

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

JANUARY 1836.

No. I.

J. Addison Alexander

- ART. I.—1. Ernesti Friderici Caroli Rosenmülleri *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*. 20 vols. 8vo. Leipzig: 1788—1829.
2. *Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*. Von Ernst Friedrich Karl Rosenmüller Vols. I.—IV. Leipzig: 1828—1830.

THESE are the titles of the two most important works of the late Professor Rosenmüller, neither of which was finished when he died. The name of this writer is at present so familiar to the scholars of America, that a brief sketch of his life and writings cannot be utterly devoid of interest. To those who know what the life of a laborious German scholar is, we need not say that his biography will exhibit little more than a chronological list of his publications.

This distinguished orientalist and biblical critic is often called *the younger Rosenmüller*, in order to distinguish him from his father, who was also an eminent Professor in the same University, and a labourer of note in the same general field, though in another subdivision of it. John George Rosenmüller, the father, born in 1736, was successively Professor of Theology in three Universities, Erlangen, Giessen, Leipzig. His local reputation, as a preacher and an ecclesiastical functionary, was extremely high; but his

educated Mussulman from Tunis. When the latter returned home, he sent his Christian friend a number of Arabic manuscripts, and, among the rest, an African copy of the Thousand and One Nights, in ten volumes of the octavo size. The text of this manuscript Habicht began to edit in 1825, collating other copies of a part of the collection. Vol. II. appeared in 1826, Vol. III. 1827, Vol. IV. 1828, Vol. V. 1831, Vol. VI. 1834. The work is printed in 16mo., on a clear, neat type. To each of the first four volumes is appended, in the form of notes, an explanatory index of the words not to be found in Golius and the other printed lexicons. In the fifth and sixth volumes this appendix is omitted, and the editor announces his intention to furnish, at the close of the whole work, a general glossary of such words, in alphabetical order. This, when once completed, will be far more convenient to the reader, but he will feel the want of it until it does appear.

This work may be regarded as another valuable aid to oriental students. There is nothing which lets us so completely into the interior of society in the east; and as the Koran is the best book for beginners, so the Thousand and One Nights will be an excellent chrestomathy for those who have begun to read without the points. It is proper to add, that this, so far as we know, is the first attempt to publish the whole work in the original language.

Samuel Miller

ART. VI.—*The most suitable Name for the Christian Sabbath.*

THE design of this brief article is not to demonstrate the *obligation* which lies upon us to sanctify the Sabbath; nor to define the *manner* in which it ought to be sanctified; but simply to inquire, what is the most approved *title* of that consecrated day. Names have more influence than is commonly imagined. Many are *governed* by them; and all, perhaps, attach quite as much importance to them as they ought. A little discussion may, perhaps, enable us to decide which of the various titles commonly given to the first day of the week, is most in accordance with the nature of the institution, and with the habit of the people of God in all ages.

The people called *Quakers*, refuse to give this day any other title than that which is founded on its *numerical*

order among the days of the week. They suppose that all days are alike in sanctity; that the law of the *Sabbath*, as contained in the fourth commandment, is no longer obligatory; that this being the case, to call any day "the Lord's day," is adapted to mislead; and that the title of *Sunday*, being of Pagan origin, ought not to be employed by professing Christians. They, therefore, uniformly designate it, in all their communications, as the *first day* of the week.

On these positions we shall not stop to offer many remarks. We think it easy to prove that those who maintain them are in error. That one day in seven is set apart, by divine authority, as a day of rest from worldly care, and of consecration to the service of God, we hold to be not only a fact, but also a most important fact, a fact of vital interest to the church and the world. And as to the scruple about using the title of *Sunday*, because it was originally applied to the first day of the week by Pagans, if carried out to its legitimate extent, it would proscribe a multitude of terms, in all modern languages, besides those which are applied to the days of the week, and which designate the months;— terms which Quakers use, in common with all other members of the community, without reserve or hesitation.

The title of *Sabbath* has also been seriously objected to. It is alleged, that, as this was the title of the Jewish day of rest; and as we deem it important to distinguish between the Old Testament rest on the *seventh* day of the week, and that of the *first* day of the week under the New Testament economy; so we ought to employ a different word, in all cases, to designate the latter day. This objection seems to have very little foundation, either in reason or scripture. It is undoubtedly true, that, in the second and third centuries, we find the Christian writers carefully distinguishing between the Jewish "*Sabbath*," and the "*Lord's day*;" because, when the change in the day occurred, it was insisted by many of the Jewish converts, who formed the great body of the first Christians, that the *seventh* day ought still to be consecrated to the worship of God. The Gentile Christians, therefore, in order to conciliate the Jews, and allure them into the church, honoured their Sabbath; so that, for several centuries, both the *seventh* and the *first* days of the week were considered as holy days, and devoted to religious purposes, through the greater part of Christendom. The eastern and western churches, indeed, were not entirely of one mind as to the precise character of that celebration of the Jewish

Sabbath, which ought to be adopted by Christians. Among the *eastern* Christians, the *seventh* day of the week was generally observed as a *festival*, as well as the *first*, because the Jews, from whom they received it, were very numerous in the east, and always considered and treated it as a *festival*; and also because *Marcion*, the heretic, in order to testify his aversion to the God and the religion of the Jews, always kept the seventh day of the week as a *fast*. This led the eastern churches generally, for the purpose of showing their abhorrence of *Marcion*, always to keep that day as a *festival*. In the *western* church, also, the Jewish Sabbath seems to have been kept as a *festival* for more than two centuries after the apostolic age; but in the third or fourth century, for reasons somewhat doubtful, the practice was altered, and the seventh day of the week has ever since, by the Romish church, been kept as a rigid *fast*.

This diversity of practice, and the degree of collision which grew out of the diversity, rendered it not merely convenient, but absolutely necessary, that a distinction between the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's day should be constantly maintained. Hence, Ignatius, in writing to the *Magnesians*, exhorts them "no longer to observe the Sabbaths (i. e. the Jewish Sabbaths), but to keep the Lord's day, on which our life was raised from the dead." *Origen* also carefully distinguished the Lord's day from the Jewish Sabbath, to which he says it ought by all means to be *preferred*.

But when the early Christians had occasion to speak to the *Pagans* concerning this sacred day, they commonly called it *Sunday*, the title by which it was most familiarly known to the mass of the heathen population. Thus *Justin Martyr*, in his *Apology*, addressed to the heathen Emperor, says, "We all meet together on *Sunday*, on which God having changed darkness and matter, created the world, and on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead." Thus also *Tertullian*, who wrote soon after *Justin*, in reply to the accusation of the heathen, that the Christians worshipped the sun, says:—"We do, indeed, make *Sunday* a day of joy, but for other reasons than that of worship to the sun, which is no part of our religion. At other times, when the same father is speaking to his fellow Christians, he commonly uses the title of "the Lord's day," more especially, when it is his purpose to distinguish it from the Jewish Sabbath. In like manner, the first Christian emperors use the names *Sunday* and *Lord's day* interchangeably, according

as it was their purpose to address Pagans or Christians. Of this we have a remarkable specimen in the language of the Emperor *Valentinian* the younger, after the empire became Christian, when he says, "On *Sunday*, which our forefathers very properly called 'the Lord's day.'" In short, it is perfectly evident from the earliest and most authentic records, not only that the first day of the week was statedly observed by the Christian church, from the time of the apostles, as a holy day; but also that the favourite title by which they spoke of it, was "the Lord's day;" and that when they called it "*Sunday*," it was in accommodation to the popular usage of the Pagans around them, who, in adopting the measure of time by weeks, and in giving names to the days of the week, gave the name of the day of the sun (*dies solis*) to the first. This day was also sometimes called, by the early Christians, "the day of bread," (*dies panis*) because the "breaking of bread," as a memorial of Christ, or, in other words, administering the Lord's supper, in many churches, made a part of the stated service of every Lord's day. This is the account given of the matter by *Bingham*, the learned ecclesiastical antiquary of the Church of England, who is considered as one of the best authorities, on subjects of this nature. See his *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. Book XX. Ch. II. and III.

Some of the early writers, indeed, went so far as to enjoin an equal regard, as Christian festivals, to the "Lord's day," and to the Jewish "Sabbath." Thus *Gregory Nagianzen* calls these two days, two companions, for which we should cherish an equal respect. And the *Constitutions of Clement* enjoin that both these festivals be observed in the Church; the "Sabbath day" in honour of the creation; and the "Lord's day," as exhibiting to our view the resurrection of the Saviour of the world.

Lord Chancellor *King* gives the same account with *Bingham* of the reason why the early Christians frequently gave the name of *Sunday* to the first day of the week. "The Lord's day," says he, "was the common and ordinary title of this blessed and glorious day; though sometimes, in compliance with the heathen, that they might know what day they meant thereby, they called it, in their phrase, *Sunday*, so termed, because dedicated to the Sun." *Inquiry*, &c. p. 124.

The venerable Bishop *White*, of *Pennsylvania*, in some valuable Letters addressed by him, several years ago, to the

Editor of the "American Quarterly Review," in relation to the subject of *Sabbath mails*, makes the following remark:

"It is an unequivocal fact, that, throughout Christendom, the only bodies of professing Christians, who apply the term 'the Sabbath,' to the first day of the week, are the Church of Scotland, the Dissenters in England, and their descendants in America. In that application, it is unknown, not only by all the Roman Catholics, and by all the Greek Churches, who, in this, have uninterrupted tradition on their side; but by the Church of England, by all the Lutheran Churches, and by all those which are Calvinistic, on the Continent of Europe. The deviation in Great Britain was begun by a certain Dr. *Bound*, in the reign of Charles I. It fell in with those prejudices of the Puritans, which ended in the prostration of the Church and of the State; and the error had an influence on the proceedings of the Assembly which framed the Westminster Confession." *Protestant Episcopalian*. Vol. I. p. 391.

Two things here invite our attention, viz. 1st. The *historical statement*; and 2dly, the opinion implied with regard to the propriety of applying the name "Sabbath" to the first day of the week.

With regard to the *historical statement*, it is most incautiously and inaccurately made. The terms "Sabbath" and "Sabbath day" are undoubtedly applied to the first day of the week, in the Homilies of the Church of England, (*Place and Time of Prayer*); in the *Acts of the Synod of Dort*, which every one knows, speak the authoritative language of the Church of *Holland*; in the writings of the learned *Voetius*, of *Holland* (*Polit. Eccles.* Par. I. Lib. IV. *Tract* IV. Cap. I.), of the venerable *Ursinus*, of Germany (*Corpus Doctrinae*), of Dr. *Andrew Willet*, of the Church of *England* (*Synopsis Papismi*), of the learned *Szegedin*, of *Hungary* (*Loci Communes*); and, among a host that might be mentioned, in the works of Bishop *Horsley*, of Bishop *Porteus*, of the eloquent *Wilberforce*, of Dr. *Thomas Scott*, the pious and excellent Commentator, of *Dean Milner*, of Dr. *Samuel Ogden*, of Bishop *Mant*, of Messrs. *Jones*, of *Nayland*, *Robinson*, of *Leicester*, *Cooper*, of *Hamstal Ridware*, the *Christian Observer*, of *London*, all of the Church of England; and a number of other English Episcopal, and Continental writers of the most elevated character. So far, then, as Protestant authority goes, the use of this title, as applied to the first day of the week, is far

from being confined as Bishop *White* alleges. The suffrages in its favour, from the established Church of *England*, and from the foreign Reformed Churches, are widely extended, and of unquestionable weight and respectability.

As to the opinion which seems to be implied in Bishop *White's* remarks, with regard to the propriety of applying the title of "the Sabbath" to the first day of the week, we are constrained to dissent from it as strongly as from his historical statement. He seems to assume, as a conceded point, or, at least, as one on which he feels warranted in pronouncing with great confidence, that the fourth commandment is abrogated, and, of course, is no longer obligatory on Christians. "From that date," says he, (*i. e.* from the close of the Jewish dispensation) "the fourth command in the decalogue is *defunct*, as well in substance as in name." To this opinion we are constrained seriously to object. We do not consider the fourth command as fixing the precise day, in order, which ought to be observed; but only as requiring that, after six days of labour, the seventh should be a day of rest, and be kept holy. Strictly speaking, then, there is a sense in which the Christian Sabbath is as much the seventh day as the Jewish Sabbath was; that is, it is as much the *seventh part* of the week, and succeeds to six days of labour as really as the Hebrew Sabbath did. The fourth commandment, then, far from being repealed or altered, is, in substance, as much in force as ever, and applies as perfectly to the New Testament Sabbath, as to that of the ceremonial economy; and, of course, ought to be considered as establishing the moral and perpetual obligation to devote one day in seven to the service of God, just as indubitably as other parts of the same code render obligatory, at this hour, and will forever render obligatory, abstinence from idolatry, venerating Jehovah's name, honouring our parents, or refraining from theft or murder.

In this opinion, the profound and learned Bishop *Horsley* seems decisively to concur. "To the general question," says he, "what regard is due to the institution of a Sabbath under the Christian dispensation? The answer is plainly this: Neither more nor less than was due to it in the patriarchal ages; before the Mosaic Covenant took place. It is a gross mistake to consider the Sabbath as a mere festival of the Jewish Church, deriving its whole sanctity from the Levitical law. The contrary appears, as well from the evidence of the fact, which sacred history affords, as from the

reason of the thing, which the same history declares. The religious observance of the seventh day hath a place in the *Decalogue* among the *very first duties of natural religion*. The reason assigned for the injunction is general, and hath no relation or regard to the particular circumstances of the Israelites, or to the particular relation in which they stood to God as his chosen people." *Horsley's Sermons on the Sabbath*. In fact, if the fourth commandment is abrogated, it is not easy to see with what propriety or consistency those who use the Liturgy of the Episcopal Church, can say, when this command is repeated, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law."

The Dr. *Bound*, to whom Bishop *White* refers, lived considerably earlier than he represents. His book on "*the Sabbath*," was first published in the year 1595, long before *Charles I.* came to the crown; and, of course, long before that unhallowed coalition of Papists, hot-headed enthusiasts, of various sects, and ambitious soldiers, by which the establishment, both in church and state, was finally prostrated. This book we have never seen; but *Neal* tells us, that the author "maintained the morality of a seventh part of time for the worship of God; that Christians are bound to rest on the Lord's day as much as the Jews on the Mosaical Sabbath, the commandment of rest being moral and perpetual; that, therefore, it was not lawful to follow secular studies, or worldly business on that day, nor to use such recreations and pleasures as were lawful on other days, such as *shooting, fencing, bowling, &c.*" "This book," Mr. *Neal* adds, "had a wonderful spread among the people, and wrought a mighty reformation; so that the Lord's day, which used to be profaned by *interludes, may-games, morrice-dances*, and other *sports and recreations*, began to be kept more precisely, especially in corporations." The Puritans generally fell in with this doctrine, and commonly spent the day in public, family, and private devotion. The governing clergy were greatly opposed to this view of duty in regard to the sanctification of the Lord's day. They declaimed against it as an abridgement of Christian liberty, and insisted that the *sports and recreations*, which *Bound's* book opposed, were not forbidden by any law of God.* They perceived that, if the title

* This statement of *Neal* is the more credible, since it is notorious that the dominant clergy, a few years afterwards, in the next reign, openly favoured the famous *Book of Sports*, which encouraged public *dances*, and other *public games* on the Lord's day. This book was drawn up by Bishop *Morton*, and en-

of "the *Sabbath*" were given to the first day of the week, it would naturally connect with the observance of the day more strictness than they wished to encourage; and they also feared that, if so much was made of the sanctification of the Lord's day, it would be putting on that day "an unequal lustre," as *Neal* expresses it, to the detriment of the other *festivals*, in which they so much delighted, and also to the prejudice of the Church's authority in appointing them. Many seemed desirous of inculcating and establishing the doctrine, that the fourth commandment was repealed, and the *name* therein employed for the weekly rest, no longer proper or applicable; that the observance of the Lord's day was rather a matter of agreement of the Church, than founded on divine warrant; and, of course, that the observance of the Church *festivals* carried with it the same obligation as that of the weekly day of rest.

Mr. *Neal* suggests the possibility that *Bound* might have carried his notions of the *manner* of observing the Lord's day to an austere and over-rigorous length. Certain it is, that Archbishop *Whitgift* called in all the copies of his book, and forbade its circulation. After the death of the Archbishop, however, *Bound* published a second edition of the work, in 1606, with large additions, which was very extensively circulated, and exerted a very sensible influence. Whatever might have been the real character of his doctrine,—of which, at this distance of time, it is not easy to judge,—it cannot be doubted that the sanctification of the Sabbath, as delineated by some Puritan writers, many years afterwards, was pressed to an extravagant length. So, at any rate, thought the venerable Dr. *Owen*, who, in a work which he published on this subject nearly three quarters of a century after *Bound's* book appeared, expressed his decided disapprobation of those writers "who had pharisaically and superstitiously heaped observance upon observance, for every hour, and almost minute of that day; so that a man could scarcely in six days read over all the duties proposed to be observed on the seventh; and who, moreover, had laboured more to multiply directions about external duties, giving them out, as it were,

forced with much zeal by the leading clergy of the establishment. The avowed object of the unhallowed measure was to put a stop to the growth of Puritanism, and to silence the objections of the Papists against the *strictness* of the reformed religion. *Heylin* advocates this awful profanation of the Lord's day, by authority, on the principle, that elevating the *Sabbath* in public estimation tended to depress the *festivals* appointed by the Church; and that the indulgence of the popular love of sports on that day was necessary to preserve the people from Popery.

by number and tale, than to direct the mind to a due performance of the whole duty of the sanctification of the day, according to the spirit and genius of gospel obedience."

We honour the candour of Bishop *White* in expressing his regret, that the English Reformers, in framing the Liturgy of his Church, adopted the title of "Sunday," instead of the "Lord's day," and in acknowledging that he would have preferred the latter. We certainly concur with him in judgment; and deeply regret this, as well as a few other things, in a Liturgy, which contains so much that is truly excellent, and worthy of the deepest veneration.

We are now prepared to answer the question, "What name ought to be given to this weekly season of sacred rest, by us, at the present day?"

Sunday, we think, is *not* the most suitable name. It is, confessedly, of Pagan origin. This, however, alone, would not be sufficient to support our opinion. All the other days of the week are equally Pagan, and we are not prepared to plead any conscientious scruples about *their* use. Still it seems to be in itself desirable that not only a *significant*, but a *scriptural* name should be attached to that day which is divinely appointed; which is so important for keeping religion alive in our world; and which holds so conspicuous a place in the language of the Church of God. Besides, we have seen that the early Christians preferred a scriptural name, and seldom or never used the title of *Sunday*, excepting when they were addressing the heathen, who knew the day by no other name. For these reasons we regret that the name *Sunday* has ever obtained so much currency in the nomenclature of Christians, and would discourage its popular use as far as possible.

The Lord's day, is a title which we would greatly prefer to every other. It is a name expressly given to the day by an inspired apostle. It is more expressive than any other title of its divine appointment; of the Lord's propriety in it; and of its reference to his resurrection, his triumph, and the glory of his kingdom. And, what is in no small degree interesting, we know that this was the favourite title of the early Christians; the title which has been habitually used, for a number of centuries, by the great majority both of the Romish and Protestant communions. Would that its restoration to the Christian Church, and to all Christian intercourse, could be universal!

The *Sabbath*, is the last title of which we shall speak.

The objections made to this title by the early Christians no longer exist. We are no longer in danger of confounding the observance of the *first* day of the week with that of the *seventh*. Nor are we any longer in danger of being carried away by a fondness for *Jewish rigour*, in our plan for its sanctification. The fourth commandment still makes a part of the Decalogue. We teach it to our children as a rule still in force. It requires nothing austere, punctilious, or excessive; only that we, and all "within our gates," abstain from servile labour, and consider the day as "hallowed," or devoted to God. Whoever scrutinizes its contents will find no requisition in which all Christians are not substantially agreed; and no reason assigned for its observance which does not apply to Gentiles as well as Jews. As the first sabbath was so named as a memorial of God's "rest" from the work of creation; so we may consider the Christian Sabbath as a memorial of the Saviour's *rest* (if the expression may be allowed) from the labours, the sufferings, and the humiliation of the work of redemption. And, what is no less interesting, the apostle, in writing to the Hebrews, considers the Sabbath as an emblem and memorial of that eternal *Sabbatism*, or "*rest* which remaineth for the people of God." Surely the name is a most appropriate and endeared one when we regard it in this connection! Surely when we bring this name to the test of either *philological* or *theological* principles, it is as suitable now, as it could have been under the old dispensation.

We have said, that we prefer "the Lord's day" to any other title. We are aware, that this can never be the name employed by the mass of the community. There is something about this title which will forever prevent it from being familiar on the popular lip. The title "the Sabbath" is connected with no such difficulty. It is scriptural, expressive, convenient, the term employed in a commandment which is weekly repeated by millions, and so far familiar to all who live in Christian lands, that no consideration occurs why it may not become universal. "The Lord's day" may, and, perhaps, ought ever to be, the language of the pulpit, and of all public or social *religious* exercises; meanwhile, if the phrase "the Sabbath" could be generally naturalized in worldly circles, and in common parlance, it would be gaining a desirable object.