

Bernardston Books W.A.S.S.
413-648-9864
20882 #50

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

EDITED BY

JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,

EDITOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. II.

S.A.A. COMPANY

Washington 12, D.C.
NEW YORK:

MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.

CINCINNATI:

WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.

[1846]

con diem' (*De Idol.* 14); and Dionysius of Corinth (probably somewhat later), as '*hupax apaxaxē*' (quoted by Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 23).

Thus far, also, nothing has appeared relative to any observance of the day beyond that of holding assemblies for religious worship, and a feetal commemoration of the resurrection and the beginning of the creation.

But in these last cited writers we trace the commencement of a more formal observance. Thus the whole passage in Tertullian is:—*Sole die Dominico resurrectionis non alio loco (professione), sed enim anxietate habitus et affectu carere debemus, differens enim negotio ne quem diabolo locum demus.*—'On the day of the Lord's resurrection alone we ought to abstain not only from kneeling, but from all devotion to care and anxiety, putting off even business, lest we should give place to the devil,' and that of Dionysius, '*The ερησιος της αναπατης ημερας ημερας ηερησιος.*'—'We keep the Lord's day holy' and at dates later than this we find increasing indications of the same spirit, as appears from Clements Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vii. p. 144), Hilary, Augustine, and other authorities, of which a large number will be found in Bishop Pearson *On the Creed*, and Notes (vol. ii. p. 241, ed. Oxford).

But we must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's day, though it certainly contains no mention of it. It occurs in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about a.d. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. It has, however, been understood in a totally different sense, and as referring to a distinct subject; and such we confess appears to us to be the most obvious and natural construction of it.

The passage is as follows:—*Ει ολε της εν Αματιν επημερας δευτερας, εις κτισματα δευτερας ημερας αυθημερας, δευτερας αναπατης της Γουρας—(de § καλ η της ημερας δευτερας η' αβου, καλ του θανδρου αβου [ε' τας δευτερας], ε' ε' ημερας ιδεουσε . . . &c.), και ημερας ηερησιος (ημερας ηερησιος αβου; . . . &c. (Ignatius, ad Magnesians, § ix.; Jacobson's *Patres Apost.* ii. 322. Oxford, 1840).*

Now many commentators assume (on what ground does not appear), that after *αναπατης* the word *ημερας* is to be understood. On this hypothesis they endeavour to make the rest of the sentence accord with a reference to the observance of the Lord's day, by further supposing *de §* to refer to *ημερας* understood, and the whole to be put in contrast with *αυθημερας* (or *αυθημερας*) in the former clause. For opinions in support of this view, the reader is referred to the Notes in Jacobson's edition, p. 324.

Dr. Neander, in his *History of Christianity*, translated by Mr. Ross (i. 326), refers to this passage adopting this supposition, on which the translator remarks (in a note) very truly, though somewhat ironically, that he can only find 'something of the kind' in the passage. The meaning of Neander's version is altogether very confused, but seems to represent the Lord's day as a sort of emblem of the new life of a Christian. Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of

a substantive to which *αβου* can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring by the introduction of *ημερας*. Now if we take *αναπατης* (αβου) as simply 'the life of the Lord,' having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to *αβου*. Again, *de §* may well refer to *αβου*, and *αναπατης* (αβου) meaning our Lord's life, as emphatically including his resurrection (2d in Rom. v. 10, &c.), presents precisely the same analogy to the spiritual life of the Christian as is conveyed both in *Herm.* v.; *Coloss.* iii. 3, 4, and many other passages. Thus upon the whole the meaning might be given thus:—

'If those who lived under the old dispensation have come to the newness of hope, no longer keeping Sabbath, but living according to our Lord's life (in which, as it were, our life has risen again, through him, and his death [which some deny], through whom we have received the mystery, &c. . . .), how shall we be able to live without him?'

In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view the passage does not refer at all to the Lord's day; but even on the opposite supposition it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term 'Lord's day' (for which it is often cited), since the material word *ημερας* is purely conjunctural. It has even offers an instance of that species of contrast which the early fathers were so fond of drawing between the Christian and Jewish dispensations, and between the new life of the Christian and the ceremonial spirit of the law, to which the Lord's day (if it be imagined to be referred to, is represented as opposed.

To return, however, to the nature of this observance in the Christian church, we will merely remark that though in later times we find considerable reference to a sort of *consecration of the day*, it does not seem at any period of the ancient church to have assumed the form of such an observance as some modern religious communities have contended for. Nor do these writers in any instance pretend to allege any *divine command*, or *even apostolic practice*, in support of it.

In the laws of Constantine (a.d. 300), cessation from ordinary work on the Lord's day was first enjoined, but with an express exception in favour of the labours of agriculture. (See Justin's *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* iii. 236.)

Chrysostom (a.d. 340) concludes one of his *Homilies* by discharging his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (a.d. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest (*επειδελος*) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forged *Constitutions of the Apostles* (ii. 24), and various later enactments from a.d. 600 to a.d. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business. In fact, in these subsequent ages of the church we find the ceremonial spirit rather displaying itself in the multiplication of religious festivals and solemnities, than in any increasing precision in the observance of the Lord's day. This is exemplified in the practice

THE
CYCLOPÆDIA
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

EDITED BY
JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,
AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE," EDITOR OF
"THE PICTORIAL BIBLE," &C. &C.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS MAPS AND ENGRAVINGS

IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. II.

TENTH EDITION.

NEW YORK:
IVISON & PHINNEY, 178 FULTON STREET;
(SUCCESSORS OF NEWMAN & IVISON, AND MARK H. NEWMAN & CO.)
CHICAGO: S. C. GRIGGS & CO., 111 LAKE STREET.
BUFFALO: PHINNEY & CO., 188 MAIN STREET.
AUBURN: J. C. IVISON & CO. DETROIT: A. M'FARREN.
CINCINNATI: MOORE, ANDERSON & CO.

1854.

