

THEOPHILUS BRABOURNE AND THE SABBATH*

NIKOLAUS SATELMAJER
Union Springs, New York 13160

Theophilus Brabourne's¹ *Discourse Vpon the Sabbath Day* (1628) was "the first major work to appear in the seventeenth century advocating the Christian observance of Saturday."² His extensive writings on the Sabbath were a significant contribution.³ Even King Charles I reacted to one of Brabourne's books on the Sabbath, reissuing on October 18, 1633, "that royal declaration

*Obtaining primary sources for this article was most difficult. I used the sources of nearly two dozen libraries, and corresponded with over a dozen different individuals. I wish to express appreciation to all of them, but I must make special mention of three individuals who provided me with unusual assistance: Oscar Burdick of the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California; Janet Thorngate of the Seventh Day Baptist Historical Society, Janesville, Wisconsin; and Thomas McElwain, Abo, Finland. I also acknowledge technical assistance provided by Ruth I. Satelmajer and Ingrid I. Satelmajer.

¹Brabourne most often used this spelling for his name, although several variations exist.

²Bryan W. Ball, *The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Cambridge, Eng., 1981), p. 139.

³The following is believed to be a complete list of Brabourne's writings on the Sabbath: *A Discourse vpon the Sabbath Day* (n.p., 1628) (hereinafter *Discourse*); *A Defence Of that most Ancient, and Sacred ordinance of GODS, the SABBATH DAY* (Academix Cantabrigiensis Liber, 1632; first published in 1631, I have been able to locate only the 1632 edition) (hereinafter *Defence*); *A Reply to Mr Collings Provocator Provocatus: or, To His Answer Made to Mr Boatman, Touching Suspension from the Sacrament* (London, 1654); *A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor Edoctus, or, To Master Collings His Answer Made to Master Brabourn's First Part of the Change of Church-Discipline* (London, 1654) (hereinafter *A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor*); *An Answer to M. Cawdry's Two Books of the Sabbath Lately Come Forth* (n.p., 1654); *The Second Vindication of My First Book of the Change of Discipline: Being a Reply to Mr Collings His Second Answer to It* (London, 1654); *An Answer to Two Books on the Sabbath* (London, 1659) (hereinafter *Answer to Two Books*); *Of the Sabbath Day, Which Is Now the Highest Controversy in the Church of England* (n.p., 1660); "An Answer to Mr Burt. on Ye L. Day Sabbath . . ." (unpublished book manuscript, Bodleian Library, Oxford Microfilm ms. Bodley 538), although the date of this manuscript has not been established, we know that Burton's book was published in 1631.

respecting things lawful on Sunday, which is better known as the Book of Sports.”⁴ Although Brabourne’s writings on the Sabbath were important, he has generally received only passing mention. The purpose of this article is to provide an introduction to his life and his teachings about the Sabbath.⁵

1. *Biographical Sketch*

Brabourne was born in 1590 in Norwich, England, where he lived and worked most of his life. He died in 1662.⁶ In 1654 in a book written to refute a Mr. Collings, Brabourne gave a sketch of his life:

I was brought up in the FREE SCHOOL OF NORWICH, until I was fifteen years of age, and when I was even ready for Cambridge, fifty years since, then the Bishops began to silence godly Ministers, before Crosse and Surplice. Now my Father being a godly man, desired to have me prove a godly minister, which if he doth saith my Father, my sonne shall be silenced. Therefore he sent me to London to be his Factor, to sell his stockings by wholesale to Shopkeepers. (malitious Mr. Collings might know, that London Factors pick no stockings there) I lived in London until I was married, and then returned and lived some two - three years with my Father, during which time, I gave myselfe to my book, three able Divines successively reading to me; which pains I took meerly out of my love to learning, not so much as thinking to make use of it in their ministry, though got after disposed it otherwise; the which hat since turned to my no final griefe, in regard of the contempt of some such proud clergymen as Mr. Collings is; and to my no little damage in estate, by reason of the Bishops; I dare say I am five-hundred pounds the worse, for meddling in the ministry: but I have laid it aside not of late years, God providing better for me: but though I come not

⁴Alexander Gordon, “Theophilus Brabourne, M.A.,” *The Sabbath Memorial* 13 (January & April 1887): 567.

⁵In all of Brabourne’s writings, “Sabbath” refers to the seventh day of the week, Saturday. The first day of the week he always calls “Sunday,” or “Lord’s day.” In this article “Sabbath” and “Sunday” will be used in the same way unless a quoted source has another meaning.

⁶Most list his death in 1661. Gordon, p. 568, argues convincingly that Brabourne died in 1662. Gordon’s conclusion is based on an examination of Brabourne’s will.

into the pulpit, less I shall provoke envy, yet I spend my days wholly in my studie.⁷

Even though in 1654 Brabourne still called himself a clergyman,⁸ he no longer had a parish. After completing his studies with the “three able Divines” he received his M.A. degree before ordination. On September 24, 1621, Thomas Dove, Bishop of Peterborough, and previously Dean of Norwich, gave him priest’s orders. On April 18, 1622, he was licensed for the Norwich diocese by Bishop Harsnett. In about 1630 Brabourne obtained the curacy of Catton (near Norwich) and was paid forty pounds a year.⁹

The Road to Prison

Had Brabourne been satisfied to carry out his pastoral responsibilities in Norwich in the usual manner, we most likely never would have heard of him. His problems started in 1628 with the publication of *A Discourse Vpon the Sabbath Day*. Although at that time the book did not seem to attract much attention, it was the beginning of his problems. In 1631 he issued another book which did attract attention.¹⁰ It appears that Brabourne’s difficulties began because he dared to dedicate his 1631 book, *A Defence Of that most Ancient, and Sacred ordinance of GODS, the SABBATH DAY*, to Charles I.¹¹ Brabourne asked Charles I to call for a reformation of the true Sabbath.¹² Apparently fearful that his appeal would not be heeded, he reminded the king that some OT monarchs—such as Hezekiah and Josiah—became famous by instituting Sabbath reform.¹³

⁷*A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor*, p. 94. The original spelling from Brabourne’s sources is retained in all quotations.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁹Gordon, p. 566.

¹⁰*Defence*. Even the title suggests a change in his own attitude. Although the book was first published in 1631, it does not seem that any copies of that edition have survived. The 1632 edition was used in this article. All secondary sources consulted also refer to the 1632 edition.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. (a) 2. Richard Müller incorrectly states that it was dedicated to James I: “Dieses Buch, das dem König Jakob I gewidmet wurde, verursachte grosses Aufsehen.” See Müller, *Adventisten - Sabbat - Reformation* (Lund, Sweden, 1979), p. 156.

¹²*Defence*, p. (a) 3.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. (a) 3,v.

In reaction to Brabourne's bold act of dedicating a controversial work to him, the King directed Bishop Francis White to deal with the heretic. Part of White's response was a book that appeared several years later.¹⁴

Meanwhile, Brabourne was required to personally defend his books and his views. Over twenty years later he recalled some of these meetings and conferences.

Many years since, I held a Conference with that Reverend Bishop, D. White, at Ely House in Holbourn, about the Sabbath, it lasted many dayes, an houre or two in a day; after that, I did the like once before Archbishop of Lambeth; but in all these contests I was never so abused as now, by Mr. Collings; I never had one disgraceful word from them.¹⁵

These meetings, however, did not produce a change in Brabourne. The next step was an appearance before the High Commission. He vividly recalled that experience:

On the day of my censure in the high Commission Court, which lasted a whole afternoon of a long Summers day, neer an hundred Ministers present as I was told, besides hundreds of other people: the Bishop of Ely (after the King's advocate had pleaded a long time against me read a discourse against me, about an houre long, wherein he argued against the Sabbath day; some of his Arguments were new things to me not heard of before which at present I could not answer.) (but since as soon as I got out of prison, I have answered his book, though I have not printed it).¹⁶

White's recollection of the High-Commission hearing does not show him to be sympathetic to Brabourne:

But while he was in this heat . . . crying in all places where he came, *Victoria, victoria*: he fell into an *ambuscado*, and being intercepted, he was convented and called to an account, before *Your Grace, and the Honourable Court of High Commission*.¹⁷

Brabourne was in prison at the Gate-House in Westminster for eighteen months. In addition, he spent nine weeks there while he

¹⁴Francis White, *A Treatise of the Sabbath-Day* (London, 1635).

¹⁵*A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor*, p. 74.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 100.

¹⁷White, p. A-2.

was being examined. He described the prison as “nasty” and loathsome.” The prisoners he referred to as “rogues, and lousie fellows, and cheaters.”¹⁸

Although the conditions were miserable, he did not suffer the fate called for by one of the judges, Sir Henry Martin, who asked for the death sentence. Some individuals reported to Brabourne’s wife that he was to be burned.¹⁹

The Release from Prison

After spending a year in prison, Brabourne was given an opportunity to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. Six months later Brabourne signed a document which obtained his release.²⁰ This document was misunderstood during Brabourne’s lifetime, and there is still confusion as to how it was obtained and what it really stated.

Bishop White wrote that Brabourne became “an unfained convert, and in a publike and honourable audience, he made this voluntary and humble submission. . . .”²¹ White failed to mention that it was prison which encouraged Brabourne to consider submission. Winton Solberg’s historical account is even less accurate, since he does not even mention the prison experience. He writes that the “High Commission induced him to abandon his Judaical views. . . .”²² This is hardly correct, since the Commission sentenced him to prison *because* it could not induce him to abandon his views.

Brabourne did not see it as a voluntary statement. Writing two decades after signing, he reminded his readers that he “did not easily give away to submission. . . .” He submitted only after the terrible prison experience, calling it a “recantion of a rash word, not of the matter. . . .” He reminded his antagonist, Collings, that “I did not recant one tittle of what I write against it [Sunday]; I only wrote that I confessed it [Sunday] to be an holy day of the Church; and so much I might have said of Christmas Day also. . . .”²³

¹⁸*A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor*, p. 101.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 100.

²⁰Gordon, p. 567.

²¹White, p. 305.

²²Winton U. Solberg, *Redeem the Time: The Puritan Sabbath in Early America* (Cambridge, MA, 1977), p. 79.

²³*A Reply to the Indoctus Doctor*, p. 101.

An examination of the statement reveals that Brabourne's analysis of it was correct. It was worded in such a way that he basically submitted himself to the church. He accepted Sunday to be a "Holy day of the Church. . . ." ²⁴ He did not change his position on the Sabbath, but only admitted that he was rash in his position. Did he abandon his views, as Solberg maintains? Hardly! After his prison experience, he wrote six additional books on the Sabbath along with one unpublished manuscript that has survived. ²⁵

2. *The Sabbath and the Lord's Day in Brabourne's Writings*

Walter B. Douglas provides a helpful introduction to the controversy which developed between the proponents of the Sabbath and the Lord's day. Puritans in the early part of the seventeenth century were advocating adherence of Sunday. Another group agreed with the concept, but added a new dimension; that is, of advocating that the biblical Sabbath should be kept. Theophilus Brabourne belonged to the latter group. ²⁶ He picked up his sabbatarian argument from the Puritans, but "it was difficult," suggests Bryan Ball, "for Brabourne or any of those who followed him, to see how the sacredness of that particular day could be abrogated or how it might be transferred to any other day [i.e., other than the seventh day] of the week." ²⁷ The established church argued against both Sunday sabbatarians and Saturday sabbatarians. ²⁸

Brabourne, as indicated above, took an active part in the controversy between the proponents of Sabbathkeeping and the proponents of Sundaykeeping (whether the strict Puritan concept or the more "liberal" concept of the established church). An examination of his two major works enables us to see the trend of his

²⁴The statement is reproduced in Erick T. Bjorck, *A Little Olive Leaf Put in the Mouth of that (so called) Noah's Dove* (New York, 1704), pp. 30-31.

²⁵See n. 3 for a list of his writings on the Sabbath. He also wrote other books (mostly on church government), but they are not related to the subject under study.

²⁶Walter B. Douglas, "The Sabbath in Puritanism," in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, D.C., 1982), p. 229. While Douglas seems to put Brabourne into the group of Puritans advocating the Sabbath, that is not correct, since Brabourne disassociated himself from the Puritans. See *Defence*, p. (c) [5].

²⁷Ball, p. 141.

²⁸Douglas, p. 299.

argument. More emphasis will be given to the 1632 book, since the 1628 book was in a sense an introduction to his position. The titles alone give a hint as to their character. That of the 1628 book emphasized "discourse," whereas the 1632 title stressed "defence." He wrote that "my former booke [1628] was a time of silence."²⁹

The Law and the Fourth Commandment

Brabourne realized that if he was to defend the Sabbath he must deal with the law. He saw an inseparable relationship between the Sabbath and the law. "The morall Sabbathes, together with whatsoever else is commanded in the morall law, I doe defend. . . ."³⁰ This moral law was not a burden to the Christian, for "Loue, is the summe of this law; and loue, is the law we shall walke by in the kingdome of heauen, 1. Corint. 13.8.13 and will they reject that law on earth, which we shall walke by in the kingdome of heauen?"³¹

If the moral law is eternal, how does it relate to one's salvation? Brabourne was no doubt aware that a charge of legalism might be made against him; thus he stated that "we doe not defend the law to be in force unto Iustification: for, by the *workes of the law shall no flesh be justified*, Rom. 3.20. we defend the law to be in force only unto *obseruation*."³² He went on to point out that Paul also argued against justification by the law.³³

While he defended the moral law and the Sabbath of this law, he outrightly rejected the ceremonial law and the ceremonial Sabbaths.³⁴ He believed that his position was more defensible than that of proponents of Sunday, who designated a part of the commandment to be moral (the idea of a Sabbath) and the other part ceremonial (which day). Such reasoning he called a "mingle mangle, such a hotch potch: the 4th com. is by these Interpreters become, halfe fish, halfe flesh; A Lynsey wolsey; A morrall Ceremoniall Commandement; partly lasting, partly faded."³⁵

²⁹*Defence*, p. (c) [4], v.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 4.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 5.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 7.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 15.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 113.

Brabourne went on to show that the Sabbath was a part of the moral law, and more specifically, a part of the fourth commandment. If, he asked, Christians state that the “loue of Christ constraineth them . . . why then may not the loue of God likewise conraine them, to obey his commandments in Exod. 20.1 & c.?”³⁶ If we work when God rests and if we rest when God works we are not imitating God.³⁷ Rest and holiness are two important themes of the Sabbath.³⁸

As Brabourne viewed it, the most important theme of the fourth commandment (the Sabbath commandment of the Decalogue) is one of “specificity.” To illustrate this “specificity,” he referred to the third commandment:

Remember The Sabbath day; not Remember A Sabbath day: finally, were it lawfull thus to wrest Scripture, whereas the third Comm. is, Thou shalt not take The name of the Lord thy God in vaine & c. might not I here cauile thus; Thou shalt not take A name of the Lord they God in vaine . . . ?³⁹

If the preciseness of the third commandment cannot be changed, then Brabourne throughout his writings maintained that the preciseness of the fourth commandment should not be changed. Because the commandment is specific, Sunday or the Lord’s day cannot be the Sabbath. The table below gives a summary of the basic differences between the two days as he saw them:

<i>Sabbath</i>	<i>Lord’s day (Sunday)</i>
Seventh day	“Eighth” day
In memory of Creation	In memory of Redemption
Appointed by God	Supposedly appointed by Christ
Imitation of God	No imitation of God ⁴⁰

The one unusual, if not strange, interpretation of the fourth commandment is Brabourne’s definition of the length of the Sabbath. The Sabbath day is not a twenty-four hour period, but is rather “that space of tyme and light from day peepe or day breake

³⁶Ibid., p. 6.

³⁷Ibid., p. 30.

³⁸Discourse, p. 96.

³⁹Ibid., p. 73.

⁴⁰Defence, p. 73.

in the morning, vntill day be quite off the skye at night. . . .”⁴¹ Even though he went on to defend his unusual interpretation of the length of the Sabbath, his arguments at best can be called novel.

Lord's Day not the Sabbath

Brabourne examined the various arguments which were used to show that Sunday or the Lord's day was the Sabbath. Some of his arguments can be summarized in the following manner.

First, the Lord's day could not be a Sabbath, Brabourne argued, because there are examples of travel on the Lord's day. Such traveling is prohibited on the Sabbath day and if Sunday had become the Sabbath, then such activity would not have been allowed.⁴²

Second, a popular argument used for Sunday was to proclaim it a memorial to redemption. If Sunday was to be kept in memory of redemption, then Brabourne argued that every third day of the week should be kept since it took Christ three days to complete his work of redemption. While Brabourne did not deny that it was a memorial to the redemption event, he pointed out that “for the Redemption, we haue two *Sacraments*, Baptisme & the Lords Supper, to keepe in memory the Redemption, & these are helps enough, so as there is no necessity of a Sabbath day also, for the same end.”⁴³

Third, even though there are examples of preaching and of some offering preparation activity on the first day of the week in the NT, Brabourne pointed out that these activities did not make Sunday the Sabbath.⁴⁴ In fact, the arguments for Sunday being the Sabbath are so weak that one would have the “need of *Sampsons* streng[t]h to drage & hale this 4th Comm. vnto the Lords day.”⁴⁵

If there was no biblical basis for Sunday becoming the Sabbath, then why was it that the church as a whole accepted it as the Sabbath? Brabourne reviewed several reasons.

He pointed out that the prophet Daniel foretold this change. Even in his less controversial book of 1628, he referred to Daniel

⁴¹*Discourse*, p. 85.

⁴²*Defence*, pp. 177 & 179. Brabourne refers to Luke 24:1-13 and Matt 16:6.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 199.

7:25, which states that “he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws. . . .” Brabourne believed that this was a prediction that someone would attempt to change the biblical Sabbath.⁴⁶ In his later book he became even more specific: “Oh, how is this abused Commandement, to be deplored & lamented! & how are the Agents herein, to be loathed and abhorred? for they attempt with that wicked man, prophecied on by *Daniel*, to change times & lawes, Dan. 7.25.”⁴⁷ He is not specific as to who makes the changes. However, at the beginning of the paragraph from which the above quotation is taken he referred to the change of the second commandment by the papacy. It cannot be determined for certain whether Brabourne saw the pope as the one who will “think to change times and laws.” Later he specifically made the Council of Laodicea responsible for the change.⁴⁸

Although Brabourne did not accept Sunday as the Sabbath day, he did give Sunday a somewhat special standing. He admitted that Sunday may have been kept perhaps quarterly, or twice a year “for a Sabbath.”⁴⁹ He also believed that the “Lord’s day” mentioned in Rev 1:10 may “be a yeerly Sabbath.”⁵⁰ Nowhere, however, did he accept Sunday as *the* Sabbath day.

The Sabbath Still in Force

Throughout his writings, Brabourne argued that the Sabbath was still valid. His two major books provide us with some specific arguments for this position. The following arguments give a good summary of the positions developed throughout his various writings:

1. The Lord’s day was not in force and thus the Sabbath was.⁵¹ To those who maintained that Sunday was to be kept as a memorial to the resurrection, Brabourne responded that this was not possible. Since the disciples did not know, nor believe, that Christ would be

⁴⁶*Discourse*, p. 28.

⁴⁷*Defence*, p. 296.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 483.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 163. Emphasis added.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 167.

⁵¹*Discourse*, p. 169.

raised until that particular Sunday was over, how could they have kept it in memory of the resurrection?⁵²

2. The seventh day was never abolished.⁵³

3. The seventh day was never changed.⁵⁴

4. The Sabbath was "written by God in tables of stone."⁵⁵

5. There "can be no day for a Sabbath weekly and ordenarily but the 7th day."⁵⁶

6. God must have one day in seven for a Sabbath. It is Saturday, the seventh day of the week.⁵⁷

7. God expressly commanded the seventh day in his moral law. If we abolish the fourth commandment, then "why may not the Papists caule against 2^d Comm: and say, that I indeed, it forbad Images to the Jewes, but not to Christians."⁵⁸

8. Matt 5:18 shows that every part of the law will be in force to the world's end. Therefore, the Sabbath was to be in force "to the world's end."⁵⁹ In this text, Christ prophesized the duration of the law.⁶⁰

9. The Sabbath was a means "to keepe in memory the miraculouse worke of the creation."⁶¹

10. The Sabbath reminds us that God is our sanctifier.⁶² Because Christians are subject to pride,

I conclude, like as the Sacraments be signes of justification: so the Sabbaths be signes of sanctification: The one, pointing to God the Sonne; The other, to God the Father: let both be retained in the Church of God, since both be of Diuine Institution; the one ordained by Christ, the other by God the Father, Exod. 31.13.⁶³

⁵²*Defence*, p. 404.

⁵³*Discourse*, p. 170.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, p. 171.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 173.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 175.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 177.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 191.

⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 198.

11. The apostles “did constantly obserue & keepe it, after Christs resurrection.”⁶⁴

12. To those who maintained “that they would imbrace the Sabbath, if it could be proued to be a Law of nature,” Brabourne responded that natural law could not be used to oppose moral law.⁶⁵

3. *The Sabbath in Brabourne’s Life*

In his writings, Brabourne took a very strong position for the seventh-day Sabbath. His strong advocacy for the Sabbath even put him into prison and brought derision from fellow clergy. Did his position on the Sabbath convince him that he should keep it? On this matter, there seems to be some confusion.

In his writings, he pled for church unity on the question of the Sabbath. As a result, Brabourne believed that it would be better not to keep the Sabbath until the “tyme of reformation.”⁶⁶ In his first two books on the Sabbath, he pled for a reformation which would restore the Sabbath. Until this reformation, “a Romish Relique, and Popish Tradition is honoured, in stead of an ordinance of Gods, his Holy Sabbath.”⁶⁷ He believed that Luther brought about a reformation of the second commandment, but in the seventeenth century there needed to be a reformation of the fourth commandment.⁶⁸

In some ways Brabourne did not act comfortably with his own position regarding Sabbathkeeping. He thought, however, that God was providing a dispensation until the Sabbath reformation came about. This dispensation, nevertheless, was not universal. It was only “for such as are perswaded, that the Sabbath day is still in force. . . .”⁶⁹

On the other hand, there is some evidence to suggest that Brabourne did keep the Sabbath for a while. His Sabbathkeeping

⁶⁴*Defence*, p. 466.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, p. 531.

⁶⁶*Discourse*, p. 235.

⁶⁷*Defence*, p. 618.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, p. 611.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 599.

probably started after the publication of his two major books on the subject. Alexander Gordon has pointed out that Brabourne left ten pounds to a congregation of Sabbathkeepers in his will. Gordon, in fact, feels confident in stating that “we may be sure he kept sacred his daylight Sabbath on the Saturday.”⁷⁰

4. Summary

Brabourne’s arguments for the Sabbath were well stated and he dealt ably with the theology of the Sabbath. The thrust of his writings was not only to prove that Sunday was not the Sabbath, but to show how Christians would benefit by keeping the biblical seventh-day Sabbath. It would be well to summarize his main themes:

1. The Sabbath has a universal quality and it never was, nor is it now, for the Jews only. Since it is a memorial to creation, all should keep it since “euery man hath a benefit by the Creation. . . .”⁷¹

2. The change from Sabbath to Sunday was not accidental. Daniel made a specific prediction in Dan 7:25 that such a change would take place. The Council of Laodicea was largely responsible for fulfilling this prophecy. The church in Rome, also was instrumental in this change since “*there was no Ecclesiasticall or Church assemblies, upon the Sabbath day at Rome, as there was in other Churches.*”⁷²

3. The Sabbath is a sign of God’s sanctification in the life of the Christian.

4. There was a role for Sunday, or the “Lord’s day.” Brabourne believed that Sunday was a sign of redemption, while the Sabbath was a sign of creation and sanctification. Sabbath was the king and Sunday was the deputy.⁷³ (He did not deny that Sunday may have been kept occasionally as a Sabbath; his argument was that Sunday had never replaced *the* seventh-day Sabbath.)

5. The Sabbath was not a legalistic relic, but a gift from God. Some three years before his death in 1662, Brabourne wrote:

⁷⁰Gordon, p. 568.

⁷¹*Defence*, p. 253.

⁷²*Ibid.*, p. 481.

⁷³*Ibid.*, p. 600.

Christ said the Sabbath was made for man, *Mark. 2.27.* that is the Sabbath when it was made (as at the Creation it was) then it was made for man, for the good and benefit of man: and shall we imagine that no man had good and benefit by keeping it, untill 2000 years after in *Moses* time? God makes nothing in *vaine*: and shall we think he made the Sabbath at the Creation in *vaine*? Thus I have maintained. 1. The *Antiquity* of the Sabbath, and that it is as old as this world is. 2. That all men, not only *Jews*, but also *Gentiles* so soon as they come to know the true God, and that he at the Creation sanctified the 7th day for *man*, they are bound to sanctifie the 7th day Sabbath.⁷⁴

⁷⁴*Answer to Two Books*, p. 10.