

Opposing Principles

Some portions (pages 345 to 370 and 472 to 492)

of

The Great Empires of Prophecy

by

A T Jones (1905)

Preface

This page is made up of portions taken from "The Great Empires of Prophecy" by A T Jones. It was written in 1905 but has lost none of its relevance to today's religious activities.

Paragraph numbers are in the original. What may appear to be section headings are actually taken from the titles printed on the top of each right hand (odd numbered) page. The left hand (even numbered) page always carried the relevant chapter heading, but this is only entered once in this book. Bible references in square brackets have been added by the compilers.



The Great Empires of Prophecy

By A T Jones (1905)

Chapter XXV.

Page 345 **ANTAGONISTIC PRINCIPLES.**

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.

Page 346 **ROME – AGAINST CHRISTIANITY**

Jesus Christ came into this 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 to them 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.*" [John 8:36]

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....

Page 346

11. The Roman Empire then filled the world, "*the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument to 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 included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity, was made dependent on this.*" Neander.

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 was 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 Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be an obedient servant of the State."* Mommsen.

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 Romans 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 to 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".....*

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 [or benefactor] 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 [or benefactor] 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 nations to maintain the worship of their national gods, these as well as the conquered people were considered only as the servants of the Roman State. Every religion was held subordinate to the religion of Rome, and though *"all forms of religion might come to Rome and take their place in its pantheon, they must come as 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 recognized 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 public laws." Cicero.

18. Again: the Roman State being the supreme deity, *"the senate and the people"* were but organs through which its ideas were expressed; hence the maxim, *Vox populi, vox dei*, — the voice of the people is the voice of God.

Page 349 ***"VOX POPULI, VOX DEI"***

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. Therefore there was 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 a 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 (sic) 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.

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....

Page 366

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."

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."

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 peace.

page 367 **THE GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM AT FAULT.**

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.

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.

Page 368 **AGAINST CHRISTIANITY**

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.,

Page 369 **GROUND OF GOVERNMENTAL PERSECUTION.**

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. . . . [this break is in the original]. The most horrible recorded instances of 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;*

Page 370

of holy virgins given 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.

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...

Page 472 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 unto 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 and of which they were now a part, the kingdom of God was come.

Page 473 TRUE AND FALSE THEOCRACIES.

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.**" Ezekiel 21:25-27.

6. The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time.

Page 474 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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:

Page 475 THE NEW, AND FALSE, THEOCRACY.

"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. "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part i, div. i, pars. 2, 3.

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.

Page 476 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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. *Id.*, sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, par. 2. 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 for professing it; and they must needs have the State pay them for professing it.

Page 477 CONSTANTINE'S FAMOUS SUNDAY LAW.

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, 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.)" 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 iudices, 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."

Page 478 ROME – THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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 day of weekly rest.

Page 479 THE NEW KINGDOM OF GOD.

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*. "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.

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, (Jones' insertion)] 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 to Him, and accordingly had permitted him to celebrate already three decades, and now he was entered upon the fourth.

Page 480 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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*. "Oration in Praise of Constantine," chap. iii.

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, a second and 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.*" *Id.*

Page 481 THE SUNDAY LAW ONLY RELIGIOUS.

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.*" *Id.*, chap. ii.

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. "History of the Christian Religion and Church", Vol. ii, sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, par. 2. 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.* "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. viii.

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.* "Oration in Praise of Constantine," chap. ix.

Page 482 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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 the pampering of the body*, BUT FOR THE COMFORT AND INVIGORATION OF THE SOUL BY INSTRUCTION IN DIVINE TRUTH ?" *Id.*, chap. xvii.

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*. "Life of Constantine," book iv, chap. xx.

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 appoint holy days.

Page 483 BY AUTHORITY OF PONTIFEX MAXIMUS.

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*. "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 9 from end.

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." *Id.*, chap. i, par. 44. 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*. "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. lxxv, par. 5.

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 as by a Christian believer."

Page 484 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

"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." - *Dury*. "History of Rome," chap. cii, part i, par. 4 from end.

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." Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book i, chap. ix.

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 the Jews*, a 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..."

Page 485 SUNDAY IN THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

"Since then it was desirable that this should be so amended that *we should have nothing in common with that nation* of parricides, and of those 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 the observance of Sunday, this protest became stronger than ever.

Page 486 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION

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." 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 Chrlstiani hoc faciat; quod si reperti fuerint Judaizare Anathema sint a Christo."

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 became emperors, the former of the East, and the latter of the West.

Page 487 SUNDAY WORK MADE SACRILEGE.

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*) "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, par. 4.; 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. Id.*

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.

Page 488 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

But as the people had not such religion as would cause them 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. Id.*, par. 5.

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.*

Page 489 THE CHURCH OBTAINS THE MONOPOLY.

This was not at all satisfying 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. Id.*

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." Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," Fifth Carthaginian.

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*. "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. iii, part i, div. iii, par. 5. 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 church.*" *Id.*

Page 490 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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." *Id.*

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; and one of the greatest of the Catholic Church Fathers and Catholic saints was the father of this Catholic saintly theory.

Page 491 ORIGIN OF THE INQUISITION.

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. "The Correction of the Donatists," chap. vi. I adopt Schaff's translation, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xxvii, par. 12.

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. "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, sec. ii, part iii, div. i, last paragraph.

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. *Id.*, sec. iii, part ii, div. iii, par. 5.

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.

Page 492 ROME - THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

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."

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.

Signs of the Times 1880-06-03.002 [\[A comment on Exodus 33:7\]](#)

And Moses pitched the tabernacle without the camp, and all who desired to seek the Lord were commanded to separate themselves from the congregation by resorting thither. The tabernacle here mentioned was a temporary tent arranged for the worship of God. The sanctuary, the pattern of which God gave to Moses, had not yet been built.