

**CIHM
Microfiche
Series
(Monographs)**

**ICMH
Collection de
microfiches
(monographies)**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1997

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

- Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed / Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies / Qualité Inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material / Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below / Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10x	14x	18x	22x	26x	30x
			✓		
12x	16x	20x	24x	28x	32x

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



J.J. Talman Regional Collection,
D.B. Weldon Library,
University of Western Ontario

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche sheet contains the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

J.J. Talman Regional Collection,
D.B. Weldon Library,
University of Western Ontario

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.


Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par la première page et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaît sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



APPLIED IMAGE Inc

1653 East Main Street
Rochester, New York 14609 USA
(716) 482 - 0300 - Phone
(716) 288 - 5989 - Fax





THE SABBATH


ITS HISTORY AND
MODERN LIBERAL USE



Victor J. Gilpin

REV. V. J. GILPIN, B. A.

LONDON * * CANADA.



THE SABBATH

Peculiar significance has been attached, amongst us, to the first day of the week and the singular regard in which this day has been held is evidenced in the names that have been given to it. Legally, the day is Sunday, but amongst religious people it is known as "The Sabbath," "The Lord's Day," or "The Holy Day."

The origin of this institution has been variously stated. Two different accounts are given in the Old Testament. In Genesis (2; 1-3) we are told that Jehovah himself instituted it by his own act of resting on the seventh day after working six days at creation, and that he "blessed" this day by a special act of sanctification. In Deuteronomy (5; 15) the origin of the Sabbath seems to rise out of the celebration of the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt. It is not in place here to deal with the comparative literary values of the accounts of Genesis wherein Jehovah, a tribal God of part of the Hebrew people was conceived as being subject to weariness or the necessity of rest and the later and more historical but still partial records of the national exodus. Let it suffice to know that when the Jewish historians came in later centuries to compile their historical literature there was an evident lack of certainty in the matter.

The origin of the Sabbath however is not Jewish but Babylonian, and with the Babylonian literature we are now almost as conversant as we are with that of the Hebrews. Records of the Sabbath among the ancient Babylonians are quite clear, at least three thousand years before the Jews became a nation under Moses.

One of the most interesting paragraphs of history is that which relates the emigration of Abraham from the city of Ur, in Babylon, to the city of Haran in the north. Now the city of Ur was a moon-god city and the city of Haran, to which Abraham went, afterwards was known as worshipping Sin, the moon-god.

Records of this moon-god worship in the Babylonian city of Ur contain references to the division of time into

weeks, a division that very naturally arises out of devotion to the cycles of the moon. It is very obvious that the four quarters of the moon supply the natural division of the month into weeks of seven days each. The seventh day of the week was given up to moon-god ceremonies, and whatever Abraham's journey from Ur to Haran may signify whether it was a tribal emigration or the adventure of one man, it is possible that by this event the seven-day division of time was handed down to the Hebrews. At least the fact that in the older Hebrew Scriptures the new-moon and the Sabbath are almost always mentioned together is very significant. Also the word which means "To greet the new moon" is related to the Hebrew word which expresses religious joy. One thing is certain, that some of the ceremonial life of the Hebrews had its origin far back in the moon-god worship of the Babylonians, whose writings bear abundant testimony to the existence of the Sabbath institutions.

Prof. Rawlinson, the celebrated Assyriologist, publishes a tablet discovered in Babylonian ruins which refers to the "Sabattum". A religious calendar for two months prescribes duties for the King every seventh day. On these days he was not to eat meat roasted at a fire, nor to mount his chariot, nor to call in a physician nor invoke curses on his enemies. Seven was a mystical number among the Babylonians; and ancient inscriptions, preserve to us the names of the seven planetary deities from which our days of the week are named. Practically all authorities on Archaeology agree that the Sabbath is of Babylonian origin and that our division of time into weeks ending with Sabbath, began with these people.

The Sabbath eventually came into Jewish possession and in the course of development went through various phases. In its early history there was simply the ordinary cessation from labor that was usual to festival gatherings. Prof. Emmanuel Deutsch, of the British Museum, a learned Orientalist, and one of the best authorities on the Sabbath of that time, states: "We cannot refrain from entering an emphatic protest against the vulgar notion of the Jewish Sabbath being a thing of grim austerity. It was precisely the contrary—a day of joy

and delight in a feast day honored by fine garments, by the best cheer, by wine, lights, spice and other joys of pre-eminently bodily support."

In Abraham's "Jewish Life" he says—"On the Sabbath, joyous wedding feasts were held and singing and dancing were carried on, chess and table-games were indulged in and precious viands were brought forward for the sake of good cheer, while merry tunes were played."

George Eliot in "Daniel Deronda," describes the joyful transformation that takes place on the coming of Sabbath in the house of Cohen, the Jewish pawnbroker, and here as elsewhere, is evidenced that minute accuracy in historical allusions, which characterizes all her writings

Later in the history of the Jews the ordinance of worship with extended details occupied a more important place and when the local sanctuaries were abolished in the seventh century B. C., the Sabbath survived, reverting to its earlier and humane form.

While in exile, this institution, because it served to distinguish the captives from the surrounding peoples, became endeared to the Jews, and on their return it rapidly grew into a sacred institution. The civil law embodied it and subsequently began to enforce its observance, so that what began in the days of primitive freedom as an act of spontaneous festival ultimately became an institution of extreme rigor. It was declared by a later period to be a capital offence to break the Sabbath, and a system of elaborate legal restrictions grew up around it. It was in this resulting era with its thirty nine prohibitions that Jesus was persecuted for his liberal interpretation of the Sabbath. According to this Sabbatarian casuistry Jesus broke the third law that forbade harvesting, for while passing through the field he plucked the ears of corn.

Under this third commandment also, grass is not to be walked on, for that was threshing. Nailed shoes, under another law, were not to be worn for that would be bearing a burden. The lame might use a staff, but not the blind. A horse might be led by a bridle, but it was not to hang so

loose that he might seem to bear the bridle as a burden.

Jesus felt that the Rabbis made an end of the mere observance of the day and he uttered the remark that epitomizes the modern liberal conception of the day, "The Sabbath was made for man." It is noteworthy, in his argument with the Scribes that Jesus, when he speaks of David's time and propounds the case of the animal falling into the pit, he makes an appeal to the more primitive period when the Sabbath had simply a humanitarian basis.

Since this day of Rabbinical rigor, the world has periodically undergone such eras of rigid Sabbatarianism. The Puritan rule and the Connecticut blue laws recall to us the echoes of the day that persecuted Jesus, and presumably the attempt that is being made at the present time to confine people to restricted areas is a vestigial remain of this old time Rabbinical passion. The Scribe in his thirty nine articles prohibited a man from walking more than a thousand yards on the Sabbath. It is not difficult, in view of our restriction of Sunday conveyance to find a modern parallel for this legalistic device.

In the New Testament slight reference is made to this institution. In the Old Testament it is pointed out in different places (Ex. 31-12, 13; Ex. 31-16, 17; Deut. 5-15; Ex. 20-12;) that the Sabbath was a sign between Jehovah and the Israelites, as if it were to be a matter of only local importance. In the New Testament we find that neither Jesus nor any Apostle enjoins Sabbath-keeping nor forbids Sabbath-breaking. This leads to the conclusion that in the sources of Christian teaching and practice there is no such thing as Sabbath breaking. It would be as justifiable to speak of Lent-breakers or Christmas-breakers not being Christians, as to say that Sabbath-breakers were not Christians.

Jesus, no doubt had a very liberal conception of the Sabbath, for it was said of him "He cannot be of God because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." He accepted an invitation to a feast, and justified his disciples in travelling and laboring on that day. In the controversy which he had with the

Pharisees on the occasion when they were maintaining the binding force of their fourth commandment upon him and his disciples, and he was denying it, he unhesitatingly made the claim that he was "Lord of the Sabbath"—a phrase which in that connection could mean nothing else than that he was Lord of it, to reject it. He also denies the implication of the Genesis story about Sabbath origin in the words "My father worketh hitherto."

Paul, born and educated a Jew and brought up to believe in the observance of the Sabbath as a sacred duty would have taught it if it had been part of the new religion. But it is significant that no word of injunction drops from his lips. In fact, to him, observance of days was utterly abolished. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of a holy day or of the Sabbath days."

There are just two references in the New Testament to religious gatherings on the first day of the week. One (John 20-19) when the disciples met shortly after the crucifixion. The other, (Acts 20-7) some time after when the local Christians met at Troas.

From these two little facts have been deduced, by the church, all the conclusions about the sacred necessity of observing Sabbath in order to please God. Upon these two incidents, as far as the Bible is concerned, the whole fabric of Sundayism is erected.

It is noteworthy that at the council of Jerusalem (which is recorded in Acts) where Paul and James met, perfect freedom is given in the matter of Sabbath observance. The leaders of the church gathered purposely to discuss and settle what Judaistic ceremonies and forms should be perpetuated in the Christian religion. "It pleased the Apostles and Elders, with the whole church" to select and prescribe four only, among which Sabbath keeping was not mentioned.

The next period of interest is that in which the early Christian church transfers its affection from the seventh day, the real Sabbath, to the first day of the week, for upon this day it was said Jesus rose from the dead. It took two centuries to effect this transition, during which some sects such

as the Ebionites rigorously observed both days. Since then, the Sabbath, passing through various phases of observance, including festivity, worship, rest and legalism, has come to us to be interpreted and used as shall best serve our times.

The Jews and the Christians are not the only peoples who have periodical rest and worship days. The Mohammedans who borrowed largely from Old Testament sources, celebrated every seventh day, but not on Saturday nor Sunday—they used Friday. The Egyptians observed every tenth day, and the Hindus chose the new and full moon days. In fact every religion has its regular days upon which for the most part work ceases and there is general devotion to religious matters. We are told that of all the three hundred and sixty five days of the year, there is not one day which some sect or denomination in America, does not observe in some religious way and consider sacred. Every religion considers its division of time just as sacred as does Christianity, and if any attempt at compromise were made, it would only serve to publish the deep antipathies that exist in regard to the change of religious custom.

The first legislation in Christendom on the subject was that enacted by Constantine in 321 A. D. His edict is as follows:—"On the venerable day of the sun, let all judges and dwellers of cities rest; but country people may cultivate their fields lest they should lose a favorable time granted by heaven, seeing that it frequently happens that the grain or the vine cannot be so fitly planted on any other day." In the year 425 A. D., games and theatrical exhibitions were first forbidden and in 528 A. D. all labor was prohibited.

The Sabbath is mentioned at times by the fathers of the early church.

St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem says "Henceforth reject all observance of the Sabbaths."

St. Jerome says in 392 A. D., "On the Lord's Day they went to church and returning from church they would apply themselves to their allotted works and make garments for themselves and others"

And again he says "The day is not a day of fasting but

the day is a day of joy, the church has always considered it a day of joy and none but heretics have thought otherwise.

Many centuries now elapse until the Reformation, when an attempt was made to support Sabbatarian principles, and Luther says "If anywhere the day (Sunday) is made holy for the mere day's sake, if anywhere anyone sets up its observance on a Jewish foundation—then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to feast on it, to do anything to remove this encroachment on human liberty." And Calvin even went so far as to propose to change the day from Sunday to Thursday as a distinct assertion of the Christian principle that one day was just as good as another; and one day when John Knox visited Calvin on Sunday afternoon he found him playing at a game of bowls.

Then came the Puritan reaction from which we are just now recovering after three centuries. The Protestant church broke from all the traditional authority of the Roman church and wishing of course to preserve Sunday, as it was a matter of necessity for meetings—they searched around for sanction and settled on the fourth commandment. There was also a reaction against sports at this time, on the part of the Puritans, which became the butt of Macaulay's remark that "The Puritans opposed bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to bears but because it gave pleasure to the people." This remark embodies the Rabbinical passion, the vestigial remains of which we are not yet rid.

The statutes both of England and New England preserve in quaint language the legal expression of the Puritan Sabbath.

In Queen Elizabeth's reign a statute was enacted requiring all persons to attend church on the Sabbath. Under William III and Charles II further enactments are registered expressly stating that they are for the honor of God and upholding of religion.

In Massachusetts in 1634, after a law was passed requiring people to cease work on Saturday at 3 p. m., to prepare for Sabbath by studying the Catechism, and according

as the Minister of the Gospel directed, another law was enacted as follows:—

“Whereas complaint hath been made to this court that divers persons within this jurisdiction do usually absent themselves from church meetings upon the Lord’s Day, power is therefore given to any two assistants to hear and censure either by fine or imprisonment all misdemeanors of that kind committed.”

Further—“Any sin committed with a high hand, as the gathering of sticks on the Sabbath day, may be punished with death, when a lesser punishment might serve for gathering sticks privily and in some sore need” This latter is the judicial report of the elders. A fine of five shillings was imposed for every absence from public worship.

In 1658 we have the following. “Whereas by too sad experience it is observed, the sun being set, both every Saturday and on the Lord’s Day, young people take the liberty to walk in the streets and fields, to the dishonor of God—be it enacted etc. etc.—a fine or corporal punishment.” In 1780, when a distinguished Frenchman visited Boston, he wished on Sunday to take a walk for his health, but his landlord prevailed with him not to go, for, said he, “I shall be heavily fined.”

A review of this severe restriction is likely to enable one to define the attempted restrictions and the inquisitions of to day as the remnant of a former rigorous ecclesiastical regime.

Most of us have been brought up in this atmosphere of Sabbatarianism. We remember Sunday as a day that invoked peculiar deference. It was an unnatural day. It had no cheer—no out-of-door freedom, but was significant of awe, restriction, prosaic catechism and reprimand.

The Sabbath question has come up several times recently in connection with the World’s Fairs and the attempts of the Lord’s Day Alliance to tie up all means of popular conveyance on Sunday.

But we are in the peculiar position of having had no verdict of science on the question of what is the proper

proportion of time to be set apart for periodical rest. Science after exhaustive experiment, might demonstrate that every eighth day was the proper time. No extended experiment has been made with large groups of people in this matter. We are now using 15 per cent. of our time, but Science might show that we need 18 per cent. or only 12 per cent. No one knows. Our division of time is based on an old Babylonian astronomical basis and has only the sanction of Judaistic practice. The day shall come, no doubt, when the experiment will be made and the biologist, the sociologist and the physiologist shall render a somewhat authoritative verdict. It may be, in the great economical re-adjustment of the future, when most men shall be direct producers, and no man shall have to work over four or five hours a day, that a particular Sabbath of rest shall not be needed.

Now, in view of the moon god worship origin, in view of the inheritance of the Sabbath by the Jews and its varied observance in festival, dance, ceremony and Rabbinical legalism, in view of its liberal re-interpretation by Jesus and Paul and the early church, in view of the fact that in different countries and climates and amongst people of different pursuits, the Sabbath has undergone all sorts of changes in its observance, can anyone doubt but that there is only one question to be asked, namely, what periodical rest time do we need and how should it be used by us, in this twentieth century. In view of the fact that all attempts that have been made towards investing this day with some specific divine sanction, have been the expression of the priestly element always evincing that same Rabbinical passion, can there be any other place to bring this question than to the bar of the enlightened reason of this century? It is interesting to know the origin of the Sabbath and its varied history for fifty centuries, but as in all questions of welfare, usefulness is the paramount issue. "The Sabbath was made for man."

What shall be our use of the Sabbath?

In the last half-century our understanding of religion has been undergoing a change. We are leaving behind that

conception wherein religion has been a thing of days, celebrations, rituals, events, and are coming to that larger conception, namely:—That religion is love, life, disposition, spirit, attitude. With this change in conceiving religion, the Sabbath has also undergone a change. Men no longer believe that worship is strictly identified with church and hymn book. It belongs to the whole of life and the whole number of days. No one day can be said to be God's 'day. All days are His days, so the uniqueness of any day passes away necessarily, and thus at this new ethical view point we are confronted with the Sabbath question. In Canada we are fighting the last battle against the Sabbatarian, for, in England and the United States, the intelligent leaders have seen the sanity and helpfulness of a liberal Sabbath.

Who is the Sabbatarian?

He is the man who wishes to preserve in a large measure the Puritanical Sabbath. He wants the dead calm Sunday, no pleasure, no fun, no excursion, no outing. He appeals to the past, he talks severely, or as he says "reverently," about, "The day of the Lord," "The sacred day," and declares that the day can be desecrated by going out for a boat ride or by some innocent amusement.

This attitude is none other than that of the scribes who found fault with Jesus for being in the corn-field on the Sabbath.

The Lord's Day Alliance aims at the strict Sabbath and expend much energy and labor in efforts towards enacting Sabbath legislation. It seeks to tie up every institution but one and that is the church. But this is not to be wondered at. The Alliance is simply the church, or rather the priestly part of it organized under another name. It is the fashion for the directors of a commercial concern, when certain business opportunities open up, growing out of their present concern, to organize under another name to reap these profits. Under their original name they dare not, for prejudicial reasons. The Lord's Day Alliance is the church institution organized under another name, supported by church collections, directed by church ministers and using the church

organization in the distribution of their literature and in procuring the necessary petitions. In other words the Alliance is the church and hence a purely partizan body. It pleads for peculiar privileges for itself, but its statements and requests should be considered by any government or council, to whom it appeals, as partizan statements.

The Alliance asks that all street cars shall be stopped, that all amusements shall be prohibited, that there shall not be open any places of entertainment. In short that there shall not be any attraction in any town, city or in the country, except that of its own organization—the church. But, they exclaim "Oh no! we do not say that" we say, "No place shall be open where a fee is charged." And here is a piece of legislation worthy of the ingenious Rabbinical mind. It is as if a town council said to the bakers, "We shall not prohibit anybody from eating bread, only we shall prohibit people from eating that bread that they pay for," which would simply be a prohibition of all bread eating.

It is also innocently claimed that the Lord's Day Act does not force people to attend church on Sunday, that there is no sub-section in the Act to this effect. And of course it does not, such an enactment would be too indecently direct. But what else can the ingenious device mean than this very thing. Indirectly does this act seek to force people to attend church. It virtually says, attend church or nothing.

The laity are not calling for a restricted Sabbath, there is practically very little interest in the campaign except that which has been artificially created by Alliance work. Is it not the clergy who, alarmed at the decline of church attendance partly through the defection of the socialistic working man, are attempting to ensure for themselves a monopoly of that day. There shall be no other event of interest on that day but church service. The people shall have no other place to go but to church.

Might not the following question reasonably be asked:—If any organization, political or social, should petition the government to pass a law to the effect that on one day of the week, say Tuesday, nothing of interest should take place ex-

cept such meetings of this social or political organization, is there any fractional portion of the community that would tolerate it?

Is it not arrogance also on the part of the church that it shall prescribe that a hundred sextons shall work on Sunday for one organization, and that fifty men shall not work on Sunday for another organization? The church may deliver letters, procure liveries, keep sextons in the basement, almost compel factory hands to attend three services on Sunday and violate every law of rest for hundreds of people. But if a public spirited citizen suggest that the art gallery or public library should be open to workmen on the only day when it is possible for them to come, a loud protest is heard from nearly every pulpit to the effect that God's Day will be dishonored. I ask, would we tolerate such partizan conduct from any other organization in the world?

When will the church cease to beg for special privileges and become frank and rational enough to stand on merit only?

I cannot help but think how tersely was the spirit of the Sabbatarian movement expressed by the action of the Secretary of the Alliance, who rather than take a street car from one town to another on a Sunday, ordered a livery to drive him out, notwithstanding that a pouring rain drenched both driver and beast.

But is the dead-calm Sunday in the best interests of the people? Does a day of quiet suspense restore the vitality of the worker?

The dead-calm Sunday induces collapse—not healthful rest, and I can conceive how such an ideal may be somewhat responsible for the rushing of business up until 12 o'clock on Saturday night, for there is the knowledge that the next day, activity must cease and hence the desire to make the best of all the hours left. One can imagine the festive word of Saturday night "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die."

We have then two ideals, the one of silence and oppressive stillness and the other of recreation and education.

The latter is supported by our sociologists. It is contended by them that an environment of strange silence induces morbid feelings. It tends to make the individual feel his loneliness and his separate condition. It tends to make one brood overmuch on his lot. It tends to introspection and mental congestion. Our Sunday is not the day it should be. A considerable portion of this city's population lives in a somewhat slovenly manner, lying around in loose fashion, eating heavy dinners, smoking and idling away time. Whirlwinds of dust on our unwatered streets drive people indoors, and the workingman, kept inside of the factory all week is compelled to keep inside his home on Sunday. The transportation system is tied up. He cannot get to the open places

No city of its size has better rural places to go to than London, in its Springbank property, and yet on the only day that our population can use it, by a short-sighted law, its advantages are denied the vast bulk of our citizens.

In the movement for industrial betterment nothing is more important than facilities for that refreshment that comes through change of scene, change of faces and change of air. The difference as to the purity of the air between London City and Springbank is very noticeable. Moreover the sociologist is emphatic in his request for these facilities of transportation as a means of correcting the enormous evil of the congestion of city life. As opposed to the statement by the Alliance officials that those opposed to the provisions of the Lord's Day Bill were only Jews, Adventists and Infidels, I point to the plain fact that the Sociologists are a unit in declaring for a liberal interpretation of Sunday. I will quote from the following:—

Prof. Small, head of the department of Sociology in Chicago University, after saying that he had been brought up in an atmosphere of the strictest Sabbatarianism, declares:—
 "I am forced to the conclusion that it is illogical and in the end obstructive of the essential uses of Sunday, to attempt to institutionalize a Sabbath upon the Pharaonic or Puritan model. Any one who believes that the Sabbath was made

for man and not man for the Sabbath must eventually discover that the Jewish and Puritan Sabbath becomes a moral and physical impossibility when taken out of the rural civilization and transplanted to an urban civilization. It is not the case of would but of must. To make intra-mural transportation an impossibility on Sunday in a town of any considerable size is virtually to condemn large portions of the population to the conditions which irresistibly make for a downward rather than for an upward tendency, morally and physically. The utmost that can be done in this direction with wisdom and justice is protection of those sections of the population who wish to devote the day to religious worship against disturbing occupations. On the other hand the utmost freedom of movement in an urban population is as vital as the purity of air and water and the efficiency of the drainage system. Deeds of mercy and charity are, in my judgment, no more essentially promotive of the conditions that make for genuine religion, than those necessary occupations which are concerned in giving the city populations means of free movement whether it be on the first day of the week or the seventh."

Prof. Francis Peabody of Harvard University says:—"Regarding the specific questions of transporting townspeople on Sunday to the country, I cannot believe that the confinement of the less fortunate population to the restrictions of the town can be consistent with the spirit of Christian love. Sunday should be the means of lifting the level of one's week day life; and this lift of level, for great numbers of plain people mean an escape of daily pressure of town life into the peace, liberty and quietness of the country."

Prof. N. P. Gilman, author of "Profit Sharing" says:—"Certainly the friends of the workingmen should favor a rational rather than a Puritanical Sunday for him; a Sunday to which the forenoon is given to worship and the afternoon and evening to innocent recreation, reading, domestic pleasures, excursions to the country and the like—would be really a day of rest for him."

Prof. Zueblin, of Chicago University, probably Am-

erica's greatest authority on municipal life, and certainly the workingmen's great friend, says:—"It is to be hoped that always the masses will be able to secure privileges on Sunday in accordance with the unmistakable Christian teaching "The Sabbath is made for man and not man for the Sabbath" How it is possible in this age for people who do not particularly need Sunday as a day of rest and recreation to attempt to deprive their less fortunate fellowmen of innocent pleasure is incomprehensible and certainly is confined to a very small fraction of Christendom."

Franklin Giddings, Prof. of Sociology in Columbia University, New York, eminent authority on sociological questions, has this to say:—"Those people who attempt to promote a true morality in our modern industrial communities, and especially to maintain good order and a healthy attitude towards life in the wage earning classes, can make no more fatal mistake than to insist on a strict Sabbath observance. Such an attitude creates the opportunity for evil men, who wish to prey upon their fellows, and who do not scruple about leading them into vice. In every way the working classes should be encouraged to spend their Sundays in quiet recreation out of doors. At present their tendency to give up their one day of rest to mere idling is working them untold injury."

"Familiar as I am with the enormous change for the better that has taken place in their habits in New York since the development of our subway, ferry and trolley-car system has enabled them to get out into the country on almost all Sundays, I am amazed when I learn that an intelligent community opposes the most active possible operation of its transportation system on the first day of the week. This opposition can be explained only on the ground of a most unfortunate ignorance of fundamental facts and tendencies.

Let us outline a liberal constructive Sabbath.

As Prof. Gilman says—let the forenoon be given to reflection and to worship, that is to ideas of admiration of the good, the sublime and the true, but for the rest of the day let him be free to secure a change of place and fellowship—if he so desires. Let it be possible for him to seek the rural open places and engage in innocent amusements.

I cannot help but compare London's Sunday with its citizens hiding within doors from the dusty streets and avenues, intense with silence—with a Sunday in Boston where tens of thousands flock to the spacious sea-beach, gazing on its splendor, drinking in its invigorating air and listening to Wagnerian music or strolling through the hundreds of acres of parks.

If there is anything that the municipally interested man fears it is congestion of population, just as the physician fears congestion in the diseased body. The doctor strives for circulation and knows that that is the antidote, so free circulation is the corrective of the evils of urban congestion.

As a minister I declare that the multiplicity of services on Sunday is needless. The time is coming when the Kindergarten will make the Sunday School unnecessary and the classic musicales of Sunday evenings with a feature of illustrated municipal lecture interest, will make the ordinary Sunday evening church service unnecessary and our ministers will welcome the relief. I know a church with a membership of 450 that boasts of holding fifteen services every Sunday. Was ever there such a parody on Sabbath-keeping?

It is not necessary to legislate restrictively to secure the seventh day of rest. Managers and foremen know full well that periodical rest is needed, and no beliefs in Sinai-revelation or resurrection-miracle can add to the real evidence of its necessity.

But an idle Sunday is not a rest Sunday and it is this kind of Sunday that makes the recreation dangerous.

A useful Sunday will secure to the great majority of the people rest, recreation and education.

Regarding rest it is in no wise endangered, for the imperious need of it, the lack of other holidays, the religious feeling amongst us, the example of the government in closing its courts and the council-chambers, and the public opinion of our country will preserve this day as a day of rest. We have had held over our heads the bugaboo of what is called the "Continental" Sunday, but the Sabbatarian, always confusing freedom of movement with desecration, finds nothing but ill in

the thronged parks of Berlin and Munich. Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh speaking of this said, "We counted on one occasion in Paris, thirty three theatres and places of amusement open on the Sabbath day but in one hour we saw in London and Edinburgh, with all her churches and schools and piety more drunkenness than we saw in five long months in guilty Paris." A thing that is remarked by travellers, for instance concerning Munich, in Germany, is the happy domestic scene of the whole family, with happy faces, gathered around the table in the park listening to the invigorating strains of elevating music.

Regarding the privilege of recreation, we look for an afternoon spent in a park, out in the distant fields, or at innocent amusements. We are not thinking especially of the rich man but of the workingman, from whom is withheld now the only day on which he can reach the rural open places. He sits indoors on this day, often nourishing ill feelings that his environment has forced upon him during the week. He lives in a congested quarter, generally the poorest of the city. His ears are numb with the throbs of machinery. His head is grimy and penetrated with the grease and dust of the factory and he comes home at night to a small home and small lot. Sunday comes, surely his day of opportunity to see nature. He dreams of the delight of the rivers and longs for the open fields. But he is doomed to the quarter he has worked in all week for the cars fail to run and the dusty Sabbatarian streets shut him indoors. Two or three generations of this and he has got used to his urban prison, and his fancies of nature die away in the stupor of unbroken silence.

Is it not vital to a country that its function of circulation shall not be impaired? A stoppage of circulation is a serious matter. Nature has produced a physical body whose circulatory system never ceases, so necessary a part does it perform. In view of this importance one is inevitably led to consider that the arresting of the circulatory or transportation system of the body politic is fraught with grave possibilities.

Regarding education, the Liberal Sabbath suggests to us

the morning sermon, the afternoon possibilities of well furnished Public Libraries and Art Galleries. Zoological and Botanical Gardens and the Museums should welcome all, and the evening brings its Municipal Lecture on William Morris or the Arts and Crafts movement, or some such topic, to an audience charmed by orchestral music. Sunday classes for the mechanic, the apprentice and the journeyman, in science or art, shall help to make a profitable day

On the first occasion of the Sunday opening of the National Museums of London, England, over ten thousand people availed themselves of the educational opportunity.

The Sunday I have outlined after careful calculation will not need to employ as many persons as are employed under the present system.

Just entering, as we are, on the enormous possibilities of municipal betterment, we are handicapped by the misuse of this one great day of opportunity. We may keep the people off the streets, and out of the parks and from the country, and out of our educational institutions and imagine we are having a sacred day, because of the intense quiet, but we are driving indoors activities, that, being repressed, shall express themselves in other and unnatural ways. We are paying a big price I am assured, for the Sunday repression that is now in vogue, and that is termed by the Sabbatarian, a day sacredly kept to the honor of God.

