march before your standard, and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of his Son.*" This was sufficient, and the *holy* war for the extermination of Arianism was undertaken.

A force of Romans, the largest Belisarius could command from the weakened empire, aided by recruits from the east, landed in Africa. The Vandal army numbered 160,000 fighting men. Belisarius was hastened in his march toward Carthage by enemies of Gelimer and friends of the Catholic creed. The armies met near the city, and victory came to the

Romans through the folly and rashness of the brother of the Vandal king. Gelimer fled, and Carthage opened her gates, and admitted Belisarius and his army. "*The Arians*, conscious that their reign had expired, resigned the temple to the Catholics, who rescued their saint from profane hands, performed the holy rites, and loudly proclaimed the creed of Athanasius and Justinian." The Catholic faith had triumphed. Arianism fell, and Sardinia and Corsica surrendered, and other islands of the Mediterranean yielded to the arms and creed of Justinian.

In the autumn of 534 Justinian granted a triumph to Belisarius. Gibbon thus described the scene: "*From the palace of Belisarius the procession was conducted through the streets to the hippodrome...The wealth of nations was displayed, the trophies of martial or effeminate luxury; rich armor; golden thrones, and the chariots of state which had been used by the Vandal queen; the massive furniture of the royal banquet, the splendor of precious stones,*

147

the elegant forms of statues and vases, the more substantial treasures of gold, and the holy vessels of the Jewish temple, which, after their long peregrination, were respectfully deposited in the Christian church of Jerusalem. A long train of the noblest Vandals reluctantly exposed their lofty stature and manly countenance."

"The Arians deplored the ruin of their church triumphant above a century in Africa; and they were justly provoked by the laws of the conqueror, which interdicted the baptism of their children, and the exercise of all religious worship." It is not much to be wondered at that those who remained plotted against the government and the general who represented Justinian. The loss of life was terrible in those wars for the supremacy of one creed above another, and the path to the papal crown was bloodstained. It is stated that five million Africans were consumed by the wars and government of the emperor Justinian.

For the sake of brevity, the wars between the Catholic empire and the Vandals may be taken as an illustration of the extermination of the other two kingdoms—that of the Heruli and the Ostrogoths. Justinian was the reigning emperor; and most of the work was done by Belisarius, this same general, between the years 533 and 538.

The last contest with paganism was in 508 when the Britons accepted Christianity; the "daily" spoken of in Daniel had been taken away. By 538 the way was clear for the papacy to sit enthroned in Rome. The new capital established by Constantine left Rome that it might be occupied by the head of the church. The new religion—Christianity—we have seen mingled with paganism, which it crushed, and gave birth to the papacy. The new policy, a union of church and state, gave civil aid to that paganized Christianity called the papacy. The harvest of the seed sown in the days of Constantine was reaped in the reign of Justinian, whose military and civil power supported "the abomination that maketh desolate."

A striking feature of this history is the fact that the very code of law which Rome has bequeathed as a legacy to later times, is the work of this same Justinian. Is it to be wondered at that the laws of this emperor, who reigned

at the time when the papacy was formed, and who was the one who supported it by arms, should contain some principles of the papacy? Fisher says, "*Humane* principles are incorporated into the civil law, but likewise *the despotic system of imperialism.*" The laws of Justinian form the basis of national laws to-day; likewise the religion of Justinian is the recognized religion of most countries to-day.

148

Constantine and Justinian were the two men instrumental above all others in forming the papacy, and giving it civil power. The contest between Arianism and the orthodox Catholicism was the means of enthroning the papacy. A power soon to be recognized as the personification of all tyranny swayed the scepter of Rome, and the followers of the One who proclaimed a covenant of peace to Israel, would for the period of 1260 years struggle for existence. Every principle of truth was crushed, and with 538 was ushered in the Dark Ages.

149

CHAPTER XVII

The Work Of The Mystery Of Iniquity (Chapter 11:32-45)

As the year 457 B.C. was an important date in Jewish history, so 538 A.D. is a milepost in the history of the Christian church. The former, dating from the decree to restore and build Jerusalem, marks the beginning of one great prophetic period, the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14. The latter, which witnessed the setting up of the papacy, is the date from which to reckon that other prophetic period, "*a time and times and the dividing of time,*" or the twelve hundred and sixty days of Dan. 7:25. It is the period during which the little horn, that plucked up three of the ten divisions of the Roman empire, should bear sway. It is to the beginning of this period, the year 538, that the thirtyfirst verse of Daniel 11 brings the history.

The fully developed papacy was not the work of one nor of two years any more than the universal power of Babylon, Medo-Persia, or Greece was an immediate acquisition. As those kingdoms grew in power, so papal Rome grew in power. According to Rev. 13:2, the dragon gave the beast his power and his seat and great authority. The work of Constantine and Justinian in gaining power for this new organization was parallel to the conquests of Cyrus, Alexander, and Caesar in their conquests for their respective nations. The seat of the pagan Roman government was removed to Constantinople, thereby giving room for the papacy to be seated on the throne in the city on the Tiber. As territory and a capital were gained gradually, so the *authority of the papacy* was a gradual acquisition. Each of the four universal kingdoms had a distinct policy, which was followed throughout its existence. Likewise the papacy had its policy just as clearly defined. the working of this policy in its inception is best seen in Alexandria. It was there that the two streams, paganism and Christianity, mingled their waters. the papacy had birth on the banks of the Nile: Egypt was the mother who nursed it, and as it grew, it breathed in the miasma of its surroundings. First,

Christians *interpreted* the Bible according to pagan thought, and paganism appearing to be vanquished, in reality became the conqueror.

Then the *teachings of* the Word were changed. In order to compromise with pagans, idol worship was introduced into the Christian church; the second commandment was dropped from the decalogue, and the tenth was divided
150

to preserve the number. The fourth, the keystone to the law of God, a memorial of creation and redemption, was so altered as to exalt the enemy of God above God himself. Later, the whole Bible was discarded, and as that detector of sin was suppressed, vileness and iniquity became uncontrollable. This, however, was not the whole policy of the papacy, but only one of the stones in the foundation of the structure that was being reared.

The head of the church, who was likewise a civil ruler, was exalted more and more above his fellows, until a complete ecclesiastical hierarchy was formed. By decree of a general council the head of the church was declared infallible. But even before, this faith in the new church, and especially in the *head of* the church, took the place of faith in Christ. The Virgin Mary and saints became mediators for sinful man, and forgiveness was granted by the head of the church. Righteousness by works led to long pilgrimages, penance, and relic worship. Everlasting punishment was held as a threat above the heads of the common people. The darkness deepened. The inquisition was instituted to force men's conscience. Kings upon their thrones were compelled to recognize the superior authority of the power of Rome, and failure to do so meant the removal of their crowns. Subjects were absolved from allegiance to their sovereigns, and so complete was the obedience of nations to Rome, that no man dared lift his hand in opposition. A darkness beyond comprehension settled over all the world. The light had been extinguished when God's Word was banished. "The noontide of the papacy was the world's moral midnight."

The power which should speak great words against the Most High, and wear out the saints of the Most High, was allotted 1260 years in which to work; but so cruel was that power that the time was shortened, lest none should survive the persecution. It was Egyptian or Babylonian bondage for the Christian church. But even as God had some in Egypt and Babylon who were followers of the light throughout the period of darkness, there was ever a little company of believers who held the Scriptures dear to their hearts, and who obeyed the commandments.

The Waldenses could trace their ancestry back to the days of Paul, and from Asia Minor, where that apostle first preached, to the wild retreat in the mountains of Italy, there were faithful Sabbath keepers. The power on the throne might change the day of worship, but there were always some who obeyed God rather than man. As Gabriel told Daniel, "They that understand among the people shall instruct many; yet they shall fall by the sword, and
151

by flame, by captivity, and by spoil." Though thousands fell because they dared lift the voice against the powers that be, yet God watched their

numbers and counted each one who gave his life.

There is no more wonderful record of deliverance from bondage than that which God wrought for his church at the close of the period of persecution. Israel's deliverance from Egypt, when a multitude marched through the Red Sea on dry land, was marvelous; the deliverance from Babylon was a wonder in the eyes of the world; but the birth of Protestantism—the deliverance from the darkness of the Middle Ages—surpassed all others. In the twelfth of Revelation, where the same deliverance is mentioned, it is stated that the earth helped the woman—the church. And it did indeed. Powers that were wholly unaccountable for the good they were doing, were used by the Father to break those bands that Satan had placed around the truth. The suppression of the Bible had led to the suppression of all learning. There were no schools for the masses; there were no books, no papers; physicians were forbidden to practice medicine, lest they should take money which would otherwise go into the coffers of the church. Should any man dare to advocate learning, or cross the beaten paths made by the church, he was led to the stake. But it could not always be so. God made use of the Moors who had accepted Mohammedanism to help deliver his people. Schools were established by them in Spain and western Asia. The sciences were taught, and from these schools the light of learning broke into Egypt.

Wycliffe, called "the Morning Star of the Reformation," in the fourteenth century, translated the Bible into English. He wrote tracts showing the fallacy of the papal system. He, in England, like Daniel of old, was in close touch with the king, and the light of the gospel was having its effect. To the ruler on the throne, and the students in the universities, Wycliffe gave the gospel. His followers, known as Lollards, were bitterly persecuted, but never wholly exterminated; and it is their descendants, who, as Puritans, brought Protestantism to America.

Huss and Jerome in Bohemia lifted their voices against papal dogmas, and later Luther, the German monk, proclaimed liberty of conscience and salvation alone by faith in Jesus Christ. He had found a copy of the Bible chained in a cell of one of the German monasteries, and the spark there kindled, lighted a fire which Rome was unable to extinguish.

The Word of God became the lesson book for the German nation. Luther was assisted in his work of reform by Melanchthon, the noted teacher in 152

Wittenberg. Other schools were established throughout Germany; teachers were educated, and before the death of Luther the German nation sat at the feet of Protestant teachers; so rapid was the work when the Word of God was opened to mankind. The Reformation marched on to victory. Rome retreated into narrower and still narrower bounds, not before the sword, but before the onward march of truth. Into every nation of Europe the light shone, and America was founded upon the principles which had their birth in Germany.

The papacy quivered before the blow; and had each nation accepted the Reformation' as it came to it, it would have been but a short time until

history would have been at an end. God was in the Reformation, offering to modern nations the same deliverance which was held out to the Jews when they were granted an opportunity to return from Babylon to Jerusalem. The everlasting covenant was repeated, but men in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries treated it as the Jews did the decree to leave Babylon. When once the principles of the Reformation—liberty of conscience and the equal rights of all men were presented to a nation, and were refused, that nation sank back into the arms of the papacy, and carried to its completion the principles of that government.

Such was the history of France. The experience of that nation stands as an object lesson to the world. Truth had been proclaimed within her borders, but again the papacy rose up to do according to his will. It is in that country that verses 36-39 of chapter 11 were exactly fulfilled. Having rejected light, the intensity of the darkness into which men fell was beyond description. Scott, in the life of Napoleon, speaking of France in the year 1793, just a few years before the expiration of the allotted time (verse 36), says: "*The world for the first time heard an assembly of men, born and educated in civilization, and assuming to govern one of the finest European nations, uplift their united voices to deny the most solemn truth which man's soul receives, and renounce unanimously the belief and worship of the Deity.*" "*France stands apart in the world's history as the single state which, by the decree of her legislative assembly, pronounced that there was no God, and of which the entire population of the capital, and a vast majority elsewhere, women as well as men, danced and sang with joy in accepting the announcement. This was atheism—the logical result of the position taken in Alexandria when Christians assumed the garb of pagan philosophers. God's Word was treated as a product of the human mind. Atheism in the individual is likewise the result of so treating the Scriptures.*"

153

Still further quotations from the history of those times will show how completely God was rejected, and the worship of the human intellect was substituted.

One day "the doors of the Convention were thrown open to a band of musicians, preceded by whom the members of the municipal body entered in solemn procession, singing a hymn in praise of *Liberty*, and escorting a veiled female, whom they termed the 'Goddess of Reason.'" On unveiling the creature, she was found to be a prostitute opera singer. This was the fittest representation France could find of the reason which they exalted. Perhaps it was hard to understand, when noting the policy of Greece in elevating human reason, what the result of such a course would be. The history of France in the days of the Revolution is a thorough explanation of those results.

Men to-day exalt reason above God; they deign to give private interpretation to the divine Word; they offer all sorts of theories contradictory to a "thus saith the Lord," and even professed Christians follow the Greek intellect, studying the philosophy themselves, and teaching it to their children, apparently unconscious of the fact that this is

papal and only papal, and that its ultimate result may be read in the awful annals of France.

Having enthroned the "Goddess of Reason," France passed laws which clearly reveal the result of such worship. The two institutions which date back to Eden, and which are inseparably connected with the worship of Jehovah, were defamed. The week was changed by a decree so as to completely abolish all resemblance to former times, and for a brief space France rested one day in ten instead of observing the weekly Sabbath. The law of marriage was repealed, and that safeguard to society completely disregarded.

The papacy in France was fast paving the road to self-annihilation. Human intellect worshiped brings death. The French Revolution of 1798, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Reign of Terror tell the dreadful story of destruction. The entire history of this period is an object lesson to the world of the final destruction of nations when the Spirit of God is withdrawn, because those in authority refuse to worship Jehovah, choosing rather to exalt the "Goddess of Reason."

Complete overthrow stared France in the face until the control of affairs was assumed by the young military officer, Napoleon Bonaparte. Out of chaos he led the nation through bloodshed to a place of honor among the
154

nations of Europe. The cause of the struggle, which cost thousands of lives, was the *attempt* to suppress both civil and religious rights. The Reformation in Germany in the sixteenth century struck a deathblow to feudalism and the monarchy. France was the battle ground where papal tyranny wrestled with Protestantism and republicanism. Absolute monarchy always accompanies and supports the policy of the papacy, whether in a pagan or a nominally Christian nation. Democracy in principle is the form of government assumed by any nation when the light of truth is accepted.

When the Reformation was rejected by France, the tyranny of the monarchy knew no bounds. Two thirds of the land of the state was in the hands of the clergy and nobles; the king passed laws taxing his subjects against all protest from Parliament; warrants for arrest and imprisonment were issued by his authority alone; "*famine* prevailed in every province, and the bark of the trees was the daily food for hundreds of thousands." The oppression was unendurable, and men, frenzied until they were more demon than human, rose in revolt.

In America the principles of the Reformation had been put into practice with comparative ease. But France, having once rejected light, waded through blood in her demand for freedom.

Then appeared Napoleon. With the rapid movements of a master mind he carried victory for French arms throughout Europe. The army was the controlling element; nobles and clergy were alike powerless, and the common people had exhausted themselves without avail during the terrors of the past few years. He defeated the Austrians and captured Milan; he forced the pope, and various cities of Italy, to purchase peace by giving up their art collections. He organized a republic in Northern Italy, and

compelled Austria to cede its Belgian provinces to France. He conducted an expedition to Egypt, hoping to gain control of the eastern Mediterranean. On the way he captured Malta, and then gained a victory over the Mohammedans of Egypt near the pyramids. Near the Nile, however, Bonaparte was met and defeated by Lord Nelson, the greatest of English naval officers. England, jealous of the rapid progress now being made by Napoleon, had opposed his progress in Egypt. Later, he defeated the Turks of Egypt at Aboukir. In 1799 a constitution was adopted in France, and Napoleon was chosen First Consul with two assistants. France had attempted to copy the Constitution of the United States, but the effect failed. The constitution of 1799 established a centralized government, and

155

deprived the people of liberty and self-government. "*Equality, not liberty*, was all that the cause of France now represented."

The reforms of Napoleon are worthy of notice. Says the historian, "He personally participated in the religious ceremonies which attended the formal restoration of the old system of worship where the Goddess of Reason had been enthroned with atheistic orgies." "*Full* toleration was secured for non-Catholics." It was Berthier, who in 1798 made the pope a prisoner, thus fulfilling the prophecy concerning the 1260 years of papal supremacy.

The reforms of Napoleon, however, tended only toward a monarchy, and while the people pleaded for republicanism, the pride of the man overruled, and he bent his energies toward his own exaltation. He was proclaimed emperor in 1804, and, in imitation of Charlemagne, he received a crown from Pope Pius VII in Notre Dame. Freedom seemed again to be defeated. Partial acceptance of truth brings only tyranny. This is individual as well as national experience.

The establishment of the principles of the Reformation, as seen in the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, was the result of Puritan faith and courage to follow in that light which led away from the papacy. The struggle of France is a warning to those who see no harm in harboring the principles of antichrist, or those who, having known the truth of civil and religious liberty, turn again to the bondage of error.

At the time of the end (1798) the kings of the north and the south again contended. From the founding of Constantinople by Constantine in 330, the power which held that city had maintained control of the Mediterranean, for Constantinople is recognized by all nations as the key to both Asia and Europe. In the time of the end, history will again center about this city.

As in times past, so again we are obliged to trace far back to find the source of events which now appear in full view. About the time that the papacy was growing into a full-fledged monarchy, recognized among nations of the earth, another power had birth. This new work of Satan came in the form of Mohammedanism, which to-day holds about one sixth of the world's population in its grasp. The new doctrine originated in Arabia, from whence it spread as a smoke from the bottomless pit. Syria fell under its power, but Egypt became the center of its influences. Egypt has felt every evil

influence, and the banks of the Nile have fed every form of idolatry.

156

Mohammedanism is but another form of Egyptian darkness. By the power of the sword the followers of Mohammed strove to enter Europe. The western horn of the Crescent, the Moslem symbol, was extended into Spain in the early part of the eighth century, and for a time all Europe was threatened, but the battle of Tours (732) stopped the progress of the conquerors. In 1453, however, Constantinople was captured, and has since remained in the hands of the Turks, the boldest advocates of the doctrine of Mohammed. As the *founding* of Constantinople is a guidepost in history, so the capture of that city in 1453 is another landmark. One of the greatest checks received by the papacy was due to the influx into Italy of Greek scholars, driven from Constantinople by the incoming Mohammedans. The discovery of America was due to the closing of the eastern passage to the rich islands of the Indian Ocean by the Mohammedans in Constantinople and Asia Minor, and so in more ways than is usually thought, God worked to advance truth through those who were ignorant of his truth.

Not only Egypt, but Syria and Turkey in Europe, belonged to the Mohammedans, and he has entered the "*glorious* land," and a Moslem mosque occupies the site where once stood the temple of Solomon. Edom, Moab, and Ammon, however, escaped the hand of this conquering power, and these countries receive an annual tribute from the Turks who pass in caravans on their way to Mecca.

The ambition of Napoleon to establish the authority of Europe in Egypt might have been the beginning of the last struggle between the north and the south. Even in his day Russia and France made friends, but the time had not yet come for the Turk to take his departure from Europe, and England took the part of Egypt against the arms of Napoleon. Napoleon recognized the strength of Constantinople, so also did Russia, and there has been constant jealousy among the nations of Europe lest one should outwit the others, and become the possessor of that stronghold.

Every eye is centered on that one spot, and has been for years. Turkey is known universally as the "Sick Man of the East," and the only reason he does not die is because intoxicants are administered, figuratively speaking, by first one nation then another. The time will come when he will remove from Constantinople, and take up his abode in Palestine; that is, plant his tabernacle between the Mediterranean and Red Seas. Time and again the world has been brought to realize that the end of all things is near at hand, for all know that when the Turk steps out of Constantinople, there will be a general breaking up of Europe. They may not name this impending conflict

157

the battle of Armageddon, but God has so named it. In the Crimean war of 1853-1856, the world trembled for Turkey, and, lest the crisis should be precipitated, England and France came to the rescue, and Russia was bidden to stand back. In the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, the powers of Europe united to sustain the life of the *sick man*.

"I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four

winds of the earth...And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God; and he cried...saying, Hurt not the earth...till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." These angels now hold the winds of strife, waiting for the church of God to prepare for his coming. The sealing angel goes through Jerusalem (the church) to place the seal of the living God on the foreheads of the faithful, and while this work goes forward, Turkey stands as a national guidepost to the world, that men may know what is going on in the sanctuary above. God's eye is upon his people, and he never leaves himself without a witness in the world. No man knows when Turkey will take its departure from Europe, but when that move is made, earth's history will be short. Then it will be said, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still,...and he that is righteous let him be righteous still." To-day is "the day of preparation." the fate of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome is recorded for the edification of the nations of to-day, and the lessons taught by all center in the events just before us. While the world watches Turkey, let the servant of God watch the movements of his great High Priest, whose ministry for sin is almost over.

158

CHAPTER XVIII

The Closing Scene (Chapter 12)

DANIEL, the man greatly beloved of God, was several times given a view of the history of the world; but the last vision covered the whole period in detail, and Gabriel did not leave the prophet until he had revealed to him the consummation of all things. Daniel is a latter-day prophet, and while giving a history of the time intervening between his own day and the present time, it was upon the closing events that special emphasis was laid. Four times in his prophecies the expression, "*time of the end*," is repeated; "*the latter days*" is used twice, and "*the end of the indignation*" and "*for many days*" each appear once, and the closing words of Gabriel were, "Thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Thus nine times in the course of the book, attention is called to the fact that the prophecy pointed directly to the closing history of this earth.

When the last vision began, the prophet was beside the River Tigris. It was the third year of the sole reign of Cyrus, the Persian king. Beginning with the times in which he lived, Gabriel carried the prophet through the history of Persia; he spread out before his vision the conquests of Alexandria, and the division of his empire; he saw the workings of Greek literature and art, and watched this influence spread into Italy, there molding the fourth kingdom, and finally blending with the truth in such a manner as to form the papacy. Daniel saw antichrist upheld by arms on the throne of Rome; he was carried through the Dark Ages; he watched, and lo, the darkness scattered before the truth as proclaimed by the Reformers. Like a sudden clearing after a storm, the clouds rolled back, and the Sun of Righteousness shone forth; but again the darkness gathered, and France, that nation of Europe which was a battlefield where Protestantism contended with the

papacy, almost ceased to exist, so bitter was the struggle between the principles of truth and error.

The very existence of God was denied, and for a time eternal ruin hung like a pall over that country. God's wrath was stayed, but as a person stricken by some loathsome disease may live, yet ever bear in his body the effects of the illness, so France coming out of the struggle is still scarred with the awfulness of her sin. The prophetic guide carried the prophet on, and revealed the contest between modern nations; he saw the final struggle

159

between the north and the south, and pointed to Constantinople as the seat of contention in the last days. Nations should turn their gaze toward the present occupants of that city and patiently await the removal of the Turk into the "*glorious land*." For "*he shall come to his end and none shall help him*."

The prophet had watched with intense interest the people upon whom had shone the light of heaven. From Babylon to the end of time a golden stream connected heaven and earth, as if the heavens were open and the dove of peace were descending. At times the stream narrowed to a mere hair-line of light, but it was never wholly extinguished; then the prophet saw it broaden until it lightened the whole world.

That light followed the Jews for hundreds of years, but in the days preceding the Saviour's birth there were but a few souls that bound earth and heaven together. With the advent of Christ a flood of light filled the earth, but again the darkness almost covered the face of the sun. The streams of light were numerous as the Christians scattered throughout the earth, but gradually as the prophet followed these in vision, they grew dim and dimmer. In the days of Luther and the Reformers the stream widened, and again the light flashed like streaks of lightning, piercing the darkness. But days of clear shining were comparatively few.

The close of the prophetic period of 2300 days brought men to important changes in the heavenly sanctuary. Through all time Christ had pleaded for his people, and whether they were many or few, his love was always the same. Finally the great High Priest entered within the holy of holies. To Daniel the scene of the investigative judgment had been revealed. He had seen the Son approach the Ancient of Days; the books of heaven were opened and the records examined. Over and over again the nail-pierced hands had been raised before the great Judge, as the name of some repentant soul was read, and the Intercessor had cried, "*Pardon, Father! My blood! My blood,*" and the scarred character, the marred record, was covered by the life of the Son of man. Daniel had seen this. He knew that God's people must pass in review before the Judge of worlds, but at the end of the last vision there is another scene presented.

While men are watching the movements of nations; while they cry, Peace and safety, and yet prepare for war, the angel of God is seen by Daniel to pass through the earth, and place a seal upon the foreheads of those to whom these heavenly rays extend. So long as the angel finds any of these faithful ones, Christ still intercedes, but at last the messenger wings his way

toward heaven. Throughout the vast kingdom of Jehovah echoes the sound, "*It is done*," and Christ from the inner sanctuary rises and proclaims, "*It is done*." He lays aside his priestly garments, and prepares to set in order his kingdom.

His mediatorial work is over; the door from whence has streamed those rays of light and mercy is closed forever. Those who have been sealed must now stand wholly by faith, clinging to God alone during a "*time* of trouble such as never was since there was a nation."

Daniel had watched men pass through trials. He had seen Israel tried, and men in all ages who were true to God tested on the point of faith, but in all previous instances the test had been lightened by a mediator. Now there is no intercessor, and man stands alone. Mercy is no longer sheltering him. It is another night in Gethsemane, another day of Calvary.

Again the words are uttered, not by one lone man, but by multitudes, 'My God, my *God*, why hast thou forsaken me? The sweat drops of blood roll from other foreheads; the crown of thorns can be pressed unheeded into many a brow; Calvary's nails can be driven without added pain. The burden of heart-searching is great among the faithful few, as they remember that one unconfessed sin means death. The mother of Zebedee's children asked for her sons a place on the right and on the left of the King on his throne. The Saviour said that place belonged to him who should drink of the cup of which he himself must drink. That is the cup which is drained to the bitter dregs by the remnant people in the time of trouble, for they are the ones who shall occupy the position mentioned by the mother of James and John. The faithful, sealed followers are not the only ones who know that probation has ended, for upon the wicked the seventh plague is falling, and from it none escape. The time of trouble to the wicked will be terrible, for they drink to the dregs the cup of God's wrath. "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand," but the righteous do not feel the effects of the plague. The mountains shall shake and the islands flee away. Then it is that the grave yields up a part of its dead. At the resurrection of Christ a multitude from all ages came from their graves; they were seen in Jerusalem, and were presented by Jesus as a wave offering on his return to heaven.

So just before his second coming the earth gives up some of those who have slumbered in its bosom. Those who pierced Christ when he hung on the cross, those who mocked and derided him during his trial, will arise to see him as he comes triumphant with the host of heaven. Likewise those who

under the last message have fallen asleep in Jesus, will come forth to welcome him for whom they looked and lived. These come forth to everlasting life, but the first class will be slain by the brightness of his coming.

The kingly garments are put on, and the Saviour prepares to gather his people. Throughout heaven the preparation goes on. Angels hurry to and fro, and the inhabitants of unfallen worlds watch with all eagerness. As the

company forms to accompany the King, the law of God, the ten commandments, the foundation of his throne, is hung upon the sky in view of the startled multitudes of earth. "*His* righteousness hath he openly showed in the sight of the heathen." Men who have scoffed and derided those who obeyed this law, now see it written in the heavens.

Again the most brilliant rainbow is painted on the threatening clouds which overhang the earth. Mercy and justice mingled in all God's dealings with men until they utterly turned from him. To the waiting company this is a renewal of the everlasting covenant made to the fathers that the inheritance should belong to the faithful. Over and over again that same symbol of the everlasting covenant has been hung in the sky, but men have not heard the voice of Jehovah as he spoke in the bow. "The heavens declare the glory of God," but while suns, planets, and systems have been studied by scientists, they have failed to see that in them all God has pictured the organization of his church, and the story of his love to man.

From the creation of the world the very order and arrangement of the stars have told the plan of redemption, but man, devoid of the spirit of truth, can not understand the alphabet of the celestial dome; and while the story has been repeated night after night, he has failed to see the law of God in the firmament.

Jehovah to-day points us to the stars that we may learn the lesson given to Abraham as he called him to his tent door, and traced the promise of the Saviour in the sky. The Star arose upon-Israel, and *wise men* of the East, inspired by God, knew that it was the Christ star. Men, using God-given ability, have invented wonderful instruments for searching the heavens, and God has encouraged the effort in hopes that it would lead to an understanding of the divine story written there, but only the very few have seen or heard the spiritual lesson which was taught.

Daniel watched as Gabriel proceeded, and he saw the heavens depart as a scroll; he saw the sun burst forth in all its glory at midnight, a herald of the Sun of Righteousness. He heard the voice of the trumpeter as the sound

162

rolled through all the earth; he saw the righteous dead come forth in answer to the call of the God of heaven. They came forth glorified; the power of the grave is broken; the earth has no hold upon them, and drawn heavenward, they rise to meet the Lord in the air. Multitudes from the days of Adam down to the end of time mingle with that little company who on earth were waiting and watching for his appearing. Together they pass toward the gates of heaven. The advance guard throw open the pearly gates, and again the angel choir chant the wonderful hallelujah which was sung when Christ returned with the little company on the day of his ascension.

From without come the words, "*Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; that the King of glory may enter through.*"

From within rings forth the song: "*Who is this King of glory?*"

The accompanying host reply:—

"*Jehovah, mighty and victorious;*

Jehovah, victorious in battle,

Lift up your heads, O ye gates;
And be ye lifted up, O everlasting doors;
That the King of glory may enter through."

"And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him a hundred forty and four thousand." In a hollow square about the throne are clustered those who were living when the Son of man came in power. As they see the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world, a song of triumph bursts from their lips. Heaven's arches ring, and wonder of wonders, they whose experiences have seemed so varied, they who have been separated, crushed, degraded, upon whom sin had once placed its terrible hand, find that their voices blend in perfect harmony, and the song they sing is one of such pathos, such depths of joy and gratitude that none others can join with them. Praise rings throughout heaven. Christ's image and his character are perfectly reflected by this company. From the deepest depths of sin to the pinnacle of heaven, each as a stone in the Master's crown, reflects his character, at some certain angle, and the one hundred and forty-four thousand together complete the circle of perfection.

In addition to this company, who act henceforth as the bodyguard of the King, taking the place which had been vacant since the fall of Satan and his angels, was seen another company composed of those who were martyrs,
163

and those who have been snatched from the pit of ruin. And again there is seen an innumerable company which no man can number, representing every nation, tribe, and tongue.

The number which would have peopled the earth had no sin ever entered, is gathered about the Father and the Son. Christ looks upon them, and in spite of the remembrance of the fall, and the pain and sorrow which the plan of salvation cost, when he sees the travail of his soul, he is satisfied. In the midst of his redeemed church the Saviour breaks forth into singing. The thought of sin and sorrow is blotted out. From the nail-prints in his hands stream beams of light which is "the hiding of his power." Heaven bows in adoration, for the victory is gained.

Then it is that Daniel sees the language of the heavens interpreted. The universe is composed of suns, many of them mightier than our own, and each sun is the center of a planetary system, and each planet is accompanied by its satellites, a vast circle within a circle, moving in perfect order, performing its revolution in its allotted time, making, to the ear of Jehovah, the music of the spheres. The immensity of space is filled with universes, and all revolve about the throne of God; all are held in their orbits by rays of power from his throne of life; each shines with a light reflected from Him who is the fountain of life; each is guided in its path by the eye of him who sits on the throne.

This is the type of God's order for his church upon earth. The perfect order of the heavenly bodies is a pattern for family and church organization. Each little company should shine as a star. God looks with pleasure upon the clusters of worshipers as they move in perfect order, each bending to the influence of the higher powers. As it is the power of God in the sun which

holds the earth in its course, so his power, working through the highest organization on earth, controls those of smaller power. In the family, children should obey parents, and parents should obey God, even as the earth follows the sun, and the sun circles about its center—God's throne. The perfection of this system will characterize the last church, which will have developed the character which was looked for in ancient Israel. God's people are a peculiar people, and their peculiarities will live in the virtues of Christ, which they reflect; this fits them to become a royal priesthood. To Daniel the angel said, "They that be teachers [margin] shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." And so the prophet had the privilege of seeing a nation or company of teachers among the saved, who carried forward the work which his own race might have done. As Christ was a *teacher*, who

164

spoke with authority which none could resist, so the remnant church will be teachers by virtue of the Christ life within them.

It was a beautiful picture, that last scene which fell upon the eyes of Daniel. So many times disappointment had been the outcome when the beginning looked so promising, but in the end it is a glorious triumph. Those who are taken from the depths of sin will shine as the stars in the firmament.

"But thou, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end." At that time "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

The portion of time known as "the time of the end" is as distinctly marked as any other prophetic period. At its beginning the hand of oppression was removed from the law of God, which had been changed, and which, in the language of Revelation, had prophesied clothed in sackcloth. At the same time the persecution of the saints had ended. Civil and religious liberty were standing full-fledged before the world, and Gabriel, seeing the freedom granted to man, explained the effects by saying, "*Many* shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

Men living to-day see the fulfillment of the angel's words. Thousands of miles of railroad thread the globe, making it possible for messengers of truth to pass speedily from place to place. The ocean, once an almost impassable barrier between continents, is now crossed in a few days. The printing press daily sends forth thousands of tons of matter, so that the everlasting gospel can be scattered like autumn leaves to every nation on the face of the earth. The multitude of inventions also astonishes the world. Every day witnesses the birth of some new convenience. "*Men* have sought out many inventions," and still the work goes on. God allows it, that his truth may be spread with rapidity, for before his coming every nation, kindred, tongue, and people must hear the warning message.

The increased knowledge of the present generation is marvelous and beyond description. There is no realm of science left unexplored. This is, that man may be led to see the wonders of creation, and so desire to know more of the Creator. As the closing of the Bible in the beginning of the twelve hundred and sixty years brought darkness, intellectual and moral, so the opening of God's Word has led to intellectual as well as moral

advancement. From city to city messages fly on swifter wings than carrier pigeons, while through the mysterious depths of old ocean the words of man pass, unheeded by the myriads that people the ocean caverns.

165

While man looks on in amazement, angels watch with intense interest to see if man will co-operate with them in using these vast facilities to forward the gospel in the earth.

God, from the beginning of earth's history, has offered life to that nation which would make his Word the basis of its education. The Jews were lost as a nation because of the failure to train their children according to its sacred truths; and when the Christian church inherited the promise made to the Israelites, it was upon the same condition that they should teach their children all the statutes of Jehovah.

The time of the end is the period during which the remnant people will be developed. One great means for their education will be a return to true principles of education.

As Christian education and healthful living are revealed in the first glimpse given of the prophet Daniel and his work, so, as he is about to close his earthly career, as he views the last days of earth's history, he is pointed by Christ's special messenger to a people who are true to those same foundation principles. The people who pass safely through the time of trouble, which closes this last prophetic period, will be fortified physically by strict obedience through faith to all the laws of the physical man. And mentally they will be made strong by an education of faith which separates every family from the culture of Egypt, Babylon, and Greece, and instead turns the hearts of parents to their children, binding them all together in the love of Christ.

The time of the end, the period in which we now live, is a time when knowledge shall increase, and as the worldly wise trust more and more to their own wisdom, the faithful followers of God will separate entirely from worldly education. Now is the time for the truly wise to shine as stars whose light is made more apparent as the darkness of iniquity deepens. It is evident that Daniel's whole attention had been centered on the events which Gabriel, God's historian, had related, and when the final triumph of truth was given, it was shown that Christ himself was near the prophet, and that angels of heaven were also listening to the record of events.

So closely bound to earth are these heavenly beings, and so strong are the ties that unite their hearts and interests to man, that when Gabriel ceased speaking, one angel called to Christ, who was again seen on the waters of the stream of time: "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" That was the angel's question, and Christ himself made answer. Holding up his

166
right hand and his left unto heaven, he "*sware* by Him that liveth forever that it shall be for a time, times, and a half."

Angels have waited six thousand years for the completion of the plan; they have watched generation after generation for the final number to be made up, and have seen one century after another roll round, and still the

inhabitants of earth loitered. What wonder is it that when the end is made known, they call out, "How long shall it be till the end?"

Daniel had heard this same period mentioned by Gabriel, and now it was repeated by Christ, but he says, "I heard, but I understood not." the prophet's heart was heavy as he followed the history of nations to the end of time; and fearing he should still be left in doubt as to the time for the fulfillment of all he had seen, like Jacob who in his night of wrestling clung to the angel, he pleaded, "O my Lord, what *shall* be the end of these things?" No request yet made by this man of God had been passed by without an answer. Neither was he now left in ignorance of the time. Gabriel answered the earnest inquiry in tender tones. Said he: "Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed *till the time of the end*;" and then it was seen that "till the time of the end" meant the same as "a time, times, and a half," at the end of which period the great persecution should cease.

This prophetic period of twelve hundred and sixty years began in 538; the law of God was changed, and the Sabbath of the decalogue was trampled under foot of men. Both the law of God and the saints of God were bound for "a time, times, and a half" by the power which exalteth itself above Jehovah, as described in Dan. 7:25. The persecution tended only to scatter the power of the holy people; and at the time of the end both the law of God and the people were restored. The "time, times, and a half" ended in 1798. Since that time the Word of God has been freely circulated among the people. The prophecies have been studied, the judgment message of Revelation 14 has been proclaimed, and in 1844, at the close of the twentythree hundred days, light shone from the sanctuary above, revealing the true Sabbath of the Lord.

As knowledge has increased, the wonderful truths for the time of the end have spread from country to country, preparing the way for the coming of the Son of man.

That the two prophetic periods which had so puzzled the mind of the prophet might be more perfectly understood, Gabriel said, "From the time that the daily is taken away," that is, from 508 A.D., "there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days" until the time of the end, 1798. And 167

again, "Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days." There is then a blessing pronounced upon those who are living in 1843 ($508 + 1335 = 1843$), for the seal has been removed from the prophecies, and they are understood. True it is that "many shall be purified and made white and tried," and that some will not understand, but that does not disprove the prophecies, for "the wise shall understand." In the time when all may understand some will insist that the book of Daniel is still a sealed book. The words of Christ and Gabriel witness against all such. "Whoso readeth, *let him understand*." "He that hath an ear, *let him hear* what the Spirit saith unto the churches."

DANIEL'S WORK WAS OVER. The story of the world was written. His prophecy would stand until the end. He slept with his fathers, after more than seventy years of faithful service in the courts of Babylon and Shushan.

Men could find no fault with him except concerning the law of his God, and Jehovah called him a "man greatly beloved."

In the last days he stands in his lot as a prophet, and the things revealed to him, together with the Revelation given to John on Patmos, and the warnings sent of God through the spirit of prophecy in the remnant church, will guide the faithful company of believers through the time of trouble, and prepare them for the appearing of Christ in the clouds of heaven.

168

Appendix.

THE SANCTUARY

The heavenly sanctuary is the center of Christ's work for man. The destiny of every soul hangs upon the decisions rendered in that great tribunal. Whether they are conscious of it or not, that work concerns every soul upon the earth.

The ancient sanctuary service was given as a shadow of the work done by Christ for the fallen race, in the heavenly sanctuary. The whole Jewish economy was a compacted prophecy of the gospel. It was the gospel in figures. The diagram given on the opposite page illustrates this truth. *The subjects are not exhausted by any means*; but a few texts are given on each subject, that will serve as a guide to deeper research for those who wish to see the light that flashed from the Levitical laws and sacrificial offerings. All the texts in the diagram are reprinted on the following pages, together with the leading thought in the texts. Let the reader ever remember that, "The entire system of Judaism was the gospel veiled."

There are precious views of the work of Christ revealed in the rays of light flashing from the Levitical laws and sacrificial offerings, that will well repay the student who will search for them.

Many to-day discard the study of the Levitical laws, because they think the gospel has no connection with the Jewish economy. All such would do well to ponder prayerfully the last two verses of the fourth chapter of John's Gospel. Moses wrote of Christ. Every statement made, every symbol given was for the one object; viz., To reveal a sin-pardoning Redeemer to fallen man. Christ said: "If ye believe not his [Moses'] writings how shall ye believe My words,"..."for he wrote of Me;" also, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Luke 16: 31. The words are true to-day, and any one who will study the Levitical laws, believing that the entire system of Judaism reveals the gospel of Christ, will find his faith in the Saviour greatly strengthened by the study. As they learn to behold Christ revealed in types, shadowed in symbols, and manifested in the revelations of the prophets, as fully as in the lessons given to the disciples, and in the wonderful miracles wrought for the children of men, their hearts will burn within them as He talks with them by the way. They will be dwelling upon the same precious truths the Saviour

169

dwelt upon as he walked with the disciples on the way to Emmaus; when, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets He expounded unto them in all the

Scriptures the things concerning Himself." Luke 23:13-31.

170

Second Coming of Christ

Lev. 16:20-25. When the high priest on the day of atonement had made an end of reconciling, and had placed the sins upon the scapegoat, he laid aside his high priest's robe, and went into the court and cleansed it. So Christ when probation closes, lays aside His priestly garments and comes into the antitypical court, the earth, to gather out of it all things that offend and do iniquity. Matt. 13:41.

Isa. 63:1-6. Christ comes clad in garments of vengeance.

Rev. 19:16; Zeph. 2:1-3. Christ does not come to the earth in priestly robes, but in kingly garments.

The Millennium

Lev. 16:20-22. The scapegoat was led into a desolate land, a land not inhabited. "Scapegoat" is a synonym for evil.

Job 1:7. The earth is the devil's home.

Jer. 4:23-27. The earth will be desolate. When there is "no man," animals, or birds, the devil and his angels will be the only life left upon the earth.

Isa. 24:21, 22; Jer. 4:27. This desolate condition will only be for a limited period of time.

Eze. 28:18, 19. The devil will finally be brought to ashes on the earth.

Lev. 6: 9-11. The ashes of the burnt offering left in a clean place, taught the final destruction of sin and the devil.

The New Earth

Gen. 3:17. Earth cursed by sin

Num. 85 :g3. Curse only removed by the blood of the offending party.

Lev. 17:11-13. The blood made atonement for sin.

Lev. 4:7, 18, 25, 30. The blood of every sin offering poured upon the sin-cursed earth, taught the cleansing of the earth by the blood of Christ.

Jer. 9:21. The air is laden with disease germs as the result of sin.

171

Ex. 15:23. The water is effected by the curse. Land, air, and water are all cursed by sin.

Lev. 14:4-7. This offering made provision for the cleansing of the water, air, and ground. The blood came in contact with each. It was caught in an *earthen* vessel held over running *water*; and the bird. flew through the *air* with blood upon its feathers. Hyssop, cedar wood, and wool were dipped in the blood.

1 Kings 4:33. The hyssop and cedar represented the two extremes of vegetation. Dipping them in the blood was but a type of the vegetation of the whole earth being cleansed by the blood of Christ.

Num. 19:6. In this offering the cleansing of the vegetation by fire was also taught. The hyssop and cedar wood were burned.

John 19:29. The cross was made of the trees of the forest. Thus the two extremes of vegetation, the hyssop and the forest trees, came in contact with the blood of Christ.

Lev. 25:23, 24. The land was never sold, but if lost in any way could be

redeemed by the one nearest of kin that had power to redeem.

Ruth 2:20. Christ is the only one near of kin to humanity that has power to redeem. Satan does not own the land; he simply has present possession.

Christ alone has the right to redeem Adam's lost dominion.

The Law of God

Ex 25:21 The ark, the central article of furniture in the sanctuary, was made to contain the law of God.

Ex. 31:18. The tables were called tables of testimony.

Rev. 11:19. The ark containing the testimony is in the heavenly sanctuary.

Sabbath

Ex. 25:30 Shewbread was to be continually kept upon the table in the holy place.

1 Chron. 9:32. Every Sabbath the priests were to prepare fresh bread.

172

Lev. 24: 5-9, The bread was made in twelve loaves, placed in two rows upon the table. It remained on the table a week, and was then taken off the table and eaten by the priests.

1 Sam. 21:6. The fresh bread was taken hot from the oven each Sabbath morning and placed upon the table.

All the work connected with the shewbread was Sabbath work; therefore, all the antitypical lessons connected with it were Sabbath lessons. The bread was a type of Christ, the "living bread." John 6:51. We as members of the royal priesthood (1 Peter 2:9) should have fresh truth from the Word of God each Sabbath day, and feed upon the truth ourselves.

Rev. 11:19. The ark in the most holy place was made to contain the law of God. John saw the ark in heaven. The Sabbath commandment, which is the basis of all Sabbath keeping, is the fourth one in the decalogue, and is found in the heavenly ark.

Repentance

Every sin offering taught this truth; for the sinner confessed his sins over the head of the sacrifice before its life was taken.

Lev. 4:27-31. Freedom from sin was clearly taught; the sinner's sins were "forgiven him."

Fate of the Wicked

Psa. 73:12-18. When David entered the sanctuary he clearly understood the fate of the wicked. The sanctuary service taught it plainly.

Lev. 3:14-17; Lev. 16: 25. All the fat was separated from the sacrifice and burned.

Psa. 37:20. The burning of the fat symbolized the burning of sin and sinners in the fires of the last days.

Lev. 4:8-12; Lev. 6:10,11. Even the care of the ashes taken from the altar taught an important lesson. They were not thrown carelessly aside, but were emptied out on a "clean place" prepared for the purpose.

Mal. 4:3. The antitype will be fully met when the fires of the last day have fully consumed Satan and the wicked, and all that remains of them will be ashes upon the "clean" earth. Eze. 28:18.

173

Christian Help Work

Ex. 22: 22-24. God has a special care for the widow and orphans.

Deut. 14:29. One who cares for the stranger, the widow, and orphan will be blessed in his work.

Deut. 24:19-22. When the grain was harvested provision was made for the poor.

Isa. 58:7-12. Spiritual and physical health come as the reward of supplying the needs of the poor and helpless.

Spiritual Gifts

Ex. 28:30. The Urim and Thummim were to be placed in the breastplate and worn by the high priest.

Num. 27:21; 1 Sam. 28: 6. The high priest learned the mind of the Lord through these stones in the breastplate.

1 Sam. 23:9-12. Direct answers were given from God by means of the breastplate, representing the direct communication between God and His people, through the prophets.

"At the right and left of the breastplate were two large stones of great brilliancy. These were known as the Urim and Thummim. By them the will of God was made known through the high priest. When questions were brought for decision before the Lord, a halo of light encircling the precious stone at the right was a token of the divine consent or approval, while a cloud shadowing the stone at the left was an evidence of denial or disapprobation."

Christian Education

Ex. 12:26, 27. One object of the types and symbols was to arouse an inquiry in the minds of the young, and these questions were to be faithfully answered by the parents.

Ex. 13: 7, 8, 14. The eating of unleavened bread and the redeeming of the first-born would cause the children to inquire why it was done. The instruction given was to be in answer to the child's own inquiry.

174

Deut. 32:7. Instruction was to be received by questions asked parents and elders. It was the duty of the parents and elders to faithfully answer these questions.

Josh. 4: 6-7. Objects were placed in conspicuous places to arouse the curiosity of the children, and the questions were to be faithfully answered.

Psa. 78:6,7. Faithfulness to God was to be implanted in the child by the instruction given by the parents.

Deut. 4: 9-13. The knowledge of the events connected with the giving of the law of God, was especially mentioned as important in the education of the children.

Deut. 6:7-9. The conversation in the home and while engaged in the daily tasks should always be such as will educate the children in the things of God.

Ministration of Angels

Ex. 25:20. The golden cherubim were but a shadow or type of the cherubim "that covereth" in the sanctuary in heaven. Luke 1:19.

Ex. 36:8, 35. Cherubim were wrought in the curtains that served as "veils" and ceiling for the earthly sanctuary, and were but a type of the "thousand thousands" and ten thousand times ten thousand" of angels that Daniel beheld in the heavenly sanctuary.

Dan 7:9, 10. To Daniel this vast multitude of angels ministering in the heavenly sanctuary appeared as a "fiery flame." Heb. 1:7; Eze. 1:14.

Baptism

John 1:25. There was something in the Scriptures that taught the people that when the forerunner of Christ came he would baptize; for the people were expecting it.

Ex. 40:12-16. Washing with water was a part of the ceremony in consecrating the priests.

Ex. 30:17-21. Washing with water when they served in the priests' work was so important that "death" was the penalty for neglect.

1 Cor. 10:1, 2. The Lord called the passage through the Red Sea baptism.

175

Dress Reform

Num. 15:37-39. Dresses were made in such a manner that as they looked at them they were reminded of the commandments of God, and encouraged to obey them. In their dress they were not to seek after their own hearts, nor their own eyes. If they did, they would copy the fashions of Babylon.

Deut. 22:5. Women were forbidden to wear masculine attire.

Lev. 19:19. Garments were ever taken as an emblem of the righteousness of Christ, and when different substances as linen and wool were mingled it spoiled the figure.

Isa. 3:16-24. Foolish fashions are not confined to modern days, but have been in existence from early times. All of the fashions named here, are used in some part of the world to-day. When the "daughters of Zion" followed the fashions of the world, it caused Zion to sit upon the ground desolate. Isa. 3: 26.

1 Peter 3:5. It was only a firm trust in God that enabled the women to dress plainly and ignore the fashions of the world.

1 Tim. 2:9. Women should dress in modest apparel.

Gen. 35:1-5. After Jacob's daughter had been disgraced (Gen. 34:1-5), Jacob drew near to God. He then saw that their manner of dressing was like the world, and he called upon his family to change their garments and hide their ornaments.

Josh. 7:20, 21, 11. Achan coveted the Babylonish garment and lost his place in Israel.

Judgment

Eccl. 12:13, 14. The law contained in the ark in the most holy place, is the standard in the Judgment. Rom. 2:11-13.

Jer. 17:12. The throne of God has ever been connected with the sanctuary in heaven.

Dan. 7:9, 10. Daniel was given a view of the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary. He saw the Great Judge of the universe seated upon that throne.

In His presence the books were opened and every case decided. The

sanctuary is the great Judgment Hall of the universe of God.

176

The Lord's Supper

Gen. 14:18. Melchisedec, the great priest king of Salem, gave "bread and wine" to Abraham.

Lev. 7:15-21. The "peace offering" shadowed forth the death and resurrection of Christ. It was to be eaten on the first and second days; any one who ate the flesh the third day, by that act, virtually said he did not believe that Christ would be alive upon the third day.

Lev. 19:5-8. And one who disregarded this injunction failed to see the object of the service, and thus "profaned the hallowed things of the Lord," and was cut off from among the people of God. The peace offering was eaten by all the people. It shadowed forth the death of Christ, while the Lord's Supper commemorates it.

John 11:39. Upon the fourth day after death the body had begun to decay.

Psa. 16:9, 10. The prophets clearly revealed that Christ's body would not see corruption. It would not be in the grave the third day.

Acts 2:24-27, 30, 31. Peter quoted from the sixteenth Psalm to prove the resurrection of Christ. The people were familiar with the peace offering, which clearly taught the death and resurrection of Christ, and the converting power of God attended his words.

Righteousness by Faith

Lev. 16:13. The incense shielded the priest from death when he went in before the Lord.

Rev. 8:3 [margin]. Incense added to the prayers of the saints makes them acceptable to God.

NOTE. It was the work of the priest in the daily ministration to present before God the blood of the sin offering, also the incense which ascended with the prayers of Israel. So did Christ plead His blood before the Father in behalf of sinners, and present before Him also, with the precious fragrance of His own righteousness, the prayers of penitent believers.—" *Great Controversy*," p. 421.

Deut. 15:19, 21. The offerings were to be without blemish, thus representing the perfect life of Christ imputed to us.

177

Lev. 22:24, 25. If any one offered an imperfect offering it was not accepted. By faith they were to see Christ's righteous character in every offering.

Health Reform

Lev. 23:27, 29. Every man was required to afflict his soul while the work of atonement was going forward. All business was to be laid aside, and the whole congregation of Israel were to spend the day in solemn humiliation before God, *with prayer, fasting, and deep searching of heart.*—" *Great Controversy*," p. 420.

Isa. 58:5. To fast is to afflict the soul. The day of atonement in the type was a fast day. The appetite was held in perfect control, a type of the control of appetite God required during the antitypical day of atonement.

Luke 21:34-36. The Saviour says that during the time of the judgment,

while individuals are being "accounted" worthy or unworthy, we are to take heed lest we become overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness.

Surfeiting is taking too freely of food, whether it be good or bad.

Drunkenness is partaking of improper food. We are to be the master, and not the slave, of our appetite.

Isa. 22:12-14. In this period when God calls to self-control, many will give loose reins to their appetite.

Isa. 66:15-17. All such will be destroyed, "consumed together saith the Lord."

Deut. 23:12-14. The Lord required strict sanitary arrangements throughout the camp, for He walked in the midst of His people.

Life Only Through Christ

Lev. 4: 29. Every sin offering slain, taught that the sinner gained life through the death of the offering. A substitute was slain and the sinner lived.

Rom. 6:23. Sin brings death; freedom from sin, life through the Saviour.
178

Tithing

Lev. 27:30-34. The Lord reserved as His own one-tenth of man's income. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." He has a right to claim a portion of the wealth.

Num. 18:20-28. The Lord used the tithe to support his work in the earth. It was given to the priests, and they in turn paid a tithe into the treasury.

Heb. 7:1, 2. Abraham paid tithe to Melchisedec.

Heb 6: 20. Jesus is a priest after the order of Melchisedec.

John 8:39. If we are Abraham's seed we will do the works of Abraham—pay our tithe to support the work of Christ upon the earth. "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

1 Cor. 9: 9-14.

Order

Num. 4:17-20. If those appointed to carry the articles of furniture, went in to look at the furniture before it was covered, they were slain. Each was to come in their order. The priests were to cover the furniture, then the Kohathites were to bear it.

1 Sam. 6:19-20. The people were punished with death for disobeying and looking into the ark.

2 Sam. 6:6, 7. God commanded that the priests alone should touch the ark.

2 Sam. 6:12, 13. When the ark was carried by the priests according to God's direction, the Lord blessed them.

NOTE. The directions in regard to order in the tabernacle service were recorded that lessons might be drawn from it by all who should live upon the earth. Men were selected to do various parts of the work of setting up and taking down the tabernacle; and if one strayed in carelessly and put his hands to the work assigned to another, he was to be put to death.

We serve the same God to-day. But the death penalty has been abolished; had it not been, there would not be so much careless, disorderly work in His cause. The God of heaven is a God of order, and He requires all His

followers to have rules and regulations, and to preserve order.—"

Testimonies for the Church," Vol. V, p. 274.

179

Questions For Study

NOTE.—For the benefit of those who may wish to use "Story of Daniel the Prophet" as a text-book in either the family or the school the following questions have been prepared.

CHAPTER I

DANIEL AND HIS FELLOWS TESTED

1. How long ago did Daniel live?
 2. What is he called, and why?
 3. How much of the world's history is covered by his prophecies?
 4. Of what did the Saviour bear witness?
 5. Was the Book of Daniel ever sealed? If so, for how long?
 6. When did "the time of the end" begin?
 7. Who can understand the book of Daniel?
 8. With what statement does the book open?
 9. When did this trouble begin?
 10. To whom is the captivity of Judah an object lesson?
 11. Why did God separate the Jewish nation from the rest of the world?
 12. What was God's design?
 13. What facilities were given to carry out His plan?
 14. Why was Jerusalem destroyed?
 15. Through what agencies was the restoration accomplished?
 16. What king reigned over Judah about one hundred years before the days of Daniel? How long did he reign?
 17. What remarkable incident happened during his reign?
 18. Who came to the king to inquire of the mighty God of Israel?
 19. Of what did they hear instead?
- 180
20. What message came to the king from God?
 21. How was it preserved?
 22. What two classes of mothers are brought to view?
 23. Who was born three years after the king's recovery? What was his mother's name?
 24. How was the child trained?
 25. Give the points of contrast between this young king's character and that of Christ's.
 26. Was the prediction of the prophet fulfilled at once?
 27. Who was reigning when Jeremiah began to prophesy? What relation was the king to Manasseh?
 28. How was the impending doom portrayed?
 29. What did Josiah do that prevented the destruction from coming in his day?
 30. How many sons did Josiah have, and what office did they occupy?
 31. What were their names?

32. Who was Jehoiachin?
33. What is said of Jehoahaz' reign? [margin]
34. What course did Jehoiakim pursue?
35. What calamity befell the nation during his reign?
36. What is said of Jehoiakim?
37. Give the history of Jehoiachin.
38. Who was given an opportunity to save Jerusalem?
39. How long had Daniel been in Babylon when Zedekiah received an important testimony from Jeremiah?
40. Give the testimony.
41. What excuse did Zedekiah give for not obeying the testimony?

181

A TRUE EDUCATION

42. Who were related to the kings mentioned above?
43. How old was Daniel when taken to Babylon?
44. What is said of Daniel's early training?
45. What history did he study? What Bible story was told and retold to him? Was he taught physiology?
46. What is said of the songs they sang?
47. Where were these youths educated?
48. What was the character of the youth in the schools of that day?
49. Why was Daniel and his companions chosen as foreign missionaries? Is the same principle true to-day?
50. On what list were these youths placed?
51. What shows that their home education had been thorough?
52. What is said of their "examination grade"?
53. What special test came to them?
54. With what is a Biblical education in harmony?
55. What decision did Daniel make?
56. Were there more than four Hebrew youths in the court of Babylon?
57. What position was taken by Daniel and his three friends?
58. How much was involved in this decision?
59. What request was made of the officers?
60. When the officers hesitated, what proposition was made by the young men?
61. What was the result of the ten days' trial?
62. Was this always their exclusive diet?
63. Whom does Daniel's character represent?
64. Wherein was Daniel's test like Adam's?
65. Where did Christ begin His ministry?

182

66. What lies at the foundation of every true reform?
67. What is embraced in health reform?
68. Who are fitted to bear responsibilities?
69. Describe the school experience of Daniel and his friends?
70. What motive inspired them?
71. Who was their educator?

72. What was given them while they were learning the languages and sciences?
73. How long were they in this school?
74. Who conducted the examinations?
75. Who received the highest grades?
76. How did they compare with the wise men of the kingdom? What position was given them?
77. What was ever in their mind?
78. Describe their personal appearance.
79. What is the foundation of the highest education?
80. Who will be rewarded?
81. What opportunity for missionary work is offered in the worldly universities?
82. What examples in the past are cited?
83. How long did Daniel live?
84. With whom did he become acquainted?

CHAPTER II

A CONTROVERSY BETWEEN TRUTH AND ERROR

1. Give the first sentence in the chapter.
2. How is Nebuchadnezzar spoken of in the first chapter? How in the second?
3. Where will we find the history of Babylon?
183
4. What is embraced in this history?
5. What is Satan's accusation against God?
6. What request was made and granted?
7. What had God told the people to do? What did they do?
8. Describe the city.
9. In what council was Satan then a representative?
10. What was his design?
11. After what pattern was the city modeled?
12. Describe its government when Nebuchadnezzar came to the throne.
13. What did he do for the city?
14. What is said of Nebuchadnezzar?
15. What did Babylon become?
16. In what branches of education were the Babylonians especially proficient?
17. What did God say caused Babylon to turn away?
18. What statement of the Lord was exemplified in the court of Babylon? By what parties?

THE DREAM

19. Of what was Nebuchadnezzar thinking when he fell asleep?
20. With what facts was he well acquainted?
21. Did he know of the future?
22. When was God's opportunity to speak to him?
23. What prevented the king from relating the dream?
24. Of whom did he demand an interpretation?

25. What was their answer?
 26. Why did the Lord permit this?
 27. How did the request of the wise men affect the king?
- 184
28. How long had Nebuchadnezzar reigned when he made this decree?
 29. With whom had he ruled the previous two years?
 30. How long had Daniel and his fellows been counted with the wise men?
 31. What question did they ask Arioch? What reply was given?
 32. Did Daniel trust to any one's, interceding for him? What did he do? What was the result?
 33. What supreme moment comes in every life?
 34. How had Daniel been prepared for this test?
 35. What probable reason is given for Daniel not being classed with the wise men of Chaldea?
 36. What does God choose with which to confound the mighty?
 37. How did Daniel and his fellows spend the night?
 38. What was shown Daniel?
 39. What was revealed in Daniel's song of praise?
 40. What was developed in the schools of Babylon?
 41. With what was this contrasted?
 42. How had God taught Egyptian senators?
 43. What text of Scripture was exemplified when Daniel stood before the king and wise men?
 44. Give the contrast in appearance between Daniel and the king.
 45. What opportunity was given Daniel? What did he choose?
 46. To whom was the king's mind directed?
 47. How much time and space is required by God to give the history of twenty-five hundred years?
 48. In what way was the grandeur of Babylon recognized in the image?
 49. Give passages of Scripture predicting the downfall of Babylon and her wise men.
 50. Where alone is the strength of every nation?
 51. Who decides their destiny?
- 185
52. How long did Babylon continue?
 53. In what way was the second nation represented in the image?
 54. Name in order the four kingdoms represented by the image.
 55. What division was made in Rome?
 56. In the days of the division what will God establish?
 57. What was the image?
 58. The different grades of metal revealed what?
 59. In the place of one universal kingdom what would be established?
 60. What peculiar combination was denoted by the mixture of clay and iron?
 61. Give the basis of government in heathen nations?
 62. How long will the union of church and state continue?
 63. What was indicated by the stone being cut out of the mountain without

hands?

A CHANGED HEART

64. Did the king accept the interpretation?
65. Was it God or Daniel that he honored when he fell before Daniel?
66. How old was Daniel? What position was given him? Were his companions forgotten?
67. Who was reigning in Judah?
68. What did God intend His people should do?
69. Were they excused from this duty because they failed to do it in a time of peace?
70. Follow step by step the means God used to send the knowledge of the true God to the ends of the earth.
71. What placed Nebuchadnezzar in a position where he could save Jerusalem?
72. How did God recognize this change in the messages sent through His prophet?
- 186
73. What is the history of Babylon to us?
74. Give the comparison between the past and the present.
75. Name some of the sins of ancient Babylon toward which the world today is hastening.
76. In what way does God's call from modern Babylon resemble Abraham's call?
77. What has God given His people that, if followed, would make them a wonder to the world?
78. What would make them teachers of the world?
79. What will the true principles of government accomplish?
80. How many were true to principle in the days of Daniel? Who will be true to-day?

CHAPTER III

TRUE FREEDOM IN WORSHIP

1. How many years after the dream of the Second Chapter did Nebuchadnezzar make the golden image?
2. What positions were held by Daniel and his three friends?
3. What opportunities had been improved by them? 24. What had befallen Jerusalem, the Jews, and Jehoiachin?
5. Give Nebuchadnezzar's spiritual condition.
6. What did he make? After what model?
7. In what way did his image differ from the one in the dream?
8. Give height and location of the image.
9. To whom did the king issue a decree?
10. Who was watching with intense interest?
11. With what was the worldly power of Babylon in conflict?
12. Of what was Babylon a symbol?
13. Give the words of the herald.
14. How should God be worshiped?

15. What is necessary in pagan worship?
 16. In the person of the Babylonian king, what did Satan do?
 17. Describe the course God pursued when Satan refused to worship before His throne.
 18. What course did the Babylonian king pursue?
 19. What is the motive power in heavenly government?
 20. Human power exercised is what?
 21. What is all tyranny? By what other names is it sometimes known?
 22. When civil power enforces worship, what does that worship become?
 23. What is it from a civil standpoint? From a religious point of view?
 24. Did all bow before the image?
 25. What report was carried to the king?
 26. Name those who refused to bow before the image?
 27. Into whose presence were they called?
 28. Describe their interview with the king.
 29. To whom were they a spectacle?
 30. What were at stake?
 31. Who were actors? What opportunity was offered them?
 32. Is there any religion of value that does not teach loyalty to God?
 33. What had the Hebrew youth learned from the history of God's dealings in the past?
 34. What answer did they give the king?
 35. How did this answer affect the king?
 36. What command did he give?
 37. In what way did God begin to vindicate His servants?
 38. Were they injured by the fire?
 39. How was the king suddenly affected?
 40. What question did he ask? Give the answer of his attendants, also the king's reply.
- 188
41. What enabled the king to recognize the form of the fourth?
 42. Who had given the king a description of the Son of God? What did he know of the angels?
 43. How did the king feel as he approached the furnace?
 44. How did he address those in the furnace?
 45. What were the hosts on the plain of Dura witness to? What was forgotten by the assembly?
 46. What did God accomplish with only three men?
 47. How widely was the story of the wonderful deliverance told?
 48. What principles were made known, also what history?
 49. What does Nebuchadnezzar again acknowledge?
 50. When Daniel interpreted the dream, what triumphed? When the three Hebrews were saved from the fire, what was proclaimed to the nations of the earth?
 51. What decree was issued? What freedom was given by this?
 52. In place of death, as planned by Satan, what was granted?
 53. What was the crowning act in the lives of the three Hebrews? Are they

mentioned after this? How were they rewarded?

54. Did they *know* God would deliver them?

55. What does the absence of faith bring?

56. What is God ever ready to do?

57. Are we often tried in the same way twice?

58. What men are mentioned as being tried in different ways? What has each child of God to-day? Whose ear is ever open?

59. Were Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego different from us?

60. Why are their lives written?

61. How were they affected by the positions they held?

62. In what way may we obtain strength of will and body?

63. What is the fruit of the Spirit?

64. Give the steps which led to the crucial test on the plains of Dura.

189

65. What chapter in Revelation contains the same principles as the third of Daniel?

66. What is the image of Revelation?

67. What will be given the image? How many will be required to worship it?

68. Answer the four questions asked in the last paragraph of the chapter.

69. Of what are the scenes of the third chapter a miniature representation?

CHAPTER IV

THE MOST HIGH RULETH

1. What is the fourth chapter of Daniel?

2. To whom was it sent?

3. How does it come to us?

4. What was the object of the king in writing the document?

5. In what way does the king express himself similarly to Paul?

6. What was Nebuchadnezzar called?

7. How was he spoken of in the prophecy?

8. Why had he been successful in war?

9. In what way does the capture of Tyre illustrate how God used the king to punish other nations?

10. Who was given a view of the capture of Egypt? To whom was the testimony sent?

11. How was Egypt represented in the vision?

12. In what ways was this vision probably made known to Nebuchadnezzar?

13. How great were Nebuchadnezzar's conquests when the dream of the fourth chapter was given? What can be said of his income and resources?

14. How did the dream affect him? Upon whom did he call for an interpretation of the dream?

15. Could they interpret the dream?

190

16. To whom did God always give the first trial?

17. When they failed, who was called?

18. By what name was Daniel known to Nebuchadnezzar and his

associates?

19. What was the meaning of the name?
20. What had God said of Bel years before?
21. What opportunity was again given Daniel?
22. What is said of the dream?
23. Where were magnificent specimens of trees seen?
24. What story had been handed down to the people, and of what two trees did they know?
25. Describe the tree of the dream.
26. What strange fact was true of the tree?
27. How did it correspond with the Egyptian tree?
28. What can you say of the roots of this wonderful tree?
29. Whence did it draw nourishment?
30. Upon what were the fair leaves and fruit dependent?
31. Who was seen by the king as he gazed upon the tree?
32. Whom did he resemble?
33. What command was given by the Holy Watcher?
34. What was left of the tree?
35. Did hewing down the tree kill the stump and roots?
36. What is said of this message to Nebuchadnezzar?
37. In his former dream, what was shown him?
38. How could he have avoided this experience? .
75. Where would he find his home?
76. For how long? What lesson would he thus learn?
77. How did Daniel exhort the king?
- 191
78. Was there time for repentance?
79. Is the message of warning heeded by those determined to have their own way?
80. How much time was given the king in which to repent?
81. How was the king engaged at the end of this period?
82. What did he exclaim?
83. Whose thoughts and words was he almost repeating?
84. What blasted the tree and degraded the monarch?
85. Who has power to give and take reason and ability?
86. What elevates man above the beasts?
87. Quote the words of David.
88. What means does God use to save those who will not heed His call in prosperity?
89. Describe the condition of Nebuchadnezzar during the seven years.
90. What mandate had gone forth?
91. What is necessary in the cause of God?
92. When can God no longer sustain men?
93. What is said of the experience of nations and individuals? Of the church?
94. Who will be brought to confusion?
95. Where does every brilliant thought originate?

96. What was the object in all God's dealings?
97. What was the result of the king's degradation?
98. To whom did he send an account of his experience?
99. What had the king learned?

CHAPTER V

THE LAST YEARS OF THE BABYLONIAN KINGDOM

1. What four principles does the history of the Babylonian nation reveal?
192
- 2.. How do we learn these principles?
3. Where do we find the highest development of some of the plans of Satan?
4. Of what were these principles a counterfeit?
5. What was the source of its strength?
6. Under what laws was it built and developed?
7. Where does the greatest evil lie?
8. What principle makes the strongest earthly kingdoms?
9. Was it easy to detect the error?
10. Does God ever deal arbitrarily with men or angels?
11. Does He deal arbitrarily with Satan?
12. What did He allow in the Babylonian kingdom?
13. Why did He do this?
14. What does the least perversion of truth bring?
15. How does God vindicate Himself before the universe?
16. What did Satan claim as his own?
17. Who protected the king upon the throne?
18. Who gave power in his battles?
19. To what was this kingdom compared in the king's dream?
20. Who caused the tree to grow?
21. How high was it?
22. Why did God send warnings and entreaties to this nation?
23. Of what is its history a forcible commentary?
24. If Babylon had heeded the warnings, what would she have done?
25. What would then have been her history?
26. Of what need none remain ignorant?
27. Of what can no nation plead ignorance?
28. What explains it all?
29. For whom is the book intended? Of what is Babylon an object lesson?
193
30. What is said of her growth?
31. What do her failures describe?
32. In what are nations and individuals alike?
33. When does destruction come to nations and individuals?
34. What takes their place?
35. What does the Most High do?
36. How do the events often appear to the human eye?
37. Under what control are they?
38. What therefore, does the study of the book of Daniel demand?
9. How many years intervened between the fourth and fifth chapters of

Daniel?

40. When did the reign of Nebuchadnezzar close?
41. What kind of a reign did he have?
42. Were there any signs of weakening power?
43. Whom did he have to take his place?
44. Did any one question his right to the throne?
45. Over what had his subjects apparent reason to rejoice?
46. How did this history look in the eyes of heaven?
47. What desires had different times been written opposite the name of the king?
48. With what were these periods followed?
49. Of what was there a record?
50. What object did God have in this?
51. Does heaven grow weary with the struggles of nations?
52. Who was the son of Nebuchadnezzar?
53. How many times is he mentioned in the Scriptures?
54. How many acts of his life are associated with the mention of his name?
55. What is there strange about this?

194

56. When this silence is broken, what is the nature of the act mentioned?
57. In what year of his reign did he take Jehoiachin from prison?
58. How long had he been in prison?
59. What did the king give this ruler?
60. How long did this kindness continue to Jehoiachin?
61. Where had Evil-Merodach been reared?
62. What must he have known?
63. Who might have been the instructor of the prince?
64. What reason can be given for this?
65. How long did Evil-Merodach reign?
66. By what was his reign followed?
67. Who then was seated upon the throne?
68. Who was associated with him in about 541 B.C.?
69. How long did they reign conjointly?
70. What relation was Belshazzar to Nebuchadnezzar?
71. What was his character?
72. Was Daniel retained in his court?
73. Where was he living in the third year of Belshazzar?
74. What vision was given Daniel while at this place?
75. What occurred during the reign of these two kings?
76. Who knew that the downfall of the kingdom was near?
77. What was to be done in spite of the Jews' oppression?
78. From where will the host of the saved be gathered?
79. Who is mentioned as being among them?
80. When these ruling monarchs turned from God, how did it affect the Jews?
81. What had the Jews been instructed to do when they went to Babylon?
82. How long was their captivity to last?

195

83. What preserved the peculiarity of the Jews?
84. What did this keep them from?
85. Of what were the Babylonians worshipers?
86. Why did they mock the Jews?
87. What did they forbid them to do?
88. What did they demand of the Jews?
89. But how was it with Israel?
90. Of what did the Babylonians boast?
91. What reason did they give?
92. Did the king relent?
93. What was it to the Jews?
94. Of what was this a foretaste?
95. What are both periods of trouble called?
96. What were the Jews to do under these circumstances?
97. Could they ever have preached the Gospel under more favorable circumstances?
98. What did they teach beneath this oppression?
99. What was known to the Babylonians throughout this captivity?
100. What had Daniel received more than once?
101. What were Ezekiel and Jeremiah doing at this time?
102. To whom were they to make known these messages?
103. Was the presence of prophets among God's people hidden in their midst?
104. To what nations were these messages sent?
105. Did they know who was to destroy Babylon?
106. Had the name of the leading general been mentioned?
107. How does God use His people?
108. When they neglected to give the light in a time of peace, how were they required to give it?

196

109. What was Babylon like at this time?
110. In what year did the Medes and Persians start against Babylon?
111. Who heard of this news?
112. What message did God then send His people?
113. Who at this message withdrew from Babylon?
114. What does history say about the delay of Cyrus?
115. What did Cyrus set his men to do?
116. How long were they digging these channels?
117. What did the prophecy say of this time?
118. How was it fulfilled?
119. Who scoffed?
120. What came the next spring?
121. Was there any time to leave then?
122. Who met in open battle?
123. Who was defeated?
124. What did the Babylonians do?

125. Could the Jews get out then?
126. What was then reached in the greatest of earthly governments?
127. What was awake with anxiety?
128. Who only was asleep?

CHAPTER VI

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

1. What time had arrived?
2. Did the people know of it?
3. How were the people spending that night?
4. How was it in the dens of Babylon?
5. How in the palace halls?
- 197
6. Where were the nobles?
7. Who else were present?
8. What was this feast, and to whom did they drink?
9. What did the king order?
10. As they drank, whose blessing was invoked?
11. Did the cup reach the king's lips?
12. By whose hands, and after what models, had those vessels been made?
13. Who had watched them when taken to Babylon?
14. Who had guarded them while there?
15. Of what was their presence a witness?
16. Does God let such desecrations go unnoticed?
17. What did the king see on the opposite wall?
18. How did this affect the king?
19. What ceased?
20. Upon whom did the one thousand guests look?
21. Who were called to read the writing?
22. Could they read the language of Heaven?
23. How did the four characters appear upon the wall?
24. What had been the condition of the city for several days?
25. What had the Lord said about their earthly protection?
26. What becomes of the strongest strongholds when God's hand is laid upon them?
27. Had the rulers of Babylon learned this lesson?
28. Who had never owned his weakness?
29. Who had watched the progress of affairs in this great city?
30. Of what was it the battle-ground?
31. Between whom was the controversy?
32. Who had mustered these forces against Babylon?
- 198
33. Who was God using?
34. What had God said about Cyrus' entering the city?
35. While the king and his lords were drinking, what was Cyrus doing?
36. When the Chaldeans could not read the writing on the wall, how did it affect the king?
37. What did he know?

38. What did the queen mother remember about Daniel?
39. Who was called into the banquet hall?
40. What did the earthly monarch promise him?
41. How did the prophet of God appear before the terror-stricken throng?
42. How were children named by Israel in early times?
43. Whose names were changed by God?
44. What is the meaning of the name, *Daniel*?
45. What had Nebuchadnezzar called him?
46. In whose honor was this name?
47. Did this affect the prophet?
48. How did he speak before the king?
49. What was this moment to them?
50. Was Daniel at this time an old or a young man?
51. How did these rewards affect him?
52. What did he proceed to do?
53. How did he speak to Belshazzar?
54. What did he say?
55. How were these words spoken?
56. What had Belshazzar done?
57. What had he severed?
58. Of what is the natural breath a symbol?
59. How had the king used his breath and powers?
- 199
60. Where and how were these characters written?
61. Give the four terrible words.
62. What was their meaning?
63. In what way does God deal with men?
64. What is a common belief among idolators?
65. How did the explanation of the writing affect the magicians?
66. Is this symbol still applicable?
67. By whom had God sent an explanation?
68. Give Ezekiel's explanation.
69. When a man accepts Christ, what is written opposite his name in the books of Heaven?
70. As long as he hides in Christ, how is he known?
71. How does he deal with men?
72. If the worst of sinners repent, what does God take into account?
73. How does God deal with nations?
74. What does this explain?
75. What had God given the Babylonian monarchs?
76. Who had long hovered over this earthly government?
77. What had been bestowed upon them, and for what purpose?
78. But what had happened at last?
79. What only could be the result?
80. What was the last word that Daniel read?
81. How was Daniel attired?
82. By the time this was done, what was heard?

83. What was done unnoticed by them while they were feasting?
84. What had prevented Cyrus from entering the city?
85. How did the men enter the river?
- 200
86. When the Babylonians were feeling secure, what had they neglected to do?
87. As soon as they entered the city, what happened?
88. Did they receive the news in time to save them?
89. Toward what place did the enemy rush?
90. What words had the prophet uttered describing the scene?
91. What did the prophet exclaim?
92. What raged through the street?
93. With what did they fight hand to hand?
94. What became of the king?
95. Who took the kingdom?
96. What had come to an end?
97. When an individual or nation becomes lifted up in iniquity, what comes to pass?
98. What question naturally arises?
99. What is a simple and natural answer?
100. What had Daniel found out by the study of prophecy?
101. Knowing this, what was his attitude towards Cyrus?
102. What was there a good reason to believe?
103. When he was excluded from Belshazzar's council, where did he spend a portion of his time?
104. What is said of the province of Elam at this time?
105. With whom was it probable that Daniel had formed an acquaintance?
106. On what other occasion did the priests reveal to a leading general the prophecy concerning him?
107. What is evident from the first chapter of Ezra?
108. What does God always give those walking in the light?
109. What great truth does this illustrate?
110. Where is there always a witness?

201

111. What does the recording angel write against the unfaithful?
112. Where is this witness?
113. How may we feel?
114. What will every man reap?
115. What are nations repeating to-day?
116. Who was an instrument in God's hands to punish Babylon?
117. What will the next overthrow of governments usher in?
118. For what are the nations now mustering their forces?
119. What cry has gone forth?

CHAPTER VII

DANIEL IN THE LIONS' DEN

1. What is contained in the first five chapters of Daniel?
2. With the close of the fifth chapter, what nation is introduced?

3. Give name and age of the ruling king.
 4. Who is associated with him? What is his position in the nation?
 5. How was this change in kingdoms represented in the image of the second chapter?
 6. Were the Medes an unknown power?
 7. Give the earliest Bible record of this nation.
 8. How were the Medes first brought in contact with the Jews? How long was this before the fall of Babylon?
 9. What can be said of their worship? What reason is given for this?
 10. With what were the Medes and Persians brought in close touch?
 11. Name the elements they worshiped.
 12. Where did they establish their worship, and what was kept continually burning?
 13. In what did they believe?
 14. Quote the words of Isaiah to Cyrus.
- 202
15. How is God's position shown in these words?
 16. What was the physical condition of the Persians?
 17. Give the reason for this.
 18. What were the Medes and Persians?
 19. Where do we learn of the organization of the kingdom?
 20. Into how many provinces was the kingdom divided?
 21. Why was this change important?
 22. Upon what did peace depend?
 23. Who were placed over the one hundred and twenty princes?
 24. What appointment was made out of the usual order?
 25. What made it still more unusual?
 26. What is revealed in Daniel 8:1, 2?
 27. What probably gave him this position?
 28. What is said of Daniel's character?
 29. Of what is it a witness?
 30. In what way was Daniel an example to all office-holders?
 31. What fact shows that he served God and not a man-made party?
 32. In order to be a good business man is it necessary to be a "policy man"?
 33. While prime minister, what was Daniel receiving?
 34. To what is the usual type of a statesman compared?
 35. What pleases the Lord?
 36. How may a man preserve his integrity?
 37. What was Daniel's duty as chief of the presidents?
 38. Why were they to report to Daniel?
 39. What was the character of the presidents?
 40. In what respect did the Babylonian government resemble those of the present day?
 41. Quote the divine description of the condition of the nation.
- 203
42. Where will we find the details given?
 43. What are the nations of to-day?

44. Even in the best of governments, what is seen?
45. Give points of similarity between Rome and Babylon.
46. Upon what was Rome built?
47. What other nations repeat the same story?
48. Where may we read the details Daniel had to meet?
49. What three things are shown in the sixth chapter of Daniel?
50. Why did the king plan to promote Daniel?
51. What did the presidents plan to do?
52. Give the principles of divine government from which Daniel would not swerve.
53. In what way could they condemn him?
54. With whom did their underhanded ways bring them in conflict?
55. Who waited upon Darius?
56. With what falsehood did they address the king?
57. Give the import of the decree.
58. Why was God especially interested in Babylon?
59. What is the difference between knowing God and knowing about Him?
60. Through whom did God manifest His power? How long had Daniel witnessed for Him?
61. Describe Daniel's character.
62. What did he realize?
63. Did he know of the decree?
64. What course did he pursue?
65. What appointments did he keep?
66. Tell of his spiritual life.
67. Which life could his enemies comprehend?
- 204
68. What parallel is drawn between Christ and Daniel?
69. In what way was Daniel prepared to meet the nervous strain of business?
70. What is the weight of the atmosphere?
71. Why does it not crush us?
72. Of what is it a type?
73. How can we equalize the pressure of trials?
74. What course did Daniel pursue?
75. Who was in the councils when they plotted against Daniel?
76. What did the spies discover?
77. What did the king discover? How did the king spend the day?
78. How did they meet every argument of the king?
79. When is God's opportunity?
80. Give Daniel's prayer. What was impossible?
81. Where did Darius and Daniel meet?
82. Who was best fitted to enter the den?
83. Give Darius' words to Daniel.
84. How was the mouth of the den secured?
85. When again did Satan exult as he saw a stone laid over an entrance?
86. Could either Christ or Daniel be held?

87. Where was the angel? Describe Daniel's experience in the den.
 88. Was there ever a time when all beasts were gentle?
 89. What made them ferocious?
 90. What will harmony with God again restore?
 91. How did the king spend the night?
 92. Give the words of the king to Daniel, and his reply.
 93. What reply was given the woman at Christ's tomb?
 94. Why was Daniel protected?
- 205
95. Give the fate of Daniel's accusers.
 96. What did the nations of the world see?
 97. What affect did it have upon Darius and Cyrus?
 98. What special light was given Daniel after this experience?
 99. Give Darius' decree. What decree was given by Cyrus?
 100. Where can we learn the fate of evil men?
 101. Give the substance of the last paragraph of the chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL

The Judgment Scene

1. What is dealt with in the first half of the book of Daniel?
 2. What is contained in the last six chapters?
 3. How far do the visions reach?
 4. What does the prophet see in the future?
 5. What may we know from these guide-posts of the prophet?
 6. What history is given in the seventh chapter of Daniel? Give the central theme of the chapter.
 7. What remarkable fact is mentioned?
 8. What was shown to Nebuchadnezzar? Why?
 9. What was opened up to Daniel?
 10. Where did the angel of revelation linger?
 11. The seventh chapter of Daniel reveals the history of what people?
 12. When was this vision given?
 13. To what does the giving of this view bear testimony?
 14. How old was Daniel?
 15. How many years had he been in court?
 16. What testified to the purity of Daniel's life?
- 206
17. Who had been shown these things before?
 18. Why could the Spirit reveal these things to Daniel?
 19. Give the words of Hosea. By what symbols were the kingdoms represented?
 20. Of what are winds a symbol?
 21. What was represented by the water?
 22. How many kingdoms were represented?
 23. In what way had the first one been represented to Nebuchadnezzar?
 24. How did it appear to Daniel?
 25. When had Habakkuk spoken of Babylon?

26. What did he say?
27. When Daniel watched the lion in vision, what unnatural position did it take?
28. What was indicated by this change in position?
29. Give Habakkuk's reason for this sudden weakening of the power of Babylon.
30. What unpardonable sin did Babylon commit?
31. How long after the vision did Daniel witness the overthrow of Babylon?
32. By what symbol was Medo-Persia represented?
33. What was its character?
34. Give the nationality of Darius and Cyrus.
35. Who ruled the kingdom when Babylon was overthrown?
36. Who was the leading spirit?
37. How is Medo-Persia represented in the eighth chapter of Daniel?
38. What two portions of Scripture are mentioned as revealing the bear-like nature of Medo-Persia?
39. How many years are covered by the history of the second kingdom?
40. By what symbol was the third kingdom represented?
41. What is indicated by the four wings and four heads of the leopard?
- 207
42. How is the Grecian kingdom represented in the eighth chapter of Daniel?
43. Of which beast did Daniel wish to know particularly?
44. Describe the fourth beast.
45. What did the angel say of the lives of the beasts?
46. How was the same truth represented in chapter four?
47. Explain the way in which the principles have been handed down from nation to nation.
48. What did Rome renew in religion? In education?
49. When did Rome succeed Greece?
50. What were the ten horns?
51. With what part of the image of the second chapter does the fourth beast harmonize?
52. How does the history of Rome differ from that of the preceding nations?
53. Where in prophecy do we find the details of the decline and fall of Rome?
54. By whom and when was it broken into ten parts?
55. State Rome's opportunities to receive the gospel.
56. How was light offered to Babylon and Media and Persia?
57. Did Greece also have an opportunity to receive the light?
58. In what ways was Rome especially favored, and how did they treat the light?
59. Did Roman history end with the division?
60. Quote what is said of the little horn.
61. Give in detail the account of the plucking up of the three horns.
62. Describe the appearance of the little horn.
63. What was the condition of Rome?

64. To what is the rise of the little horn compared?

65. By what name is it known?

208

66. Why did Babylon and pagan Rome fall?

67. Describe the work of the little horn.

68. What position did Rome hold in the days of Christ?

69. Who preached in Rome? With what results?

70. What gradually crept into the Roman Church?

71. What did Paul call it?

72. What was grasped by the Church?

73. When was this power assumed?

74. What decree then went into effect?

75. Besides speaking stout words, what was done by the little horn?

76. Upon what did the little horn lay hands?

77. Give the various means used to keep Europe in darkness for over a thousand years.

78. How long was this power to continue?

79. Give the texts that speak of it.

80. In how many different ways is it spoken of?

81. When did it begin? When did it end?

82. Is his power yet destroyed?

83. What besides earthly scenes was shown Daniel?

84. When was the Saviour crucified?

85. Where was He slain? Where did He go?

86. Of what was the day of atonement a type?

87. Quote Spurrell's translation of the scene.

88. Who abides in the holy of holies?

89. Of what is the throne of God the center?

90. What revolves about it?

91. What is gravity? What is done by it?

92. From whence is all life?

209

93. What converts the soul?

94. What did every offering bring to the mind of God?

95. What will Christ ever retain?

96. Give the substance of Job 37:19-23.

97. When was the door into the holy of holies opened?

98. Where do we find the announcement of the opening of the judgment?

99. Where do you find the only description of the judgment scene?

100. Where is the only prophetic period which marks the time of the judgment?

101. When did the twenty-three hundred days begin? When did they end?

102. What message went forth at its close?

103. How widely was the message preached?

104. When did Christ come in before the Father?

105. Why could this not have been when Christ ascended into Heaven?

106. When were the books of record opened?

107. Who has witnessed each sin?
108. Of what does God have a faithful record?
109. Who intercedes for each name?
110. What is above the throne?
111. What is written opposite every name that is confessed?
112. Describe the scene that follows.
113. How long has the judgment been in session?
114. What will be decided before its close?
115. Which beast continues after the investigative judgment?
116. When does it attract attention?
117. While Christ was pleading in man's behalf, what was man doing?
118. Why did Babylon fall?

210

CHAPTER IX

THE EIGHTH CHAPTER OF DANIEL

1. How long since the vision of the seventh chapter?
 2. What subject had often been upon the mind of the prophet?
 3. Why did he keep the matter in his heart?
 4. What changes had taken place during the two years?
 5. How did this affect Daniel?
 6. Where was Daniel living at this time?
 7. What was the capital of Elam?
 8. What was Elam formerly?
 9. Who led in the revolt?
 10. What had Isaiah foretold?
 11. What did Daniel see?
 12. Why does this vision begin with Media and Persia?
 13. Where was Daniel taken in vision?
 14. What did he see?
 15. Describe the ram and its conquests.
 16. By what was the second kingdom represented in his previous vision?
 17. What is shown by both symbols?
 18. Which kingdom was the strongest?
 19. What is the best commentary on the Scriptures?
 20. Give the words of the angel.
 21. How was the increase of the kingdom represented?
 22. In the days of Cyrus how many provinces were there? How many in the time of Esther?
 23. What was the kingdom then called? What the monarch?
 24. What is said of Xerxes in the eleventh chapter of Daniel?
 25. Give the second symbol in the vision.
- 211
26. From whence does it come? In what manner?
 27. Describe its appearance.
 28. What is said of the fourth king after Cyrus?
 29. When was this fulfilled?
 30. How large was Xerxes' army?

31. Where were they defeated?
32. What had prophecy foretold?
33. How did Greece attack Medo-Persia?
34. Quote Spurrell's translation.
35. Who were the commanders?
36. What became of Medo-Persia? Why?
37. Who had stood by the Persian monarch?
38. What had the nation been in God's hand?
39. Whose example did they follow?
40. Whose fate did they share?
41. What good deed was done by Persia?
42. How is the life of nations prolonged?
43. Where did the ram and goat meet?
44. Give the historical fulfillment of this meeting.
45. What other defeats followed? What was the result?
46. In what does Alexander stand without a rival?
47. Give a sketch of his early life.
48. What did he proclaim himself?
49. What caused his death?
50. Who directs in the rise and fall of kingdoms?
51. Give fulfillment of the great horn being broken.
52. What did the four horns represent?
53. Name the four generals and the territory governed by each.
- 212
54. What comes out from one of these horns?
55. How was this power symbolized in the seventh chapter?
56. How does one feel when reading of this power?
57. What was concentrated in this power?
58. What is it said to be?
59. What was brought upon the field of action to counteract the gift of heaven?
60. What did Gabriel say of this power?
61. If our eyes are directed heavenward, what do we receive?
62. What takes possession of those who resist God's love?
63. What is said of the extent of the kingdom?
64. Give what inspiration says of "the little horn."
65. What became of cities that resisted Rome?
66. Give the description of the government given by the angel.
67. How was the great arrogance of Rome displayed?
68. Quote Daniel 8: 11.
69. How does God regard His people?
70. Of what did Rome first deprive the Jews?
71. When did Christ come?
72. With whom did He identify Himself?
73. What did He prove?
74. What did Rome do with Christ?
75. In what condition was paganism?

76. How did Satan work?
77. What crept into the church?
78. Where lay the power of the early church?
79. What was done by Christian mothers?
80. What text-book was used?
- 213
81. Were the children left in the pagan schools?
82. Could they eat with the pagans?
83. How and why did Satan put his principles into the new church?
84. What fell before the rising power of the hierarchy?
85. What choked the life of the new church?
86. What did Rome nominally become?
87. What can be said of the emperor?
88. What decrees were passed?
89. Who attempted to exalt themselves above God?
90. Whose principles were received?
91. How does John speak of the transfer of power?
92. With what is Daniel 8: 11,12 a parallel?
93. Give the work of the little horn of Daniel 7: 25.
94. How many times was Daniel shown the twofold history of Rome?
Describe each.
95. How did this affect the prophet?
96. Did he understand the time of fulfillment?
97. Give three definite events that were shown the prophet.
98. How did these scenes pass before him?
99. Who was watching?
100. How long and for what had the universe waited?
101. What do the angelic hosts wonder?
102. Who only knows the time?
103. What is shown by the thirteenth verse?
104. What question was asked Gabriel?
105. Give his answer.
106. For what did Daniel long?
107. Who appeared before Daniel?
- 214
108. What command was given to Gabriel?
109. How was Daniel affected by Gabriel's appearance?
110. With what words did the angel address Daniel?
111. How did Gabriel commence the explanation?
112. In what way did he speak of the two thousand three hundred days?
113. What did Daniel see which caused him to faint?
114. What is taught in the eighth-chapter besides the line of prophecy?
115. What gift is to be coveted?
116. What does the study of Daniel's life reveal?
117. What position does Gabriel hold?
118. Give his words to John. To Daniel.
119. Whose attendant is Gabriel?

120. Who formerly occupied his position?
 121. Who appeared to Mary? To the shepherds?
 122. What did Gabriel bring to Christ? How did he comfort Him?
 123. How were the Roman soldiers affected by his presence? Tell of his presence at the Saviour's tomb.
 124. Where did the Saviour go? Who comforted the disciples?
 125. Which one of the angels has been most closely connected with man?
 126. What did he forbid? How does he count himself?
 127. Who communicated with every prophet?
 128. Who was Lucifer? Since his fall, how has he used his power?
 129. What can you say of false prophets?
 130. Who will finally appear as an angel of light?
 131. What will be the safety of God's people?
 132. Where was Daniel carried? What was shown him?
 133. What does the river represent?
- 215
134. What are located on the banks of the stream of time? Who presides over the waters?
 135. From where was the voice heard?
 136. Give the words of the angel.

CHAPTER X

THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS

1. How much time intervened between the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel?
 2. What were the parting words of Gabriel?
 3. Of what did Daniel think while attending to the king's business?
 4. Why was he called into the court of Babylon?
 5. What calamity had befallen Babylon?
 6. What position had been given Daniel?
 7. For what did Daniel always find time?
 8. What had prophecy said of Cyrus?
 9. What was drawing near?
 10. What prophecy told the length of the captivity?
 11. Over what was Daniel probably perplexed?
 12. What did the cleansing of the sanctuary then mean to the Jews?
 13. How many times did Jeremiah give the length of the captivity?
 14. Give the quotations.
 15. What was near?
 16. Of what is this prayer an example?
 17. What had darkened the vision of many?
 18. What relation did they sustain toward the truth of God?
 19. How were they personally situated?
 20. How did they look upon the journey to Jerusalem?
- 216
21. What was strong in the hearts of many?
 22. Seventy years after Cyrus' decree, where were many of the Jews?
 23. What proportion ever returned?

24. To whom were they compared?
25. How was the spirit of prophecy received?
26. What did they choose?
27. Did Daniel know of this condition?
28. With whom did he identify himself?
29. Where did he place himself?
30. Give a portion of the prayer.
31. Of whom was Daniel a representative?
32. To whom is his prayer a rebuke?
33. With what words did Daniel approach God?
34. With whom was he acquainted?
35. With what two arms may finite man reach Infinite Love?
36. How was the prayer received?
37. Why are our requests often unanswered?
38. How are we sometimes tested?
39. When did Gabriel touch Daniel?
40. What did Gabriel first mention?
41. Give his words.
42. What was necessary that Daniel might receive the Spirit?
43. Who are God's special favorites?
44. What words are spoken to but few?
45. With which verse does the explanation of the time begin?
46. With what was Gabriel acquainted?
47. Quote Daniel 9: 24.
48. How much is contained in this verse?
217
49. Who is the most condensed historian?
50. What exact date is given?
51. What other points were given in the verse?
52. In this interview what part of the two thousand three hundred days was given?
53. What had already been revealed to Daniel?
54. How many years in seventy weeks?
55. What does this period cover?
56. When was it to begin?
57. Into what periods was Jewish history divided?
58. What was accomplished during the first period?
59. To what does the second period extend?
60. What would the one week cover?
61. To what is this last week devoted?
62. What four prophets give us the history of the forty-nine years?
63. For what was Cyrus raised up?
64. What did Isaiah say of him?
65. What was he to do?
66. Where do we find Cyrus' decree?
67. Give a portion of the decree.
68. Could all return to Jerusalem?

69. If too poor to go, who would bear the expense?
70. Had there ever been such a decree before?
71. What should Israel have done?
72. What should the exodus have been?
73. How would it have compared with going out of Egypt?
74. Who watched the preparations? How many had gone at the end of the first year?

218

75. How did Cyrus feel about it?
 76. Who worked to again arouse Cyrus' interest?
 77. What was returned to the leaders of the Jews?
 78. What work was begun in the second year?
 79. What is said of the site of Solomon's temple?
 80. Who soon stopped the work?
 81. Under what king was work resumed?
 82. How many years was the work stopped?
 83. What two prophets now began to prophesy?
 84. How had the Jews provided for themselves?
 85. What did God want them to do?
 86. Who helped them?
 87. Who tried to hinder them? What was the result?
 88. How was money supplied?
 89. How long was Jerusalem governed by Persia?
 90. What was issued in the seventh year of Artaxerxes?
 91. Give the six principal points in the decree.
 92. What did it establish? Was this a common thing?
 93. In what year was this?
 94. What period began with this date?
 95. What is shown by Ezra 6: 14?
 96. Who describes the "troublous times" in which the wall was built?
 97. What position did Nehemiah hold?
 98. How many years after Artaxerxes' decree did Nehemiah go up to Jerusalem?
 99. Who directed the work of building the wall?
 100. How did they build?
 101. What lessons of Nehemiah should be followed by Christians to-day?
- 219
102. Of what is the rebuilding of Jerusalem a fit symbol?
 103. Who was responsible for the trouble?
 104. What did a few years of rest always bring?
 105. How did they treat their own brethren?
 106. What is necessary in order to be "free indeed"?
 107. What will take place when God's people proclaim liberty among themselves?
 108. Quote Daniel 9: 25.
 109. Give the Greek and Hebrew word for "anointed."
 110. When and with what was Christ anointed?

111. What event closed the sixty-nine weeks?
112. Four hundred and fifty-seven years from Artaxerxes' decree reaches to what date?
113. Twenty-six years added bring us to what event?
114. Give Mark 1: 10 [margin] and Luke 3: 21-23 [margin].
115. For what had the Jewish nation looked?
116. Who controlled the Jewish nation at the close of the sixty-nine weeks?
117. What was the desire of every true Jewish mother?
118. Did they know where the Saviour would be born?
119. Who prophesied of John?
120. How long had his voice been heard?
121. How many historical facts established the time of John's preaching?
122. Who came to hear John's preaching?
123. How did John recognize Him?
124. Who was looking for the Saviour?
125. What did John say of him?
126. What did Christ say of the time?
127. In what condition was the nation?
- 220
128. What book would have enlightened them?
129. What books, if studied, will warn the world to-day?
130. What two signs were mentioned by Gabriel?
131. How many of the seventy weeks remained?
132. What was done in the first half of the week?
133. What was to take place in the "midst of the week"
134. When was this fulfilled?
135. How was this shown in the temple?
136. What became of the sacrificial lamb?
137. Who left the temple?
138. What forever ceased?
139. How did God still try to save the Jewish people?
140. Give the results.
141. When was Stephen stoned?
142. What resulted from this persecution?
143. How long after this was Jerusalem destroyed?
144. What can you say of the accuracy of the date 457 B.C.
145. Give four events establishing it.
146. How does history establish it?
147. In what two ways can you reckon this period?
148. How many of the two thousand three hundred years were explained by Gabriel in the ninth chapter?
149. How many remained?
150. When did the four Hundred and ninety years end? When would the twenty-three hundred years end?
151. What events then began to take place?
152. Are any living who helped to give the first message?
153. How long before 1844 did they begin to sound the message?

221

154. Who was foremost in this work?
155. What mistake was made?
156. How did the disappointment affect many?
157. What did further study show?
158. What special light was shown them?
159. By investigating the typical sanctuary service, what was revealed?
160. Whom did they behold in heaven?
161. Upon what work did He enter in 1844?
162. In what was William Miller mistaken?
163. In what was he not mistaken?
164. Where are the events between A.D. 34 and 1844 given?
165. What may we expect? What should we do?

CHAPTER XI

THE SANCTUARY

1. What led to the disappointment in 1844?
2. How many sanctuaries are brought to view?
3. What is the first?
4. How many have been permitted to see it?
5. What is the second? How was it built?
6. How long was service held in the second?
7. What did those following the shadow reach?
8. When did the Saviour leave the temple for the last time?
9. What did He say? How did His words affect the people?
10. Although the building remained, what had it ceased to be?
11. How did the Father confirm the words?
12. Does the sinner now need a priest to offer his sacrifice?
13. What has been made? Who can accept?

222

14. What way was now open?
15. What had taken the place of the earthly sanctuary?
16. Where was man's faith now to center?
17. What is the third temple mentioned in the Bible?
18. Of what had the Jews lost sight?
19. Of what did they think when Jesus spoke of His body-temple?
20. What did Jesus say? Give their reply.
21. What comes to those who study the typical work?
22. When these rays are gathered into the body-temple, what do they reflect?
23. What was God's original plan? Who gained possession? Give the result.
24. What was necessary to make the body a pure temple?
25. Why were innocent animals slain?
26. Where did Adam present his offerings?
27. What did he see by faith?
28. How did nature teach the death of Christ?
29. How were the altars at first lighted?
30. Who was the first one who failed to appreciate the sacrifices?

31. What was the difference between Cain's and Abel's offerings?
32. Describe each. Of what are Cain and Abel a type?
33. How did the followers of Cain worship?
34. Anciently what did each family have?
35. What position did the father occupy?
36. What did Jacob see?
37. Tell the story of Joseph.
38. What was Joseph?
39. Why was the earthly sanctuary built?
40. What did God say? How long before Moses went up into the mountain?
223
41. How many days did he remain there?
42. What had been lost in Egypt?
43. What did God do to reach man in his fallen state?
44. What was the whole Jewish economy?
45. What was every act in that service?
46. What is this work called?
47. Why could they not see light in the sacrificial offerings?
48. Follow step by step the work done by the sinner who brought an offering.
49. Give the work of the priest.
50. Describe the ark.
51. Describe the articles in the first apartment.
52. Where was the blood poured?
53. What was signified by this?
54. Who separated the fat from the offering?
55. What was done with the fat?
56. What did this work typify?
57. Why was the burning of the fat a sweet savor to God?
58. What lesson was taught the sinner by the act of separating the fat from the offering?
59. Describe the offering where the flesh was eaten by the priest.
60. What wonderful truth was taught by this service?
61. Of what was the incense an object lesson?
62. How often was the fire replenished?
63. Give the antitype of the seven lamps.
64. What did the table of shewbread represent?
65. What position did the ark occupy, and what did it contain?
66. Give the significance of the continual burning.
224
67. What was done with the ashes, and what truth was taught thereby?
68. Mention some of the services that would call forth questions from the children.
69. Describe the offering for the leper.
70. What wonderful truths were taught by this offering?
71. Give the antitype.
72. Describe the scene at the cross.

73. What were typified by the various feasts?
74. Give the antitype of the passover and first fruits.
75. What was the crowning service of the year, and what was accomplished by it?
76. What was seen when the ark was opened in heaven?
77. When did the judgment open?
78. What is the duty of the people during this period?
79. How did everybody anciently know when the day of atonement began?
80. How was it kept?
81. Give the difference between Gentile and Jewish homes.
82. Give the work of the priest in the temple.
83. When was the scapegoat introduced?
84. Describe the part the scapegoat had in the service. Did the congregation behold this service?
85. Describe the antitype of this service. Who will behold it?
86. When will Satan be destroyed? Will the sins ever be found again?
87. Who was cut off from Israel on the day of atonement?
88. Can you answer in the affirmative the three questions asked in the last paragraph?
89. How many will fulfill the antitype?
90. What will they do?

225

CHAPTER XII

INTRODUCTION TO THE LAST VISION

1. What is recorded in the last three chapters of Daniel?
2. To what is the tenth chapter a preliminary?
3. To what was Daniel drawing near?
4. How were his last days spent?
5. What had taken place since the events recorded in the ninth chapter?
6. To what was his godly life a rebuke?
7. What did God do to those ungodly men?
8. How was Daniel regarded by Darius?
9. Upon the accession of Cyrus, where did he remain?
10. What had Cyrus done in the first year of his reign?
11. How did he feel regarding the Jews?
12. Why did Cyrus doubt the wisdom of the decree?
13. Who did the Jews represent?
14. When pardon and freedom are offered, what do they choose?
15. Why was the voice of God dimly heard by the Jews?
16. How did this affect the prophet?
17. What two things weighed heavily upon Daniel?
18. At what did he wonder?
19. What was it he could not understand?
20. What did he determine to do two years after the decree?
21. Did he practice total abstinence from food?
22. What did he partake of, and how did he spend his time? What was his purpose?

23. Of what does the spiritual life often partake?
24. How should the soul affect the body?
25. Where did the prophet go to strengthen his mind? .
- 226
26. Who did he take with him?
27. What led the prophet's mind out after God?
28. How long did he thus seek God?
29. As he looked up, who did he see by his side?
30. How did the vision affect his companions?
31. To what is the countenance of Christ compared?
32. What is the character of the one who can bear the light of heaven?
33. How did the eyes of the Son of God appear?
34. How has He promised to "guide thee"?
35. What had Daniel's ears long been accustomed to hear?
36. How did the voice of the Son of God sound to Daniel?
37. How does it sound to ears unaccustomed to heavenly sounds?
38. Who afterwards had a similar experience?
39. In what two ways was the same voice heard?
40. How did Daniel feel when he compared himself to Christ?
41. How did he describe his condition?
42. Describe his position.
43. As Gabriel touched him, and lifted him up, what did he say?
44. Describe the touch of Christ's hand. Also Gabriel's.
45. Who should have this life current in them to-day?
46. Why did Christ come to earth?
47. How long after Daniel began to pray.
48. Explain the cause of Gabriel's delay.
49. Where had the angel been?
50. Until a nation is rejected by God, who are in the midst of their councils?
51. Who is a constant watcher in legislative halls to-day?
52. Of what is every just decree the result?
53. Where was this influence at work?
- 227
54. What would have been the result if Daniel had ceased to pray at the end of one or two weeks?
55. Quote the promise in regard to prayer.
56. Why do we not always receive an immediate answer?
57. What did the angel ask the prophet?
58. For what purpose did he say he had come?
59. What is the physical condition of those in vision?
60. When could he speak?
61. Who stood by his side to strengthen him? What did he explain?
62. Can the effect of the Spirit of God on a person be explained?
63. Who speaks through the human instrument?
64. In what condition are the eyes of one in vision?
65. What do they see?
66. When earth's attraction is broken, where are they taken?

67. When a live coal is laid upon the lips, what do they speak?
68. How did Gabriel express his love for Daniel?
69. How did the gray-haired prophet respond?
70. What were revealed?
71. How does man often record events? Why?
72. What class of events are recorded when God writes history?
73. Where is this fact especially noticeable?
74. How does Gabriel give the events of hundreds of years?
75. What does he bring into prominence?
76. How can these events be understood?
77. What books should be studied in order to understand the scriptural history of Persia?
78. To what period is the history carried in these books?
79. When is the record silent? CHAPTER XIII HISTORY OF THE DECREES

228

1. Why did the angel begin with the Persian history?
2. When was the vision given?
3. What had Daniel seen in vision?
4. Who is the only authentic historian? Where is the only unbiased history found?
5. How many unbroken threads are there in the web of life?
6. In what way is Egyptian history noted?
7. When and for what is a nation noticed by the Divine historian?
8. Why did the Medo-Persian kingdom exist? When did it pass from the stage of action?
9. When was the Medo-Persian nation born?
10. Who was the first king? Give his age.
11. Who stood by him during his reign?
12. What opportunity was given Darius?
13. What position was given Daniel?
14. Did Darius know of the true God?
15. How did he respond? How long did he reign?
16. Give the first words of Gabriel in this last vision.
17. Who can help when God's influence is withdrawn?
18. What emphatic illustration is given?
19. How long had Cyrus been reigning?
20. When had he given freedom to the Jews?
21. Where was the news heralded?
22. What did he offer the Jews?
23. How did they respond?
24. Of what is this a commentary?
25. What was the character of Babylon? What was the nature of Cyrus' decree?

26. Of what is this an illustration?

229

27. Why were the Jews so slow?

28. What should they have done?
29. Give the result of attending Babylonish schools.
30. If they had been true, what might have been?
31. When was this opportunity offered them?
32. What brought Daniel and his fellows into favor with the king?
33. What might have been established then?
34. Did Israel do this? What answers the question?
35. What was the result?
36. How was it with those who went to Jerusalem?
37. How did the laying of the foundation of the temple affect the old men?
38. How did the delay on the part of the people affect Cyrus?
39. How long did Daniel fast and pray before his prayer was answered?
40. What were Michael and Gabriel doing during this time?
41. What was Cyrus ready to do had the Jews done their part?
42. Is there any further record of Cyrus?
43. Why was his work but partially accomplished?
44. Who influenced the Jews to delay?
45. What part did Gabriel act?
46. How long did Cambyses reign?
47. How did he spend the most of his time?
48. What is Cambyses called in the Scripture?
49. Who wrote letters of complaint to him against the Jews?
50. Why were they unnoticed?
51. What liberty was still given the Jews?
52. Why did they remain in Babylon?
53. Did they ever wish they had left Babylon?
54. Where was Cambyses slain? Who took the throne?
- 230
55. By what name is he known in history?
56. What is his Bible name?
57. How long did he reign?
58. What did he do during this time?
59. Where do we find this letter?
60. Is there anything else recorded of this monarch?
61. How did his letter affect the work at Jerusalem?
62. How did the Jews reason?
63. Who did God raise up at this time?
64. Give the financial condition of the people?
65. How did God work in Babylon?
66. Who succeeded Smerdis?
67. How is he spoken of in Ezra 4: 24?
68. While the Jews were so unbelieving what was God doing?
69. What did Haggai and Zechariah do?
70. Who next warned the Jews to cease work?
71. What did the leading Jews quote to vindicate their cause?
72. Who wrote to the king, and what was the result?
73. What was seen in this?

74. What command was given their enemies?
75. Why was seeming defeat turned into victory?
76. What was the result of God's confounding worldly policy?
77. What warnings were still heard?
78. How long did God keep Darius' heart tender toward His people?
79. Who was watching for the Jews to leave Jerusalem?
80. What did Zechariah hear one angel say to another?
81. What did God promise for a wall?
82. What words of the Lord were heard?
- 231
83. What was embraced in this promise?
84. What did God say should be seen through the whole earth?
85. What remarkable promises were uttered?
86. To what time were their minds pointed?
87. What was the effect of their beginning to build?
88. Who recorded the promise of the latter rain?
89. Study carefully the marginal texts by the promise of the latter rain.
90. What would be in Jerusalem?
91. What did the prophet see in the future?
92. Who was reigning in Persia when these visions were given?
93. Why were these promises not fulfilled in the past?
94. Who are heirs to the same promises to-day? Xerxes
95. What prophecy was given by Daniel?
96. Who were the three kings that followed Cyrus?
97. Name the fourth king. When did he come upon the throne?
98. Give his Bible name.
99. What book in the Bible is wholly devoted to the Persian history during his reign?
100. When did Persia reach the height of its glory?
101. How many provinces did Persia then rule?
102. What was the capital city?
103. Describe the display of Xerxes' wealth as recorded in Esther.
104. What other feast was similar to this?
105. Describe the furnishing of the palace.
106. What familiar story is mentioned?
107. What was the result of the queen's refusal?
108. Who was Esther?
109. With whom had she lived?
- 232
110. Give her character from childhood.
111. What position was held by Mordecai?
112. Give the moral condition of the court.
113. What did Mordecai refuse to do?
114. How were the Jews regarded at this time?
115. What had they failed to do?
116. How long had mercy been extended?
117. Mention the different times when forty years have been given to

accomplish a certain work.

118. What decree was issued after the Persians had waited about forty years for the Jews to leave Babylon?

119. What did God permit when entreaty failed?

120. What does God prepare in the midst of persecution?

121. Who had guarded Hadassah?

122. When men failed to represent God's work, whom did He use?

123. How could God use Esther's beauty?

124. Give the import of the decree. How was it proclaimed throughout the kingdom?

125. In what did Satan triumph?

126. Where was the decree, first published? What was the effect?

127. How did Esther receive the decree?

128. What did it bring to her?

129. Who joined with her in fasting and prayer?

130. How did she approach the king?

131. What was before her?

132. By whom and how had God prepared for her deliverance?

132. Give the fate of Haman, and the reward of Mordecai.

133. How did the Jews escape?

134. What is a counterpart of Haman's decree?

233

135. Where will it find many of the professed people of God?

136. How will God's true people be delivered?

137. Why is this record preserved in history?

138. How is the character of Xerxes shown?

139. Why did he muster an immense army?

140. What accompanied the effort?

141. Under whose reign was the final decree issued for the return of the Jews?

142. Where is this decree found?

143. When was it issued?

144. What wonderful prophetic period began at this time?

145. What did Artaxerxes' decree contain?

146. How long was this after the decree of Cyrus?

147. In what year did Nehemiah go up to Jerusalem? How long had Ezra labored?

148. How were the walls built?

149. In what ways did the Jews reform?

150. What proportion of the Jews were saved?

151. What might Jerusalem have become?

152. What power was next mentioned by Daniel?

153. What became of Media and Persia?

154. What is included in the history of the decrees?

155. What do we individually find in the history of Persia?

156. What should we do?

CHAPTER XIV

HISTORY OF GREECE

1. What is contained in the first two verses of this chapter?

234

2. What history is given in verses 3-13?

3. What was made known to Daniel?

4. What had been difficult for Daniel?

5. In what manner is this last prophecy given?

6. What is said of the words used, and the events selected?

7. In reading the Bible what two lines of thought are found?

8. How must we seek for the deeper meaning?

9. Of what may the reader catch a glimpse?

10. Why did God give the history of these four kingdoms?

11. What creates an incentive to understand the prophecies?

12. What increases the desire to study the book of Daniel?

13. What is represented by the history of Babylon as a nation?

14. Notwithstanding its splendor, what was it?

15. What was written above the city?

16. Whose daughter was Medo-Persia?

17. Of what did she partake?

18. What is said of her religious principles

19. What partially checked the wickedness of Medo-Persia?

20. In what did Medo-Persia take an important part?

21. How was it with the Greek nation?

22. What relation did she sustain to Babylon?

23. How is this illustrated in the family relation?

24. Who are the three daughters of Babylon?

25. How do they differ?

26. What nation spans the gulf between the Old and the New Testament?

27. What period was without a prophet?

28. Of what family are the Grecians the descendants?

29. Where did they settle?

235

30. What was developed in this broken country?

31. What did they have in common?

32. To what did their religion bear a close resemblance?

33. How were these forms and ceremonies carried to other nations?

34. What became a model to the Greeks?

35. Where is the origin of everything good and beautiful?

36. By what was the gross idolatry of Babylon and Egypt replaced in Greece?

37. What can you say of these customs?

38. How was the aesthetic taste of the Greeks developed?

39. What was lacking in their nature study?

40. What did they worship?

41. Give the result.

42. What can you say of their history?

43. Why did they wander in darkness?

44. Of what is their history a reminder?
 45. Whom do the worldly students of to-day worship?
 46. Upon what are they fed?
 47. Of what are they ignorant?
 48. Did the Greeks offer sacrifices?
 49. How was the spirit of prophecy manifested?
 50. What can you say of the Grecian priesthood?
 51. What replaced the sacred feasts of Jehovah's people?
 52. What did the feasts promote? What the Grecian games?
 53. Why did God's people meet together? What was the object of the Grecian gatherings?
 54. What history is included in the Grecian history?
 55. What can you say of the people?
- 236
56. Who was Plato? When did he live?
 57. What was combined to form "*the* traditions" in Christ's day?
 58. What was the "*science* falsely so-called"?
 59. With many, what has replaced the Bible?
 60. What can you say of Plato's teaching?
 61. How did his followers come under the condemnation of Christ?
 62. Where do we find the most subtle error?
 63. Where was this mixture first found?
 64. What was enslaved by Babylon?
 65. What was conquered by Greece? Give the effect of this.
 66. Give what the angel said of Persia. Of Greece.
 67. What is said of Alexander's character and education?
 68. When did he begin to reign? What did he do?
 69. By what symbol was the third kingdom represented? How long a period was covered by this symbol?
 70. Name some of Alexander's conquests.
 71. What three gifts were combined in Alexander?
 72. How did he seek to win the favor of the conquered races?
 73. Describe Alexander's visit to Jerusalem.
 74. What was explained to him?
 75. Into whose presence was he brought?
 76. What message was given him? With what result?
 77. How did Alexander gratify his pride?
 78. What might he have been?
 79. Of what was this the result?
 80. What was the outcome of such a choice?
 81. Of what is this a commentary?
 82. What choice is shown by his doing "according to his will"?
- 237
83. How many minds are there in the universe?
 84. Name them. When we claim to exercise our own mind, whose mind controls us?
 85. What brings liberty?

86. Of what is the Greek philosophy the continuation?
 87. Give an account of the struggle for power after Alexander's death.
 88. When was the strife settled? In what way?
 89. What prophecy was thus fulfilled?
 90. Which division was first overthrown?
 91. How were the divisions reduced to two? When?
 92. Quote Spurrell's translation of Daniel 11: 5.
 93. Give the first two kings of the north, and the first three of the south.
 94. What did Gabriel give Daniel?
 95. What relation did these nations sustain to the people of God?
 96. Explain how Greece was a universal power.
 97. What entered every country Alexander had conquered?
 98. Show the extent of Greek religion, games, education, and language.
 99. What city became an educational center?
 100. Give the quotation from the Encyclopedia Britannica.
 101. Give instances where Israel twice escaped Egyptian bondage. By what were they finally captured?
 102. Locate the history of Greece.
 103. What can you say of the system of education that God gave?
 104. For what did Israel often exchange it?
 105. What prepared the Jews to accept Greek teaching?
 106. To what extent were the Greek games introduced?
 107. What is said of Greek names? In what case did God prevent this?
 108. Tell of the Saviour's early education.
- 238
109. Where were other youth educated?
 110. What is a wonder to man?
 111. What did God turn to His glory?
 112. What was done by Ptolemy Philadelphus?
 113. How did this turn to the glory of God?
 114. How was man without excuse?
 115. What was the household tongue at this time?
 116. To what is the Word of God compared?
 117. What is shown in Daniel 11: 3-5?
 118. What was the enemy's plan?
 119. Under this influence what was accomplished?
 120. What is found in Daniel 11: 6-13?
 121. In what way did the Greek influence in the northern kingdom differ from that in the southern?
 122. Which division carried forward the work symbolized by the leopard and rough goat?
 123. What two opposing powers are seen in history?
 124. In what way was this manifested in the Middle Ages?
 125. What fact is revealed by history?
 126. What nations have trouble?
 127. In what direction have universal powers gained conquest?
 128. In spite of all this, what was attempted?

129. Quote Spurrell's translation of Daniel 11: 6.
 130. What can you say of this verse?
 131. How long was it written before the fulfillment?
 132. Relate the history that fulfilled this verse.
 133. Give the history that fulfilled verses 7 and 8.
 134. Did the trouble cease at this time?
- 239
135. Who held much of Syria? When?
 136. Who undertook to regain this territory?
 137. Describe the sons of Callinicus and give their names.
 138. What two kings began to reign about the same time?
 139. Give the character of the southern king.
 140. What was the result of Antiochus' invasion of Egypt?
 141. What did Ptolemy attempt? Who prevented it? What was the result?
 142. What might have been during this period?
 143. Why did the Jews locate in Palestine?
 144. Where were they?
 145. If they had done their duty, what would have been the result?
 146. What should have been an object lesson to the Jews?
 147. Where should the youth have gone for an education?
 148. Who should have been teachers?
 149. How do these things affect the angels?
 150. Between whom was peace concluded?
 151. How long did it last?
 152. What did Antiochus design?
 153. What power is introduced in the fourteenth verse?
 154. What is said of Grecian struggles after this time?
 155. How was the power of Greece perpetuated?
 156. What is her shrine?
 157. What can you say of that power to-day?
 158. How long will it continue?
 159. What choice is offered the Israel of to-day?
 160. How may eternal life be gained?
 161. What course will bring death? Why?
 162. What is the motive power of God's system?

240

163. What is exalted by the Greek system?
164. Why has eternal truth always shone on the pathway of men?
165. When does Greek philosophy and skepticism come forth in full force?
166. What is the only safeguard?

CHAPTER XV

THE FOURTH KINGDOM

1. What power is introduced in the fourteenth verse of the eleventh chapter?
2. How far did Gabriel follow the history of Greece?
3. What prevailed in the once mighty empire of Alexander?
4. Of what did the angel of prophecy speak?
5. How was the fourth kingdom introduced?

6. How was every word given?
 7. Is there any significance in the introduction of what was to become the mightiest kingdom on earth?
 8. What was it to be to the people of God?
 9. How was Rome represented in the seventh chapter?
 10. What were its characteristics?
 11. What was this power to speak? What else would it do?
 12. How did this affect the prophet?
 13. What did Daniel see in the next vision?
 14. From whence did the little horn spring?
 15. How was this kingdom described?
 16. What was to be his character?
 17. What attitude did he assume toward Christ?
 18. Putting all these thoughts together, what do we see?
 19. What did each nation have, and why is it here recorded?
 20. Of what was Babylon an example?
- 241
21. What did her religion counterfeit? What was the result of this?
 22. Of what was Medo-Persia a type? What is said of her laws?
 23. How were the heads of this despotism kept in check?
 24. Wherein was Greece different from the two preceding nations?
 25. How did she gain control?
 26. When Babylon was overthrown, and Medo-Persia was no more, where was Greece?
 27. What is said of the fourth kingdom?
 28. How is Rome represented in Revelation 13: 2?
 29. What united in this kingdom?
 30. What are the principal points in the history of any nation?
 31. What was the character of Rome?
 32. Why was the time of the supremacy shortened?
 33. In what year did Ptolemy Epiphanes fall heir to the throne of Egypt?
 34. Who planned his overthrow and the division of his empire?
 35. What power arose to prominence before the prophet's eye?
 36. Had Rome been in existence before?
 37. How far back does the traditional history of Rome date?
 38. What prophet began to prophesy about the time Rome was founded?
 39. Who founded Rome?
 40. What was the character of the Romans?
 41. In this undertaking of self-government, who aided the people?
 42. What beast received a seat, power, and great authority from the dragon?
 43. What must the student recognize in each nation?
 44. When Satan found he had failed in the history of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece, what did he attempt?
 45. What city did he choose?
 46. What kind of foundation did he build for the structure of his worship?
- 242
47. What did Satan hope?

48. How long will his efforts last?
49. Trace the history of Rome from the days of the kings to the republic.
50. How does God rule?
51. Who are representatives in the councils of heaven?
52. Why was Satan admitted to this council?
53. What did he attempt to do in Rome?
54. How did Rome begin her career as a conquering nation?
55. How was her constitution developed?
56. How did she acquire her territory?
57. Locate and name a rival city.
58. How long did Rome fight for supremacy? With what result?
59. How does Ridpath express the policy of the government?
60. What was Rome doing while she hovered over Carthage?
61. What nation was made one of her provinces? What was the result?
62. What was forbidden?
63. What was this state of things called?
64. Who was sold in the slave markets of Rome?
65. What became a proverbial expression for anything cheap?
66. What policy scheme is mentioned?
67. A few years later, what became of the Macedonians?
68. What is said of the Grecians?
69. From what were the Romans relieved?
70. What was this called?
71. What family was still bearing sway in the Eastern world?
72. Who proposed to unite with Philip V. of Macedon?
73. Who interfered?
74. What happened to Antiochus in the battle of Magnesia?
- 243
75. Who controlled Egypt? Why?
76. What is said of the Roman army and the extent of its power?
77. What is said of the Republic of Rome?
78. What is impossible when nations depart from the principles of true liberty of conscience?
79. Is this true in individual experience?
80. When only is true liberty known?
81. What does this line of policy demand?
82. What can you say of the Roman army?
83. State what is said of the power of the Senate.
84. What did tradition make the Romans?
85. What does the inspired penman say of this?
86. Who came to Rome as the Prince of Peace?
87. What relation did the religion of Rome sustain to the government?
88. What was the one all-absorbing institution?
89. What is necessary to become great?
90. What took the place of character?
91. What did the form of religion do in Rome?
92. What were some of the leading features of the papacy?

93. Who was deified? Give an illustration of this.
 94. Who was the highest religious officer during the reign of paganism?
 95. What paved the way for the papal hierarchy of later days?
 96. What was borrowed from Greece?
 97. For what did it train a class of citizens?
 98. Of what is Roman law the basis?
 99. Of whom is the Roman lawyer the forefather?
 100. How many plans has God and Satan?
 101. What is all history?
- 244
102. What is national history?
 103. What do students often forget?
 104. To what is national history compared?
 105. What should be remembered?
 106. At what point did Gabriel call attention to the fourth kingdom?
 107. In what condition was the republic?
 108. What is said of this transition period between the republic and the empire?
 109. As the republic lost its power, who composed a corporation?
 110. Who controlled the money? Who had the army?
 111. Who was the master mind?
 112. What countries were conquered by the Roman army?
 113. Who entered Jerusalem? What was made known to him?
 114. How did Pompey enter the city?
 115. Where did Rome now stand? When was this?
 116. Who chose Palestine as the home of the Jews?
 117. What was God's will concerning His people during the Roman supremacy?
 118. With what had God entrusted His people?
 119. What was the object of God in bringing different nations to the Jews?
 120. If the Hebrew race had been true to its appointed duty, would the history of the world have been changed?
 121. Who came to Jerusalem? Why?
 122. What was the result? Why?
 123. During what rule did Rome again enter Egypt?
 124. Who requested Pompey to visit Egypt to settle difficulties?
 125. What became of Pompey?
 126. Give an account of Caesar's visit to Egypt.
- 245
127. Have we any record that Caesar ever acknowledged God as the Ruler of nations?
 128. By whom was he fascinated and corrupted?
 129. What does the seventeenth verse describe?
 130. What is said of the character of Egypt?
 131. After leaving Egypt, where did Caesar go?
 132. What was the famous dispatch he sent to Rome?
 133. What did he do on his return to Rome?

134. What is said of Caesar?
 135. What was granted to the citizens of many cities?
 136. What did he grant to all scientific men of whatever nationality?
 137. What was found in his papers after his death?
 138. How did he die? What did Gabriel say he would do?
 139. Why was heaven watching?
 140. When did Julius Caesar come to an untimely death?
 141. What became of republicanism?
 142. Who died shortly after this? What became of Anthony?
 143. Who alone remained?
 144. What does Gibbon say of this?
 145. Whose ambition leveled every barrier of the Roman constitution?
 146. What power did the provinces gladly welcome?
 147. Who restored the senate to its former dignity?
 148. When are the principles of a free constitution irrevocably lost?
 149. Who was proclaimed emperor of Rome?
 150. What is Augustus called in Daniel 11: 20?
 151. What was the condition of the world at this time?
 152. How extensive was the territory of this government?
 153. Why did Satan exult?
- 246
154. What did this moment of his quiet resting precede?
 155. Why did Mary and Joseph go to the little town of Bethlehem?
 156. What was most favorable to Christ?
 157. Whom had Satan opposed since the rebellion in heaven?
 158. How did Christ come into the world?
 159. Who had often tended his flock on the plains of Bethlehem?
 160. What did the shepherds hear?
 161. What had the wise men been reading?
 162. What did they see? What did they know?
 163. How was it with the rest of the empire?
 164. Give at least ten facts regarding Bethlehem.
 165. What is said of the story of Bethlehem?
 166. How many knew of the birth of Christ?
 167. How much is given concerning Augustus?
 168. What had he unconsciously done?
 169. Why was Cyrus called to the throne?
 170. Of what was Caesar Augustus an agent?
 171. Who was to be born in the city of David?
 172. Who was reigning during most of the life of Christ?
 173. How does Gabriel describe Tiberius?
 174. What is said of him?
 175. What began to manifest itself?
 176. What entirely ceased?
 177. What right did the emperor usurp?
 178. What did the governors of Judah reflect?
 179. What was the condition of the Jews when the time drew near for the

Saviour to appear?

180. Upon whom did they base all their hopes?

247

181. What did they expect he would do?

182. What was Satan's studied plan in all this?

183. What did he seek to do in Babylon?

184. What did he hope to do through the Medo-Persian kingdom?

185. What did he do through the teachings of Greece?

186. What did this lead men to forget?

187. In what did a few have faith?

188. What was John the Baptist's work?

189. While Tiberius was reigning and planning, what was the Man of God doing?

190. Who watched him?

191. Who attended him and shielded him from the enemy?

192. What did they finally do to Christ?

193. Who was responsible for it?

194. Who upheld them in the act?

195. If the Jews had not put Christ to death, who would have done it?

196. Who nailed the Son of God to the cross?

197. With whom did they join hands?

198. Name the representatives from the quarters of the globe that stood near Christ in his last hours.

199. Who helped bear the cross?

200. What did the Roman soldier say?

201. What was typified by the darkness that shrouded the dying form of Christ?

202. What did the light that shone about the tomb when the Son of God came forth, typify?

248

CHAPTER XVI

THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

1. What had been tested?

2. In whom did eternal truth dwell?

3. How did the death of Christ affect Satan?

4. Looking forward to His crucifixion, what did Jesus say?

5. After Satan was cast out of heaven, with whom did he meet from time to time?

6. What had these Unfallen beings questioned?

7. What did they witness?

8. Since Satan was cast to the earth, how has he worked?

9. How and where was the gospel preached?

10. How long did it take to warn the world?

11. What was the result of the persecution in Jerusalem?

12. What barrier did the gospel break down?

13. What was the result of the spread of the truth?

14. What has been the greatest drawback in Christian experience?

15. What was the character of the love of the first church?
16. How and for what purpose did mothers watch their children?
17. What did the pagans notice in the new sect?
18. What is said of the Christians and their worship?
19. What had the enemy of all truth sought to do?
20. What was the condition of the Jewish nation when Christ came?
21. What did Satan do to deceive the Son of man?
22. In what does Christ represent the human family?
23. What dwelt in mortal clay?
24. What was broken by his resurrection?
25. From the foot of the cross, whom did God choose? For what purpose?
- 249
26. What did outward pressure fail to do?
27. What examples are given?
28. What nations had attempted to overthrow the truth?
29. What new plan was devised by Satan?
30. Of what plan is this a repetition?
31. What did Paul write to the Thessalonians concerning the working of this power?
32. What crept into the pure church?
33. Who lay in the Christian garb?
34. With what did the mystery of Christ come in contact?
35. Who only is safe from deception?
36. When did the mystery of iniquity begin its work?
37. From this period onward, of what power does history speak?
38. How did the mystery of iniquity work?
39. What is said of the distinction between the kings of the north and the south?
40. What two sides of this controversy are manifest?
41. What is said of the "Church of God"?
42. What characteristics mark the true church?
43. How has God honored them?
44. What has been offered every denomination?
45. What is the effect of rejecting truth in nations and individuals?
46. Who fill the vacancies?
47. How long will this succession be kept up?
48. Who will enter the eternal city?
49. When was this struggle revealed to Daniel?
50. What does the history of Rome become?
51. What is said of the church of the first century?
- 250
52. What is said to the church of the second and third centuries?
53. For how many centuries were Christianity and paganism in open conflict?
54. How did it affect the followers of Christ?
55. What is said of Rome in the third century of the Christian era?
56. What made it hard for the emperors to control affairs?

57. Where was the authority?
58. What pressed the Roman Empire on every side?
59. What did Diocletian conceive?
60. Whom did he associate with him to accomplish this purpose?
61. Who were associated with the Augusti?
62. Who was the Caesar of the western division of the empire?
63. When was Constantine confronted by bitter foes?
64. With whom did Constantine make a league?
65. What did Constantine outwardly acknowledge at this time?
66. Under whose name did he now fight?
67. What does Gibbon say of the use of the cross?
68. How was the work of Christ counterfeited by Constantine?
69. Whom did Constantine conquer, and over what did he sit as sole monarch?
70. How did he treat the senate and people?
71. Give the substance of the extract from Gibbon.
72. Upon what are these words a sad commentary?
73. How does Constantine's life compare with the pagans?
74. Who made the first religious laws in the Christian era?
75. What noted edict was passed by him in 312?
76. In what year was the first Sunday law passed?
77. What council did he convene in 325?
- 251
78. How did the conflict which then began affect the church?
79. Of what was this a great object lesson?
80. What followed in the wake of his reign?
81. What did he leave to his heirs?
82. State what is said of Constantinople.
83. When was the city founded?
84. How long was it from the founding of the city, to the victory of Octavius over Antony at Actium?
85. Of what was this new policy the outworking?
86. What had the kingdoms of the past followed?
87. What was the central thought with them?
88. With whom did this policy change?
89. What was enthroned in the place of paganism?
90. What does Gibbon say hereafter the historian will describe?
91. How is the work of the devil described?
92. What were the results of Constantine's work?
93. What is said of the council of Nice?
94. By what has the Christian world been torn asunder?
95. What can you say of Alexandria?
96. Who was Athanasius? Who was Arius?
97. What two powers met on the battle-field when Constantine contended for the throne of Rome?
98. Where was a more deadly conflict?
99. What early fathers adopted the philosophy of the Greeks and applied it

to the study of the Bible?

100. Where did higher criticism have its birth?

101. Of what was it the result?

102. Of what is it a revival?

103. Give the result of introducing Greek philosophy into Christian schools.

252

104. How did this affect the Roman world, and what did it establish?

105. What two leaders came from this teaching?

106. What is said of the disputed points over which they wrangled?

107. For what purpose was the council of Nice called?

108. Who called this council, and was present in person?

109. What creed was recognized as orthodox?

110. What began when this creed was announced and published to the world?

111. Did this check the spread of Arianism?

112. Where was the doctrine popular?

113. What was the faith of the Vandals?

114. What other nations believed the Arian faith?

115. Where did they settle?

116. Into what countries did Arianism spread?

117. What was the faith of the emperor?

118. Who became the champion of the Catholic cause? When?

119. What was to become of three of the divisions of Rome?

120. Where does this part of the history begin in Daniel 11?

121. What is said of Justinian's reign?

122. To what is the success of Justinian due?

123. What noted warrior favored the Catholic faith?

124. Under pretense of protecting the dethroned Hilderis, what was done?

125. How was he confirmed in his work?

126. What did the bishop say in prophetic tones?

127. For what purpose was this "holy war" determined?

128. State facts in regard to both armies.

129. Give the result of the conflict.

130. What faith triumphed?

253

131. Describe the triumph granted Belisarius.

132. Who plotted against the government and the general of Justinian?

133. What is said of the wars of Justinian?

134. What may be taken as an illustration of the extermination of the other two kingdoms?

135. Between what years was this accomplished?

136. What was the taking away of the "daily"?

137. When was the papacy established?

138. Who established the new capital? Why?

139. What is said of the birth and power of the papacy?

140. When was the seed sown by Justinian harvested?

141. What did this support?

142. What is a striking feature of this history?
143. What principles did the laws of this emperor contain?
144. What does Fischer say?
145. What laws became the basis of national laws to-day?
146. What religion is the recognized religion of most countries to-day?
147. What two men, above all others, were instrumental in forming the papacy and giving it civil power?
148. What contest was the means of enthroning the papacy?
149. How long did it rule the world?
150. What was crushed during this time?
151. The "Dark Ages" were ushered in at what date?

CHAPTER XVII

THE WORK OF THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

1. What is an important date in Jewish history?
 2. What stands as a milepost in the Christian church?
- 254
3. What event made the former date important?
 4. What prophetic period began at this point?
 5. What did the latter date witness?
 6. What prophetic period began in 588 A.D.?
 7. What is said of the little horn of Daniel 7 during this period?
 8. To what date are we brought in the thirty-first verse of Daniel 11?
 9. Did the papacy develop in a short period?
 10. What other powers illustrate the manner of the rise of the papacy?
 11. Who gave his power, seat, and great authority to the papacy?
 12. What two Roman emperors were conspicuous in preparing the way for the rise of the papacy?
 13. What event prepared the way for the papacy to be seated on the Tiber?
 14. How was the authority of the papacy gained?
 15. What did each of the four kingdoms have?
 16. Where did paganism and Christianity mingle their waters?
 17. Where did the papacy have its birth?
 18. Who was its mother? Describe its growth.
 19. What did Christians do with the Bible? Give the result.
 20. What was introduced into the Christian church? Why?
 21. Which commandment was dropped from the decalogue?
 22. Which was divided to make the number ten?
 23. What is the fourth commandment?
 24. How was it altered?
 25. How was the Bible treated? What was the result?
 26. Who was the head of the church, and how was he exalted?
 27. What had taken place even before this?
 28. Mention eight facts given in regard to the work of the papacy.
 29. What settled over the world?
- 255
30. When the Word of God was banished, what was extinguished?
 31. How long a time was allotted to the power that was to speak great words

against the Most High?

32. Why was its time shortened? What kind of bondage was this for the church?

33. What little companies were found?

34. To what days could the Waldenses trace their history?

35. What did the power upon the throne change? What had Gabriel told Daniel? Who watched each one who gave his life?

36. What is said of the deliverance of the church from bondage? To what did it give birth?

37. In what chapter in Revelation is this deliverance mentioned?

38. What is there stated?

39. How were the bands broken which Satan had placed around the truth?

40. What is said of the Bible during that period?

41. Were there schools for the masses?

42. What is said about books, papers, and physicians?

43. What became of those who dared to advocate learning?

44. Who did God use to help deliver His people?

45. Where were their schools established?

46. What was taught in those schools?

47. What did Wycliffe accomplish? When?

48. To whom is he compared?

49. To whom did Wycliffe give the gospel?

50. By what name were his followers known?

51. How were they treated?

52. Who was it that brought Protestantism to America?

53. Who lifted up their voices against the papacy in Bohemia?

54. What German monk proclaimed liberty of conscience?

256

55. Where did he first find a copy of the Bible?

56. Was Rome able to extinguish this light?

57. What became the lesson book for the German nation?

58. Who assisted Luther in this work of reform?

59. What place became noted as the seat of their principal school?

60. Who were educated and sent forth before the death of Luther?

61. To whom was the Word of God opened?

62. How was it with Rome during this onward march of the truth?

63. How many nations of Europe received the light?

64. How was America founded?

65. Had every nation accepted the Reformation, what would have been the result?

66. What was God offering to all these nations?

67. Who was offered the grand opportunity of returning from Babylon to Jerusalem?

68. What was repeated? How was it treated?

69. What is the result of a nation's rejecting the principles of the Reformation?

70. What country is an example of such a history?

71. What had been proclaimed in her borders?
72. What verses in this eleventh chapter were exactly fulfilled in her history?
73. What does Scott say in the "Life of Napoleon," concerning France in 1793?
74. In what sense does France stand apart in the world's history?
75. Of what was this the logical result? What is atheism in the individual?
76. Describe the unveiling of the "*Goddess of Reason*."
77. Of what was it the result?
78. What are men doing when they give private interpretations to the Divine Word?
- 257
79. Who do professed Christians follow in doing this?
80. Where may the result of such worship be read?
81. What two institutions had their origin in Eden?
82. How were they treated in France?
83. What road was France traveling?
84. What does the worship of the human intellect bring?
85. What took place in 1798? What tells the story of destruction?
86. Of what is this entire history an object lesson?
87. What stared France in the face?
88. Who saved the nation?
89. To what did the Reformation in Germany in the sixteenth century strike a death blow?
90. What nation became the battle-ground between papal tyranny and Protestantism?
91. What does absolute monarchy always accompany?
92. What principle is assumed by any nation when the light of truth is accepted?
93. What knew no bounds in France?
94. Who held two-thirds of the land?
95. Who issued warrants for arrest and imprisonment by his sole authority?
96. What prevailed in every province?
97. In what country were the principles of the Reformation put into practice?
98. When France had reached this state, who then appeared?
99. What was the controlling element?
100. Who were powerless?
101. What was the pope forced to do?
102. What did Napoleon organize?
103. Follow Napoleon from Malta to Aboukir.
- 258
104. To what position was Napoleon chosen in 1799?
105. What constitution did France attempt to copy?
106. What was established in France?
107. What was all that the cause of France now represented?
108. What does the historian say of the reforms of Napoleon?

109. What was secured for non-Catholics?
110. Who made the pope a prisoner? When?
111. What prophecy was fulfilled at this time?
112. Toward what did the reforms of Napoleon tend?
113. When was he proclaimed emperor?
114. From whom did he receive his crown?
115. What was the result of a partial acceptance of the truth? Is this true individually?
116. Of what was the establishment of the principles of the Reformation in the United States the result?
117. To whom is the struggle of France a warning?
118. What two kings again contended in 1798?
119. How is Constantinople recognized by all the nations in Asia and Europe?
120. In the time of the end, what will center about this city?
121. When the papacy was in power what arose?
122. In what form did the new work of Satan come?
123. How much of this world is Mohammedan in faith?
124. Where did this doctrine originate?
125. What country became the center of its influence?
126. From the banks of what river has every form of idolatry come?
127. In what way did the followers of Mohammed strive to enter Europe?
128. To what country was its influence extended?
129. With what was all Europe threatened at this time?
- 259
130. What did the battle of Tours check? Give date.
131. When was Constantinople captured?
132. In whose hands has it since remained?
133. What was one of the greatest checks of the papacy?
134. What led to the discovery of America?
135. Through whom did God work to advance the truth?
136. What countries at this time belonged to the Mohammedans?
137. On what site does a Moslem mosque now stand?
138. What countries escaped out of the hand of this conquering power?
139. Who receives an annual tribute from the Turks who pass in caravans on their way to Mecca?
140. What was the ambition of Napoleon?
141. What might this have been?
142. What event was not yet due?
143. What did Napoleon recognize?
144. What other country recognized the same?
145. What has caused constant jealousy among the nations of Europe?
146. Where have the eyes of the world been centered for years?
147. How is Turkey universally designated?
148. What will take place in the near future?
149. What has the world been brought to realize again and again?
150. What will take place when the Turk steps out of Constantinople?

151. What has God named this battle?
 152. Who trembled lest the crisis had finally come at the Crimean war?
 153. What powers united to sustain the life of the "sick man"?
 154. Who are now holding the four winds of strife?
 155. For what purpose are they being held?
- 260
156. What nation stands as a guidepost pointing to the work in the heavenly sanctuary?
 157. Whose eye is upon the people of God?
 158. Can any man tell when Turkey will leave Europe?
 159. What will be said when he does go?
 160. Why was the fate of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome recorded?
 161. While the world watches Turkey, what should the servants of God watch?

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CLOSING SCENE

1. How did God regard Daniel?
 2. What had God given him several times?
 3. What did the last vision cover?
 4. Before Gabriel left, what did he reveal to Daniel?
 5. What is Daniel?
 6. How many times are each of, the following expressions repeated: "The time of the end," "latter days," "the end of the indignation," and "for many days"?
 7. What were the angel's closing words?
 8. How many times by positive expressions is the mind called to the closing scenes of earth?
 9. When this vision began, where was the prophet?
 10. In what year of Cyrus' reign was the vision given?
 11. Through what kingdoms did he carry the mind of the prophet?
 12. What was shown of Grecian influence?
 13. What was the result of this molding influence on the fourth kingdom?
 14. What did the prophet see?
 15. Before whom was the darkness scattered?
- 261
16. To what is it compared?
 17. What nation became the battle-field between Protestantism and papacy?
 18. What was denied, and what like a pall hung over the country?
 19. What was the result of this struggle upon France?
 20. What was shown the prophet?
 21. For what were God's people to patiently wait?
 22. What had the prophet watched intently?
 23. What did he see connecting earth and heaven?
 24. For how long did this light follow the Jews?
 25. What came with the first advent of Christ?
 26. What changes took place in the streams of light?

27. What changes took place at the close of the two thousand three hundred days?
28. Into what place did our great High Priest enter?
29. What was revealed to Daniel?
30. What has taken place over and over again?
31. With what is the marred record of man's life covered?
32. What did Daniel know?
33. What are the nations saying; what are they doing?
34. Who did the prophet see pass through the earth?
35. How long will Christ intercede?
36. When the last soul is saved, what echoes through heaven?
37. What does the great High Priest lay aside?
38. What is then finished?
39. What door is then closed?
40. How must those who are sealed stand in the time of trouble?
41. What makes this period different from all preceding tests?
42. To what is this compared?
- 262
43. What words were uttered which will then be uttered by multitudes?
44. What will roll from other foreheads?
45. Why will there be such deep heart searching?
46. What did the mother of Zebedee's children ask?
47. To whom did Christ say that place belonged?
48. Who will occupy the position mentioned by the mother of Zebedee's sons?
49. Who besides the sealed ones will know that probation has ended?
50. From which of the plagues will there be no escape? .
51. How does David describe this time of trouble?
52. Who is shielded from the effects of the plagues?
3. How will the mountains and islands be affected?
54. What took place at the resurrection of Christ?
55. Who were they and what are they said to be?
56. At what time will there be another partial resurrection?
57. Who will be among those who will arise? What will they see?
58. What will become of those who come forth to shame and everlasting contempt?
59. What garments does the Saviour wear?
60. Who are deeply interested in this work?
61. What is the foundation of God's throne?
62. Where will it be hung? Who will see it?
63. What is painted on the threatening clouds?
64. What mingles with all of God's dealings until men utterly turn from Him?
65. What has been seen in the sky over and over again?
66. Have men listened to its voice?
67. What do the heavens declare?
68. What have scientists studied and failed to see?

263

69. What, from the creation of the world, has told the plan of redemption?
70. Who cannot understand it?
71. Why does Jehovah point us to the stars?
72. Who was it that saw Christ in the star?
73. What have men invented by God-given ability?
74. Why has God encouraged this effort? With what result?
75. As Daniel watched, what did he see, and hear?
76. Describe the resurrection of the righteous.
77. Towards what place do they pass?
78. Who throws open the pearly gates?
79. What is chanted?
80. What are the words that come from without?
81. What rings forth from within?
82. What does the accompanying host reply?
83. Describe the hundred and forty-four thousand.
84. What calls forth a song of triumph from their lips?
85. What is so wonderful about the singing?
86. What rings through heaven?
87. From whence come the stones that gleam in the Master's crown?
88. What completes the circle of perfection?
89. What is their relation to the King?
90. Whose place will the one hundred and forty-four thousand take?
91. Of whom was another company composed?
92. Then who are seen?
93. How many gather around the Father and Son?
94. As Christ looks upon them, what does He see, and how is He affected?
95. What will He do?
96. From whence come streams of light?

264

97. Who bow in adoration? Why?
98. Of what is heaven composed?
99. With what is the immensity of space filled?
100. How are they held in their orbits?
101. From whom is their light reflected?
102. How are the planets guided?
103. Of what is all this a type?
104. Of what is it a pattern?
105. How should each company shine?
106. How does God look upon each company of worshipers?
107. Who move in perfect order?
108. How should it be in each family?
109. Where will be found the perfection of this system?
110. How will the peculiarities live?
111. What did the angel say to Daniel?
112. What did the prophet have the privilege of seeing?
113. How is the teaching compared to Christ's teaching?


114. What can you say of the last scene presented to Daniel?
115. How will those shine that are taken from the depths of sin?
116. What was Daniel told to do?
117. What would take place in the time of the end?
118. What can you say of the time of the end?
119. What is said of the law of God and the saints?
120. What stood full-fledged before the world?
121. What did this freedom lead the angel to say?
122. Mention some of the inventions of the last days.
123. Why does God allow these things?
124. What is marvelous beyond description?
- 265
125. What is said of the realms of science?
126. What is God's object in this?
127. What is it that has led to such intellectual and moral advancement?
128. How rapidly are messages sent from city to city?
129. How from continent to continent?
130. How does man look upon these things?
131. How are the angels watching them?
132. In what way has God offered life to every nation?
133. Why were the Jews lost as a nation?
134. Upon what condition was the Christian church to inherit the promises made to the Israelites?
135. What will be developed in the time of the end?
136. What will be one great means of their education?
137. What was revealed in the glimpse given to the prophet Daniel?
138. To whom is he pointed in the last days?
139. How will the people of God in the last days be fortified physically?
140. How will they be fortified mentally?
141. In what period do we now live?
142. What characterizes this age?
143. What will be the attitude of the faithful followers of God?
144. In what time should we be truly wise in a special sense?
145. To what time was Daniel's attention centered?
146. Who was near the prophet, listening to the record of events?
147. What question was asked by the angel when Gabriel ceased to speak?
148. Who replied?
149. What did he say?
150. How long have angels waited for the completion of this plan?
151. What have they looked for in each generation?
- 266
152. When they saw the inhabitants of earth loiter, what did one cry out?
153. When this period was mentioned by Christ, what did Daniel say?
154. Fearing he still might be left in doubt, what did he then say?
155. Had any request of this man of God been left unanswered?
156. What was the reply of the angel?
157. What was meant by the time of the end?

158. What would then cease?
 159. When did this period of 1260 years begin?
 160. What had been changed during this time?
 161. What had been bound?
 162. What did the persecution tend to do?
 163. At the end of this 1260 years, what would be restored?
 164. When did this "time, times, and a half" end?
 165. What has been circulated since that time as never before?
 166. What special light has shone since 1844?
 167. How have the truths for this time spread?
 168. How did the angel explain the two periods that had puzzled the prophet?
 169. What does he say of those who live at the end of the 1335 days?
 170. Why will they be blessed?
 171. What will happen to many?
 172. Who will understand?
 173. What will some insist upon when the wise understand?
 174. What is said of the words of Gabriel and Christ?
 175. How was it with the aged prophet?
 176. What had been written?
 177. How long would the prophecy stand?
- 267
178. How long had the prophet done faithful service in the courts of Babylon and Shushan?
 179. How did Daniel stand with men?
 180. What did God say of him?
 181. How will he stand in the last days?
 182. What two prophets in this sense will stand together?
 183. What will guide the faithful few safely through the time of trouble, and prepare them for Christ's coming?

Daniel Two and Daniel Seven Compared



Thou *art* this head of gold.
Daniel 2:38



The first *was* like a lion, and
had eagle's wings: Dan 7:4



And after thee shall arise
another kingdom inferior to
thee. Daniel 2:39



And behold another beast, a second,
like to a bear, and it raised up itself
on one side, and *it had* three ribs in
the mouth of it between the teeth of
it: Dan 7:5



... and another third kingdom of
brass, which shall bear rule over
all the earth. Daniel 2:39



After this I beheld, and lo another,
like a leopard, which had upon the
back of it four wings of a fowl; the
beast had also four heads; Dan 7:6




And the **fourth** kingdom shall be
strong as **iron**: forasmuch as iron
breaketh in pieces and subdueth
all *things*:... shall it break in
pieces and bruise. Daniel 2:40



and behold a **fourth** beast,
dreadful and terrible, and **strong**
exceedingly; and it had great **iron**
teeth: it devoured and **brake in**
pieces, Dan 7:7



And whereas thou sawest the feet
and toes, part of potters' clay, and
part of iron, the kingdom shall be
divided; but there shall be in it of the
strength of the iron. Daniel 2:41



and it had ten horns, and there
came up among them another
little horn.
Dan 7:7,8

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

Is the Latter Rain Falling?

A brief study about the timing of the Latter Rain
from the perspective of Ellen G. White

INTRODUCTION

There are many sincere Adventist lay members, preachers, and even theologians today that are saying that the latter rain is falling. Some make the claim that it began in or around the year 1888. Others will claim that it did not begin then, but has recently begun. They will typically claim evidences for this such as, many conversions or baptisms in some country or locality. It seems that nearly everyone has different ideas on this subject. This study is designed to take a brief look at this subject from the perspective of Ellen White's writings.

The following is a statement often used by some to state that the latter rain began to fall in or around 1888:

"Let us, with contrite hearts, pray most earnestly that **now, in the time of the latter rain**, the showers of spiritual grace may fall upon us....**It is the time of the latter rain**, when the Lord will give largely of His Holy Spirit." Testimonies to Ministers, p 509, 512 (Review and Herald March 2, 1897).

Ellen White made the statements "now, in the time of the latter rain" and "It is the time of the latter rain." It's important to note that she never stated that the latter rain was falling, only that it was "now" the time for the latter rain! On more careful examination of this statement you notice the statement, "the showers of spiritual grace MAY fall upon us." This is evidence alone that this statement is being misinterpreted. This is a conditional statement. The qualifying word is, "may." It is also important to note here that she did NOT state that showers of spiritual grace were NOW falling upon us!

Zechariah 10:1 states, "Ask the LORD for rain in the time of the latter rain. The LORD will make flashing clouds; He will give them showers of rain, Grass in the field for everyone." It can be noted that Ellen White was most likely getting her words and phrasing directly from this Bible text. What is also important to note with this Bible text is the instruction that "in the time of the latter rain" we are to "ask the Lord for rain". These two sources are expressing parallel thoughts. It is also important to remember that asking and receiving often happen at very different times. Just because we asked of the Lord for rain in or around 1888, and even the message of Righteousness by Faith began to sound which is technically a part of the loud cry does not mean that the latter rain was poured out at that time. In point of fact Deut. 11:16-17, 1 Kings 8:35, 2 Chron. 6:26-27, 2 Chron. 7:13-14, Isa. 5:6, Jer. 3:3, and Zech. 14:17 all threaten "no rain" for various stated reasons, primarily disobedience or disregard for God's law. It stands to reason that the quantity of texts that mention this problem would have a bearing near

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

the end of time. If the latter rain began to fall in 1888 or shortly thereafter then none of these texts would have any bearing on final events.

There is always a danger in placing private interpretation upon individual Bible verses, or in this case EGW statements. Private interpretation has often led to fanatical movements. Adventists have always been known for basing their beliefs solidly on the weight of the evidence and not individual verses or statements. This is truly the only safe way to study the Bible or EGW's writings. In point of fact Ellen White states, "All should decide from the weight of evidence." {RH, September 16, 1873 par. 10} Having made this statement isn't it only right to study this question in the same manner?

In this study, we have attempted to produce a balanced, systematic approach to this often asked question. Is the Latter Rain falling?

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

Statements from Ellen G. White on the Timing of the Latter Rain

Latter Rain was yet future on March 18, 1852

"The latter rain **is coming** on those that are **pure** -- all **then** will receive it as formerly." {SpM 3.1} (Copy of Three Early Visions, March 18, 1852)

Latter Rain was yet future in 1887:

"**When** the way is prepared for the Spirit of God, the blessing will come. Satan can no more hinder a shower of blessing from descending upon God's people than he can close the windows of heaven that rain cannot come upon the earth." -1SM 124 (1887). {LDE 188.2}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1888:

"[REV. 18:1, 2, 4.] This scripture points forward to a time **when** the announcement of the fall of Babylon, as made by the second angel [REV 14:8] of Revelation 14, **is to be repeated, with** the additional mention of the corruptions which have been entering the various organizations that constitute Babylon, since that message was first given, in the summer of 1844." {GC88 603.2}

"The Lord has permitted the enemy of truth to make **a determined effort against the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.** He designs by this means to awaken a decided interest in that question which is a test for the last days. **This **will** open the way for the third angel's message to be proclaimed with power.**" {1888 902.4}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1890:

"Then thousands in the eleventh hour will see and acknowledge the truth. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed" (Amos 9:13). These conversions to truth will be made with **a rapidity that will surprise the church, and God's name alone will be glorified.**" -Letter 43, 1890, p. 5. (To Brother Olsen, December 15, 1890.) {1MR 179.1}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1892:

"It is left with us to remedy the defects in our characters, to cleanse the soul temple of **every defilement.** **Then** the latter rain will fall upon us as the early rain fell upon the disciples on the Day of Pentecost." -5T 214 (1882). {LDE 192.3}

"The latter rain will come, and the blessing of God will fill every soul that is **purified from every defilement.** It is our work **today** to yield our souls to Christ, that we may be fitted for the time of refreshing from

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

the presence of the Lord--fitted for the baptism of the Holy Spirit." -1SM 191 (1892). {LDE 193.1}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1896:

"There is a world lying in wickedness, in deception and delusion, in the very shadow of death,--asleep, asleep. Who are feeling travail of soul to awaken them? What voice can reach them? My mind was carried to the future, when the signal will be given. "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." But some will have delayed to obtain the oil for replenishing their lamps, and too late they will find that character, which is represented by the oil, is not transferable." {RH, February 11, 1896 par. 6}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1896:

"The great outpouring of the Spirit of God, which lightens the whole earth with His glory, will not come until we have an enlightened people, that know by experience what it means to be laborers together with God. When we have entire, wholehearted consecration to the service of Christ, God will recognize the fact by an outpouring of His Spirit without measure; but this will not be while the largest portion of the church are not laborers together with God." --ChS 253 (1896). {LDE 193.3}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1897: (This statement is from the same year as the statement listed above from TM 509 that has been misapplied by some to say that the latter rain is now falling.)

"(Isa. 61:11.) Not to Wait for Latter Rain.--We must not wait for the latter rain. It is coming upon all who will recognize and appropriate the dew and showers of grace that fall upon us. When we gather up the fragments of light, when we appreciate the sure mercies of God, who loves to have us trust Him, then every promise will be fulfilled. [Isa. 61:11 quoted.] The whole earth is to be filled with the glory of God." (Letter 151, 1897). {7BC 984.5}

Latter Rain was yet future on March 2, 1897:

"Many have in a great measure failed to receive the former rain. They have not obtained all the benefits that God has thus provided for them. They expect that the lack will be supplied by the latter rain. When the richest abundance of grace shall be bestowed, they intend to open their hearts to receive it. They are making a terrible mistake. ... Unless we are daily advancing in the exemplification of the active Christian virtues, we shall not recognize the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in the latter

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

rain. It may be falling on hearts all around us, but we shall not discern or receive it." {RH, March 2, 1897 par. 4}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1898:

"A similar work will be accomplished **when that other angel, represented in Revelation 18, gives his message. The first, second, and third angels' messages will need to be repeated.** The call will be given to the church, ... [Rev. 18:2-5]." {16MR 270.1} (1898)

Latter Rain was yet future in 1899: (The time for the Latter Rain came years prior to this statement according to EGW, but because we were not prepared it had still not been given.)

"Brethren, we have little time in which to work. Certainly we need to stop complaining about each other, and lay our whole hearts open before God, that we may receive the Holy Spirit. **Years ago the time came for the Holy Spirit to descend in a special manner upon God's earnest, self-sacrificing workers.** The Lord will greatly bless His tried and chosen ones if they will cooperate with Him. When the Holy Spirit came down in the day of Pentecost, it was like a rushing, mighty wind. It was given in no stinted measure; for it filled all the place where the disciples were sitting. **So will it be given to us when our hearts are prepared to receive it.** Ms 2, 1899, p. 1. ("The Need for Greater Consecration," January 24, 1899.) {1MR 175.4}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1899:

"I know that a work must be done for the people, **or many will not be prepared to receive the light of the angel sent down from heaven to lighten the whole earth with his glory.**" Letter 24, 1889, p. 4. (To the General Conference, circa 1889.) {1MR 175.3}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1899: (This statement was not released by the White Estate until 1950)

"**When** the Third Angel's Message shall go forth with a loud voice, the whole earth shall be lightened with His glory, the Holy Spirit is poured out upon His people. The revenue of glory has been accumulating for this closing work of the Third Angel's Message. The prayers that have been ascending for the fulfillment of the promise, the descent of the Holy Spirit, not one has been lost. Each prayer has been accumulating, **ready to overflow and pour forth** a healing flood of heavenly influence and accumulated light all over the world." Letter 96a **1899**, p. 2. (To Sister Henry, **July 19, 1899**.) White Estate Washington, D. C. **August 30, 1950** {1MR 180.2}

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

Latter Rain was yet future in 1899:

"When Sunday observance shall be enforced by law, and the world shall be enlightened (obviously Rev. 18) **concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath**, then whoever shall transgress the command of God to obey a precept which has no higher authority than that of Rome, will thereby honor popery above God. He is paying homage to Rome, and to the power which enforces the institution ordained by Rome. **He is worshipping the beast and his image.**" {LDE 226.1} {GC 449.1} (The loud cry is against "worship of the beast and his **image.**") (Ev 234, 235 1899)

Latter Rain was yet future on October 9, 1903:

"The prophecies in the eighteenth of Revelation will soon be fulfilled. During the proclamation of the third angel's message, "another angel" is to "come down from heaven, having great power" and the earth is to be "lightened with His glory." The Spirit of the Lord will so graciously and universally bless consecrated human instrumentalities, that men, women, and children will open their lips in praise and testimony, filling the earth with the knowledge of God and with His unsurpassed glory, as the waters cover the sea." {2MR 21.3} --Ms 122, 1903, pp. 1-4. ("The Time of the End," Oct. 9, 1903.)

Latter Rain was yet future on October 13, 1904: (almost identical to the statement above)

"We see before us a special work to be done. We are now to pray as never before for the Holy Spirit's guidance. Let us seek the Lord with the whole heart, that we may find him. We have received the light of the three angels' messages; and we need now to come decidedly to the front, and take our position on the side of truth." {RH, October 13, 1904 par. 1} ...

"The prophecies in the eighteenth of Revelation will soon be fulfilled. During the proclamation of the third angel's message, "another angel" is to "come down from heaven, having great power," and the earth is to be "lighted with his glory." The Spirit of the Lord will so graciously bless consecrated human instrumentalities that men, women, and children will open their lips in praise and thanksgiving, filling the earth with the knowledge of God, and with his unsurpassed glory, as the waters cover the sea. {RH, October 13, 1904 par. 3}

Latter Rain was yet future on October 20, 1904: (repeated from statement above but notice even more future tense emphasis is added)

"We see before us a special work to be done in the time when the whole earth shall be filled with the light and the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. The prophecies in the eighteenth of Revelation

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

will soon be fulfilled. During the proclamation of the third angel's message, "another angel" is to "come down from heaven, having great power;" and the earth is to be "lightened with the glory." The Spirit of the Lord will so graciously and universally bless consecrated human instrumentalities, that men, women, and children will open their lips in praise and testimony, filling the earth with the knowledge of God, and with his unsurpassed glory, as the waters cover the sea." {RH, October 20, 1904 par. 2}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1904:

"Let Christians put away all dissension and give themselves to God for the saving of the lost. Let them ask in faith for the promised blessing, and it will come."--8T 21 (1904). {LDE

Latter Rain was yet future in 1909:

"When the reproach of indolence and slothfulness shall have been wiped away from the church, the Spirit of the Lord will be graciously manifested. Divine power will be revealed. The church will see the providential working of the Lord of hosts."--9T 46 (1909). {LDE 193.4}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1911: (Surely if the latter rain began to fall between the 1888 printing of the Great Controversy and the 1911 printing (as some state) then Ellen White would have taken note of this amazing fact that lightens the whole earth with it's glory in the 1911 printing of the GC. **THE FACT IS SHE REVIEWED AND AUTHORIZED THE 1911 PRINTING OF THE GC AND NOT ONLY NEVER MADE SUCH A STATEMENT BUT REITERATED THE FACT THAT THE LATTER RAIN WAS YET FUTURE.**)

"[REV. 18:1, 2, 4.] This scripture points forward to a time when the announcement of the fall of Babylon, as made by the second angel [REV 14:8] of Revelation 14, is to be repeated, with the additional mention of the corruptions which have been entering the various organizations that constitute Babylon, since that message was first given, in the summer of 1844." {GC 603.2}

"Of Babylon, at the time brought to view in this prophecy, it is declared, "Her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." [REV. 18:5.] {GC 604.1}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1911:

"But near the close of earth's harvest, a special bestowal of spiritual grace is promised to prepare the church for the coming of the Son of man. This outpouring of the Spirit is likened to the falling of the latter rain; and it is for this added power that Christians are to send their

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

petitions to the Lord of the harvest "*in the time of the latter rain*." In response, "the Lord shall make bright clouds, and give them showers of rain." "He will cause to come down . . . the rain, the former rain, and the latter rain," Zechariah 10:1; Joel 2:23." {AA 55.1} (1911 see note below from White Estate about the book, Acts of the Apostles)

"THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES WAS ONE OF THE LAST BOOKS WRITTEN BY ELLEN G. WHITE. IT WAS PUBLISHED A FEW YEARS BEFORE HER DEATH. IT IS ONE OF THE MOST ILLUMINATING VOLUMES THAT CAME FROM HER PROLIFIC PEN. THE AVERAGE READER WILL FIND IN IT LIGHT FOR CHRISTIAN WITNESSING. THE MESSAGE OF THE BOOK IS UP TO DATE, AND ITS RELEVANCY IS REFLECTED IN THE EFFORT OF THE AUTHOR TO SHOW THAT THE TWENTIETH CENTURY WILL WITNESS A BESTOWAL OF SPIRITUAL POWER EXCEEDING THAT OF PENTECOST. THE WORK OF THE GOSPEL IS NOT TO CLOSE WITH A LESSER DISPLAY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT'S POWER THAN MARKED ITS BEGINNING. THAT THE READER MIGHT PARTICIPATE IN THIS RE-ENACTMENT OF THE GLORIOUS SCENES OF THE EARLY CHURCH AND AT THE SAME TIME BE PRESERVED FROM THE SUBTLE COUNTERFEITS OF THE ENEMY OF SOULS IS THE PRAYER AND EARNEST WISH OF --THE PUBLISHERS."

Latter Rain was yet future in 1911:

The work of apostasy has not yet reached its culmination and will not reach this condition until, 1) Satan works with all power, signs, and lying wonders, 2) and the union of the church with the world (Sunday Law enforcement.) (1911)

"The message of the second angel did not reach its complete fulfillment in 1844. The churches then experienced a *moral fall*, in consequence of their refusal of the light of the advent message; **but that fall was not complete. As they have continued to reject the special truths for this time they have fallen lower and lower. Not yet, however, can it be said that "Babylon is fallen,... because she made all nations** drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." *She has not yet made all nations do this.* The spirit of **world conforming and indifference to the testing truths for our time** exists and has been gaining ground in churches of the Protestant faith in all the countries of Christendom; and these churches **are included in the solemn and terrible denunciation of the second angel. But the work of apostasy has not yet reached its culmination.**" {GC 389.2}

"The Bible declares that **before the coming of the Lord, Satan will work** "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" and **they that "received not the love**

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

of the truth, that they might be saved," will be left to receive "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." 2 Thessalonians 2:9-11. Not until this condition shall be reached, and the union of the church with the world shall be fully accomplished throughout Christendom, will the fall of Babylon be complete. The change is a progressive one, and the perfect fulfillment of Revelation 14:8 is yet future. {GC 389.3}

"Revelation 18 points to the time when, as the result of rejecting the threefold warning of Revelation 14:6-12, the church will have fully reached the condition foretold by the second angel, and the people of God still in Babylon will be called upon to separate from her communion. This message is the last that will ever be given to the world; and it will accomplish its work. When those that "believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thessalonians 2:12), shall be left to receive strong delusion and to believe a lie, then the light of truth will shine upon all whose hearts are open to receive it, and all the children of the Lord that remain in Babylon will heed the call: "Come out of her, My people" (Revelation 18:4)." {GC 390.2}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1911:

"But unless the members of God's church today have a living connection with the Source of all spiritual growth, they will not be ready for the time of reaping. Unless they keep their lamps trimmed and burning, they will fail of receiving added grace in times of special need." - {AA 55.2}

Latter Rain was yet future in 1913:

"But the time to receive the mark of the beast, as designated in prophecy, has not yet come. The testing time has not yet come. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. None are condemned until they have had the light and have seen the obligation of the fourth commandment. But when the decree shall go forth enforcing the counterfeit Sabbath, and when the loud cry of the third angel shall warn men against the worship of the beast and his image, the line will be clearly drawn between the false and the true. Then those who still continue in transgression will receive the mark of the beast in their foreheads or in their hands." {BTS, February 1, 1913 par. 5}

A Caution Against Time-Setting Expressions

"The times and seasons God has put in His own power. And why has not God given us this knowledge?-- Because we would not make a right use of it if He did. A condition of things would result from this knowledge among our people that would greatly retard the work of God in preparing a people to stand in the great day that is to come. We are not

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

to be engrossed with speculations in regard to the times and the seasons which God has not revealed. Jesus has told His disciples to "watch," but not for definite time. His followers are to be in the position of those who are listening for the orders of their Captain; they are to watch, wait, pray, and work, as they approach the time for the coming of the Lord; but no one will be able to predict just when that time will come; for "of that day and hour knoweth no man." You will not be able to say that He will come in one, two, or five years, neither are you to put off His coming by stating that it may not be for ten or twenty years. . . . **We are not to know the definite time either for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit or for the coming of Christ.** ... Why has not God given us this knowledge?--Because we would not make a right use of it if He did. A condition of things would result from this knowledge among our people that would greatly retard the work of God in preparing a people to stand in the great day that is to come. **We are not to live upon time excitement.** . . ." --Review and Herald, March 22, 1892. {Ev 221.1} {LDE 33.1}

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

IS THE LATTER RAIN FALLING?

CONCLUSION

This study makes it evident that Ellen G. White not only never stated that the latter rain was falling, but that in every statement she made she continued to look forward to this great event throughout her life. There has not been an event since 1844 “**with ten times the power**” of the “**midnight cry**” {SpM 4.3} to this date. However, that being said, we believe that this mighty manifestation of God’s spirit and power will yet be displayed in his people somewhere during the “little time of trouble” and that many of the principles and examples from the book of Acts will yet be repeated but on a worldwide scale. We look forward to this great event and continue to pray for it.

If this study has helped you in your spiritual walk, please contact us and let us know. <http://www.SealingTime.com/contact>

Thanks for studying with us,
Ryan McCoy
Speaker/Director/Producer/ Author
Sealing Time Ministries
PO Box 1003
Nampa, ID 83653
(208) 453-1844
<http://www.SealingTime.com>