

F
835
.714
A2
no. 64

The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

THE
CHRISTIAN SABBATH
OR
WEEKLY REST DAY.

By Elder Columbus Scott.

LAMONI, IOWA:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF
JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.

1891.

Entered according to Act of Congress, on the 11th day
of December, 1891,

BY THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF
LATTER DAY SAINTS,

In the Copyright Office of Librarian of Congress,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

F835

714

A2

no. 64

P R E F A C E.

THE subject of this little treatise has been one of much controversy at different periods since the opening of the Christian era, and is now the issue usually growing out of an attempt of heretical zealots to introduce into the Christian system of worship the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, as under the Israelitish commonwealth.

We have tried to avoid, in this effort, the inconsistency of admitting as binding in letter and spirit, under the gospel, *nine* of the ten commandments, and rejecting *one*—the fourth—by allowing them, as they related to the law, as originally intended of God, to be of force as a whole with Israel *till* Christ came, since when their spirit and force is found in the law of all good government, where their penalties are *now* affixed and executed. An endeavor has also been made to develop the superior excellence and perfection of the gospel over the law as our religious rule of life and “the power of God unto salvation.”

Since the created universe makes known to men the “eternal power and Godhead” of “the Father

of lights," leaving them "without excuse," (Rom. 1: 20), and as a seventh-day Sabbath memorialized the servitude of Israel in the land of Egypt, and their most wonderful deliverance therefrom by the outstretched, mighty, and glorious arm of Jehovah, also their formal adoption into the inheritance of God. (Deut. 5: 15; Ex. 19: 5, 6), what could more appropriately invite the attention of the world of mankind, held in the servitude of sin and death and longing for deliverance therefrom, and memorialize that grandest of miracles centering in the person and history of Jesus Christ, viz., his resurrection as the crowning act and seal of his victory after his contest with "death and hell" (and without which the world was absolutely without hope),—aye, what could more *surely* invite the attention of the world to their Redeemer than the solemn celebration of his Messiahship on the day of his resurrection—"the Lord's day," "the first of the week"?

"Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God," who learned the gospel only by the revelation of Jesus Christ and on whom was placed the responsibility "of caring for all the churches for a season," celebrated the Lord's supper on the Lord's day, and gave "order to the churches of Galatia" and Corinth to place their collections for religious purposes in the treasury "on the first day of the week"—"the Lord's

day." Surely this "order" was in harmony with the gospel revealed to him by Christ, else this far-reaching "order" among the churches is unaccountable consistently with any principle of his divine calling.

We have tried to give due credit to all authorities referred to.

With this brief reference to some of the leading thoughts and facts treated of, and with an humble trust that the cause of truth shall have been conserved to some degree by the effort, and craving charity toward its unintentional defects, we submit it to the reader.

Respectfully,

THE WRITER.

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
CHAPTER I.	
Two Systems of Divine Law.....	1-4
CHAPTER II.	
The Two Systems of Worship.....	5-6
CHAPTER III.	
The Weekly Sabbath, or Rest Day, under the Law.....	7-24
CHAPTER IV.	
The Eden Idea of the Sabbath Institution Examined..	25-32
CHAPTER V.	
Abrogation of the Law.....	33-38
CHAPTER VI.	
The First Covenant was Faulty.....	39-54
CHAPTER VII.	
The Weekly Sabbath.....	55-61
CHAPTER VIII.	
The Covenant—The Ten Commandments.....	62-74
CHAPTER IX.	
The Weekly Rest Day Under the Gospel.....	75-90
CHAPTER X.	
“The Lord’s Day”—The First Day of the Week.....	91-95

CHAPTER XI.

Historical Identity of "The First Day" with "The Lord's Day."	96-107
---	--------

CHAPTER XII.

Did not Originate with Roman Bishops. First Day and Lord's Day Identical.....	108-117
---	---------

CHAPTER XIII

Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?.....	118-123
---------------------------------------	---------

CHAPTER XIV.

"The Apostolical Constitutions".....	124-133
--------------------------------------	---------

CHAPTER XV.

The Original Words.....	134-139
-------------------------	---------

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH;

OR WEEKLY REST DAY.

CHAPTER I.

TWO SYSTEMS OF DIVINE LAW.

By the records given of God to the human race, since the creation, it is apparent that law and order was designed of him, to characterize the lives and motives and actions of the human family, in their relations to him and to each other. Hence we find by looking into the records given, that he has been pleased to reveal two systems of law, both general and specific in their character, in different eras of the world; the object of these laws being, if lived up to, the formation of governments in order to the development and well-being of man, temporally and spiritually, to exalt them in the scale of their being to the highest possible good.

In the Bible these two systems of law, from their nature and intention, are called "the two covenants" *a*, "the law of God" *b*, and "the gospel of God"—of Christ *c*. Both are designed to bring about an agreement between God and his people, and both having been given to the Jews during their national existence, Moses having been sent to deliver them from the bondage of Egypt, he, the ordained mediator of the one, and Christ Jesus, afterward sent, the teacher, high priest and mediator of the other. They are, in the record, by *contrast*, called

the "*first*," and the "second" "covenants" *d*. Also, the "law of Moses" *e*, and "the gospel of Christ," or, "of Jesus Christ" *f*. Out of these two systems of laws, in their operations and application among men, grew two governments—organized kingdoms—one called "the kingdom of Israel," because it pertained to the children of Israel only *g*; the other "the kingdom of God" *h*, *i*, "of his dear Son," "the body of Christ" *k*, "the household of God" *l*.

The *contrast* between the law and the gospel reveals its completeness when we come to consider the fact that the law, in its provisions, when given to Israel at Sinai, was *temporal*—designed to serve for a time only—and then to be superseded by the gospel of Christ, which, in its nature, is *eternal*. The blessings flowing out of obedience to the law, or "first covenant," were all to be realized *in this life*, and pertained to this life only. Likewise the penalties to follow its violation were to be visited on the transgressors in this mortal state of existence, during the time of its designed duration. "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" *a*. Also, in the enactments growing out of the decalogue, or constitution of the government of Israel, the Lord renews the *conditional* promise of long life. Conditional? Provided they rested the seventh day, kept the feasts of the Lord, and served no other gods, God would "take sickness away from" them, and the number of their days would he fulfill *b*. On the other hand the punishment of the transgressor of the law was inflicted by the hands of its administrators, as in the case of the Sabbath breaker: "And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be sure-

d Heb. 10:9, 16. *e* Mal. 4:4. *f* Mark 1:1. *g* 1 Kings 9:5. Acts 1:6.

h Luke 4:43. *i* Col. 1:13. *k* 1 Cor. 12:27. *l* Eph. 2:19.

a Ex. 20:12. *b* Ex. 23:25, 26.

ly put to death, all the congregation shall stone him with stones, without the camp" *c*. Thus it was with the *individual* transgressions, but when the nation as such, violated the law, God, whose law they had covenanted to keep, vindicated the law by *national* calamities; plagues, famines, unsuccessful wars, and death and captivity. We need but to carefully read the blessings for obedience, and the curses for disobedience, to be entirely satisfied on this matter *d*. And when the Israelitish economy was brought to a close, and the law was abrogated according to God's design concerning it, Holy Writ informs us that, "every transgression and disobedience *received* a just recompense of reward" *e*.

On the other hand the gospel, God's plan of eternal salvation, has for its basis the *principles* of the doctrine of Christ, of the oracles of God *f*, being spiritual and eternal in their nature, and the laws based upon them constituting the gospel system are perfect, and hence we read, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul" *g*, and, "whosoever looketh into the *perfect law of liberty*, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed" *h*.

The blessings that follow the faithful obedience of the children of men, to the gospel, relate not to this life only, but also to the eternal ages to come. The law could not give eternal life: "Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given *life*, verily righteousness should have been by the law" *i*. "I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if *righteousness come by the law*, then Christ is dead in vain" *j*. Also the violations of the gospel by man are reserved to the life to come to be visited

c Num. 16: 25. *d* Deut. chapter 28. *e* Heb. 2: 2. *f* Heb. 5: 12 and 6: 2.

g Ps. 19: 7. *h* Jas. 1: 25. *i* Gal. 3: 21. *j* Gal. 2: 21.

upon the transgressors. Jesus says: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: *the word that I have spoken*, the same shall judge him in the last day" *k*.

The law could *kill*, but could not forgive—"take away sin" *l*—and therefore it is called "the letter;" "for the letter killeth;" "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones" *m*; while the "law of Christ," the gospel, is designated "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," that liberates "from the law of sin and death" *n*. Thus does inspiration array in *contrast* the two systems of law given to govern the race, in their relation to God and each other; the object of the law being to instruct, educate and civilize in this world, the other to regenerate, moralize and prepare us for the special blessings of God in this life, and adapt us to the joys, honors and glories of the redeemed in the ages to come: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith (the faith revealed through Christ) is come, *we are no longer under a schoolmaster*" *o*.

k John 12: 48. *l* Heb. 10: 4. *m* 2 Cor. 3: 6, 7. *n* Rom. 8: 1, 2.

o Gal. 3: 24, 25.

CHAPTER II.

THE TWO SYSTEMS OF WORSHIP.

Under the two systems of law revealed of God, two separate and distinct orders of worship were established. Under each, men were required to acknowledge and render homage to our heavenly Father. The order of service in both laws is specifically set forth. The first covenant was made with the children of Abraham only; they alone were to be partakers of its privileges and blessings. Moses said to Israel: "For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day" *p*. "He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; as for his judgments, they have not known them. Praise ye the Lord" *q*. "For when the Gentiles, *which have not the law*, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves" *r*. Not thus was the gospel to be circumscribed to any one nation or family, but was to be "good tidings of great joy unto *all* people" *s*. The gospel of God's grace, and "repentance and remission of sins," for the obedience of faith should be proclaimed among all nations *t*: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to

p Deut. 4: 7, 8. *q* Ps. 147: 19, 20. *r* Rom. 2: 14. *s* Luke 2: 10.

t Luke 24: 47.

observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" *u*.

The worship under the first covenant was typical in its nature, and but the shadowy reflections of a better, a spiritual, an enduring and more substantial order of worship to be afterward presented to Israel and the world, and established. It was limited, as we have seen, to Israel, both in its duration and in its *location*. Of the locality where this first covenant was to be kept, also of its rewards, Moses, its "mediator," said: "Know therefore this day, and consider in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, *and his commandments*, which I command thee this day, that it may go well with thee, *and with thy children after thee*, and that thou mayest prolong thy days upon the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee *v*. And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt; to drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, *as it is this day*" *w*. "In the land" which God gave to Israel — the land of Canaan — was where the law was designed of God to be kept inviolate *x*.

u Matt. 28: 19, 20. *v* Deut. 4: 39, 40. *w* Deut. 4: 37, 38. *x* Ex. 20: 12.

CHAPTER III.

THE WEEKLY SABBATH, OR REST DAY, UNDER THE LAW.

It has seemed wise in God, in the establishment of his worship, under the laws given, to institute a weekly rest—of worship and devotion—one day out of each week of seven days, that his children may rest from the arduous duties of life, and have in special remembrance the Giver of life, and offer up thankful reverential praise and devotion for all his loving kindnesses, mercies and blessings. This day of rest once a week is only *one* of a series of requirements to be observed, whether under the law or under the gospel. By the law the seventh day of the week, usually called *Saturday*, was designated as the weekly rest day *y*. But since the introduction of the gospel of Jesus Christ and the establishment of the “better covenant, which was established upon better promises” *z*, a division of opinion has existed among the worshipers of God as to which is the proper and divinely accepted day of the week to observe, the seventh or the first day—Sunday. A large majority of Christians, holding the belief that Sunday is the proper weekly rest day, have sincerely observed it as a day of worship, believing, of course, that the “covenant” in which the requirement to observe the seventh day was embodied was taken away in Christ, “that he may establish the second” covenant *a*, and because it is a notable fact that *there is no enactment of God in, or under, the new covenant*

that requires the observance of the seventh day as a day of rest and worship. Now it is a principle in law, both human and divine, that no two or more distinct and differing wills, on any subject, or estate, by any one testator, is binding or valid at one and the same time: "Then, said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He *taketh away the first*, that he may establish the second." Thus the Apostle Paul teaches in writing to the Hebrew Saints, on this very principle of the validity of wills, and shows that God recognized this principle, and acted upon it, in the establishment of the gospel.

It will now be very essential for us to inquire *minutely* as to what the covenant which God made with Israel at Sinai consisted of, for it is just on this point almost entirely, that the division of opinion is based in regard to which is the right day to observe as the Sabbath, the seventh or the first day of the week. By the advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath, the *unity of the law or covenant given to Israel at Sinai is denied*. It is *assumed* by them that the covenant made with Israel, and written in the book of the law, did not include the *ten commandments*, and that *they* were not a *part* of the first covenant, or will, that was taken away by Christ, that he might "establish the second."

But we now ask: Are the ten commandments, as formulated at Sinai, anywhere incorporated into the new covenant as a *part* thereof? We have failed, so far, to find it so recorded in the Christian covenant.

It is also asserted that the decalogue is the *moral* law of God, is the *immutable* law, and therefore it cannot be *annulled, changed or superseded* by another. That this idea is an assumption, and wholly without proof, is shown by the fact that God, nor any man inspired of God that we have any record of in the Bible, ever applied

the words *moral* or *immutable*, or their equivalents, to the law of the ten commandments.

Separate all the rest of the law given to Israel from the decalogue, and let it stand *all alone*, absolutely so, as recorded in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and then *carefully consider* it for awhile, and the following points plainly appear:

1. The ten commandments do not positively enjoin the worship of God nor point out any mode of divine worship, but teach that the man who strictly abstains from idolatry, whether he worships or not, keeps the first two commandments. Jesus did not quote from the decalogue when he said to the devil: "For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" *b*.

2. Not to use the name of God when swearing to that which was *false*, was keeping the third commandment—"And ye shall not swear by my name falsely," is Moses' comment on this command *c*. And, in the new covenant, Jesus instituted the following to take its place. "But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; neither by the earth; for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay; *for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil*" *d*. Now, in the light of all the provisions of this enactment of Jesus Christ, what is the use of the third commandment of the decalogue? Does it serve any *practical* purpose to the follower of Christ?

3. The man who quietly stayed in his tent or house, and did *no* work on the seventh day of the week, and with his family, servants and beasts, rested from all

labor, kept the fourth commandment, according to the letter of it, whether engaged in any manner of worship or not, so far as anything we may learn from the decalogue in the abstract, is concerned. Any man can do that in a *nominal* sense, and not be particularly religious either. Just keep the seventh *day* holy!

4. The other six commandments relate wholly to the obligations of the various classes of society to each other, including those of the family and neighborhood, and were not *exclusively* peculiar to the Jews, for such conditions as are there enjoined have ever characterized the more refined and better regulated states of society, anciently in Ethiopia, Egypt, Chaldea, Greece and Rome, as well as in mediæval and modern times, as attested by the history of those countries. On this point Paul said, "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, *do by nature* **THE THINGS contained in the law**, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew *the work of the law* written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another" *e.* What law does the apostle here refer to? Let him answer: "Behold thou art called a Jew, and retest in **THE LAW**, and maketh thy boast of God, and knowest *his WILL*, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of *the law*; . . . thou that preachest a man should not *steal*, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" *f.* By the language of this text we learn that "the law," the works of which many of the Gentiles did, though having not the law, was the decalogue. Moreover we learn by this language of inspiration that

this law of the ten commandments was a part of that "*first covenant*," or "*WILL*" that Paul refers to when he says, "Then said he, Lo, I come to do *THY WILL*, O God. *He taketh away the first* [will] that he may establish the second" *g*.

5. The principle incorporated into the second commandment, viz., God "visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation," is inconsistent with the doctrine of the *personal* responsibility of each individual, as viewed in the light of "the law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus," to whom coming, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place and the darkness comprehendeth it not. Indeed, it was not applicable under the government of Israel, in so far as the execution of the law and its penalties by *human agency* were concerned, for we read: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death *for his own sin*" *h*. But when the whole nation of Israel went into transgression, and refused to return to the observance of the law, God visited them with *national* calamities (as before observed), with pestilences and great plagues, when they should break his covenant *i*. He punished them seven-fold, with consuming diseases—epidemics, drouths, giving them into the hands of their enemies who should rule over them, and the fruit of their land would be smitten. He would break the pride of their power, and they should be *robbed of their children*. He would lay waste their cities, desolate their sanctuaries, visit them with such dire and strange calamities, that even their enemies would be astonished at them; and if they refused to "*be reformed*" by all this great punishment, then they should even be destroyed out of their land, and it be left desolate, and

they left few in number. And when these sad predictions were all fulfilled against Israel, and *their children* in exile were made to feel that *they* were thus suffering on account of "the sins" of their "people Israel," need we wonder that the captive Daniel prayed, "O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, *and for the iniquities of our fathers*, Jerusalem and thy people are a reproach to all that are about us" *j*. Laws or covenants involving this principle could not, in their very nature, unless such principle was eliminated, be an adjunct to, or a part of the gospel. The law of Christ does not deal with nations, as such, in that manner. Nor does it propose penalties either in this world or that to come, wherein the children shall, in any sense, or to any degree, be held responsible for the iniquities of their fathers; but, on the contrary, "Every *one* of us shall give account of *himself* to God" *k*.

6. There are some who seem to have discovered such a high degree of morality and perfection in the ten commandment law that they, in their claims for it, assert that it is *the* code that governs in heaven; that the angelic hosts in their exalted sphere render homage to God in accordance with its requirements. "It existed," say they, "before man was created. The angels were governed by it" *l*. If this statement be true, the Sabbath was not instituted *in Eden*, or "made *for man*" only, but for the angels as well! Will one of the believers of this "spirit of prophecy" give us a dilation on the application of the decalogue, in all its bearings, to the conduct of the angels? Perhaps they will enlighten us as to how the angels order their households, including

j Dan. 9: 16. *k* Rom. 14: 12. *l* Mrs. E. White, in
"Spirit of Prophecy," vol. 1, p. 261.

their servants and beasts of burden on the Sabbath day! Possibly they could render clear to our understanding what effect it would have on the angels in heaven were they to fail to carry out the letter and spirit of the *fifth* commandment, or the tenth and last one, for instance. This would be a source of edification that the gospel of Christ fails to afford. Now we believe in revering the law of God given to Israel, just as he designed we should, but we do not wish to make claims for it that, in their logical deductions, would render it ridiculous, or that are absurd.

7. We here observe that, by the law of the ten commandments, no one can be convicted of sin, unless guilty of committing the *overt act* by it prohibited. It does not make the *conception of the act in the heart*, or its desire, sin. Nor can we determine from them what the penalty is for their violation, or, indeed, whether there be a penalty save for the violation of the *first* two; and that, as we have seen, is for *national* transgressions. Now to illustrate the truth of this statement, take the case of the man who "gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day," whom the children of Israel incarcerated till Moses might be informed of the Lord what the *penalty* might be *m*. "If there be found among you, within any of thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, a man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, in transgressing *his covenant*, and hath gone and served other Gods *n*, and worshiped them, either the sun, or the moon, or any of the host of heaven, which I have not commanded; and it be told thee, and thou hast heard of it, and enquired diligently, and, behold, it be true, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought in Israel: then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman, which have committed

that wicked thing, unto thy gates, even that man or that woman, and shalt stone them with stones, till they die. At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witness, shall he that is worthy of death be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death. The hands of the witnesses shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterward the hands of all the people. So thou shalt put the evil away from among you." This passage of holy writ demonstrates the fact, that the law of the ten commandments is *a part of the covenant* that God made with Israel at Sinai—that law prohibiting idolatry—and that to break it was "*transgressing his covenant;*" and, that its violation was determined by an *earthly court*, and that by an earthly court was the penalty executed. It further shows that, in its very nature, it is no part of the code that constitutes the *unexecuted thoughts* of wrongdoing, *sin*. Only He who knows the secret operations of the human mind and affections, can judge and convict, and he can convict *justly, only*, after the law is revealed defining evil thoughts to be sin.

With the foregoing facts concerning the ten commandments, as viewed abstractly and apart from the statutes and judgments that actually grew out of them, carefully noted, we notice again the further fact that, if Moses did not *add to* the ten commandments as originally given on the Mount Sinai, they are not all contained in the record as found in Exodus, chapter twenty. For as they stand recorded as rehearsed by Moses from the second set of tables, these additional words are found: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day*" o.

That *Moses* did not add the contents of the verse cited,

but that God spoke these words, Moses declares: "These words *the Lord spake* unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me" *p*. Observe now that the reason here assigned by the Lord, why he commanded Israel to keep the Sabbath day holy, is omitted from the copy we have of the decalogue in Exodus. But it is substantially the wording of *the title* to the enactment of God in ordaining, formulating and recording the other nine also: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" *q*. These are reasons God gave for requiring Israel to keep the ten commandments *as formulated and given to them at Sinai*, and shows us that he designed them to be kept by those so brought out of Egypt, from "the house of bondage." And further, they show that the claim made by seventh-day Sabbath advocates, that the fourth commandment is a memorial of *creation* and designed to commemorate God's work, in the creation of the universe, is an assumption. The decalogue nowhere states that the Sabbath was or is a "memorial," either of God, *or* his creation; nor does the Bible anywhere so state, so far as we know. The claim is an assumption; for this, the Bible says, is God's memorial, "And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel; the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name forever, and *this is my memorial unto all generations*" *z*. Now join the fact that God brought Israel out of the land of Egypt attended with such wonders and signs as to demonstrate to them his Almighty power and goodness, and this

Name, his “memorial,” together, and the *divine reason* for Israel’s keeping the Sabbath, assigned in Deuteronomy, fifth chapter and fifteenth verse, becomes obvious. And so inspiration understood this matter in after times, for David, recounting the wonderful works of God in delivering Israel from Egypt and planting them in Canaan, in fulfillment of his promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, concludes with these words, “Thy *name*, O Lord, endureth forever; and thy *memorial*, O Lord, throughout all generations” *r*. But again, we have no evidence in the Bible that the decalogue was ever revealed to man till it was given to Israel at Sinai: “*For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come*” *s*. And this accounts for the fact that, in all the history of things prior to Moses, we have no account of the injunction being given to anyone to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath.

God made a covenant with the children of Israel at Mount Sinai. The decalogue was made the basis of that covenant. The covenant was *national* in its character. As a nation they had to be *located*. By this covenant they were to be organized into a “kingdom,” *somewhere* on earth. This kingdom was to be of a twofold nature,—a kingdom at once religious and political, the religious phase of it being largely ceremonial, being governed by that department of the code of laws, and so we read: “Then verily the first covenant *had also* ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary *t*. Now the ten commandments, being the foundation of this covenant, it must, in its nature, be a religio-political enactment, and hence it is that six of the ten commandments relate

r Ps. 135: 13; Ex. 3: 15; Hos. 12: 5. *s* Rom. 5: 13, 14. *t* Heb. 9: 1.

directly to the relation of man to his fellow, while four relate to the obligations of man to God. The decalogue was so all-important a factor in the covenant that, sometimes by a figure of synecdoche, where a part of anything is put for the whole, the ten *basic* conditions of the covenant are called "the covenant." "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments: and he wrote them upon two tables of stone" *tt*. Indeed, sometimes a single enactment is called a covenant, as, when Canaan was given to Abraham the rite of circumcision is called a covenant *u*. Doubtless the reason why this is so, is, because it was the *sign* or *seal* of the covenant, *v*, with Abraham, and as the rainbow in the cloud was in the covenant made with Noah *w*. In the covenant made with Israel at Sinai, the Sabbath day was assigned the important position of token, sign, or seal; also "a perpetual covenant" *x*; and like the rite of circumcision was to be observed by Israel "throughout their generations" by a perpetual covenant, just like the atonement Sabbath *y*; or the statute governing the weekly arrangement of the shewbread *z*. The seventh-day Sabbath then, was the *seal* of the covenant made with Israel at Sinai. This covenant was to give way to the new and everlasting covenant, we are taught, the covenant ratified by the blood of the Son of God. Will the old be *re-enacted*—made anew—or will the Lord make a *new* covenant?

What is the *seal* of the new covenant? Not baptism, for that seems to have been foreshadowed by the natural birth, under the law. Natural birth brought one into the literal kingdom of Israel; but in the new covenant we are told that "as many of you as have been *baptized*

Deut. 4: 12, 13. *u* Gen. 17: 9, 10. *v* Rom. 4: 11. *w* Gen. 9: 12,

x Ex. 31. *y* Lev. 23: 31. *z* Lev. 24: 8, 9.

into Christ, have put on Christ. And *if ye be Christ's*, then are ye Abraham's seed, and *heirs* according to the promise." The act of *making* covenant, on our part, could not be the *seal* of it. The seal of the new covenant seems to be an act consummated on the part of God thus, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom [Christ] also, after that ye believed, ye were *sealed* with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." And, "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also *sealed* us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" *a*.

The decalogue, separate and apart from all other law, statutes and judgments, with no rewards or penalties, and *therefore* not administered or executed, is a passive or inactive formulary, and hence it is that, in the nature of the case, definitive regulations, of *equal authority* with itself, must be provided; and so we find in the history of the case that, when Moses went up into the Mount to receive the tables of the covenant, God also gave him statutes and judgments so that the *code might become operative*, such judgments and statutes having the several ten commandments for their basis, as we read in the twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third chapters of Exodus, the Sabbath being no exception. And after all this, and Moses had written the words of the Lord in a book, and the people had heard them and freely agreed to keep them, the people, the altar, and the book of the covenant, were sprinkled with "the blood of the covenant," which God had made with them "*concerning all these words.*" Of God's doings in the Mount, Moses said: "And the Lord commanded me at

a Eph. 1: 13; 2 Cor. 1: 22.

that time to teach you statutes and judgments, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it" *b*.

Since law is *inoperative* unless administered, who were the authorized, ordained administrators of this law? Who were to instruct the people and see that the law was carried into effect? Answer: "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between clean and unclean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" *c*. "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, *there is made of necessity a change also of the law*" *d*.

Now, if God gave *two* separate and distinct codes of law to Israel at Sinai, the decalogue and the ceremonial, the former *immutable*, but the latter mutable and temporary, and if the latter only was, as was designed to be, *abolished* at the death of Christ, what law is it that is, "of necessity," *changed*? The only law left, according to the assumption that two were given, is the ten commandments. Now to abolish a law, is not to *change* it. The heavens and the earth are to be *changed* *e*. The children of God are all to be *changed*, at the resurrection *f*; but not abolished nor exchanged. To abolish one code of law, and institute an entirely different and

b Dent. 4: 14. *c* Lev. 10: 8-11. *d* H. b. 7: 11, 12. *e* Heb. 2: 12,

f 1 Cor. 15: 51.

distinct law in its stead, is not to change the law, but institute an entirely different, distinct and new order of things. This consideration, it seems, is fatal to the "two-law" theory. But from the last scriptures quoted, we learn that the Aaronic Priesthood were the administrators of the old covenant. Again, "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek *the law* at his mouth" *g*. But the priesthood of Christ did not minister that covenant, nor did Christ constitute his servants ministers of that covenant. Says Paul, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; *not of the letter, but of the Spirit: for the letter killeth*, but the Spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death [the letter], written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance: which glory was to be done away; how shall not *the ministration of the Spirit* be rather glorious" *h*.

The ministration of Moses, when his countenance was so illumined that Israel could not steadily behold it, was on the occasion of his descent from the mountain "with the two tables of testimony," "and all the children of Israel came nigh: and he gave them *in commandment* all that the Lord had spoken with him in Mount Sinai" *i*. And the command, "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earring time and in harvest thou shalt rest," was among the things then and there administered *j*. Moreover, the Lord told Moses to write "these words," "for after the *tenor of these words* I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." . . . "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the cove-

g Mal. 2: 7. *h* 2 Cor. 3: 5, 6, 7. *i* Ex. chap. 34. *j* verse 21.

nant, the ten commandments" *k*. Of this covenant—the ten commandments, including the seventh-day rest—Paul says he and his fellow laborers in the Christian economy God had not made them ministers. They, then, did not preach or practice, or administer to others, that law, or hold it as of force in the kingdom of heaven. It was a law of death. They administered "the law of the Spirit of life."

8. One thing more is lacking in the decalogue, viewing it as a separate code from the rest of the system. It does not define when the seventh-day rest shall begin or end, whether at sunset on Friday evening, at midnight following, or on Saturday morning as we say. No light is given us on this point till the regulation is given, as we learn, when Moses went into the Mount to receive the statutes and judgments *l*. Nor does the decalogue define whether there shall be "a holy convocation" on the Sabbath or no. When the Sabbath was given to Israel in "the wilderness of sin" they seemed to be entirely *ignorant* as to what was meant by the Sabbath, so much so that, when the people gathered the double portion on *the sixth day*, "all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses." Then Moses proceeded to *instruct* them on the subject thus: "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning" *m*.

Had even the *rulers* of Israel been taught concerning the Sabbath, and had been *habituated* to its observance weekly, they would have understood the matter without going to Moses about it. They did not have to go to Moses to learn whether the man "that gathered sticks

on the sabbath," *had transgressed, or no*, after the Lord had uttered the ten commandments on Mount Sinai. Only the *penalty* for the transgression they desired to learn. The Lord fed Israel miraculously in the wilderness, and gave them regulations pertaining to the gathering and use of it, also prohibiting their gathering the manna on the Sabbath day, and when the children of Israel failed to observe those regulations which God had given "*to prove*" them, the Lord asked: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws," and then follows another regulation relating to the manner of observing the Sabbath, as follows: "See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, *therefore* he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: *abide ye every man in his place*, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day."

If Israel had been instructed thus from their youth up, there would have been no necessity for the explicit information here given. "So the people rested on the seventh day," not even *cooking* their food. But it is probable that these restrictions ceased with the manna, for after the giving of the law there was a statute given, authorizing "*an holy convocation*" on the Sabbath, and this would necessitate the going "out of their place" on the Sabbath, to attend the assembly *n*.

But *none* of these regulations of *human conduct* are found in the decalogue, therefore we are not taught by it what it is to keep the Sabbath day "*holy*," but we must look elsewhere for the law explaining *how* to keep it holy. And the fact that God did, by other enactments, give Israel to understand what he meant by their being required to keep the Sabbath day holy, leads us, *undeniably*, to the conclusion that God did not design that the decalogue was to be understood as a complete,

immutable, unchangeable, irrevocable code of law anywhere and in any age.

God made a covenant with Israel at Sinai. A covenant denotes a coming together of mutual parties, and a mutual agreement. At Sinai God and Israel came together in mutual agreement—covenanted *with* each other; God agreeing to do certain things for Israel upon certain conditions, and Israel agreeing to hear and obey God's law. But such a thing as a covenant *without conditions* is inconceivable. The conditions are the things that both parties to a covenant agree to do conditionally. They are the *specified* requirements of the covenant. This proposition is true of every covenant that God ever called any people of any age to make with him. The basic specifications of the covenant made at Sinai are the ten commandments, but it also included the testimonies, statutes and judgments. Moses so understood this subject, and that the conditions of the covenant as then and there made pertained to *no other* covenant that God ever had made. The proof of this is the fact that, when Moses rehearsed the law, nearly forty years after the covenant was made, he began by quoting the fundamental specifications of the covenant as follows, also including the statement that God had not made this covenant with any other people: "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O, Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. *The Lord made not THIS covenant with our fathers, but us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day.* The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you *the word of the Lord*: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire,

and went not up into the mount), *saying*, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage" *o*. This passage of Bible history is as plain as comment could possibly make it, as to *what* the covenant was, of which the seventh-day Sabbath was a part, and *where*, and *when*, and with *whom* this covenant was made. The reason assigned here in the words of this covenant *why* the Israelites were to observe the Sabbath, is, "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God *commanded thee* to keep the sabbath day." Observe: The fact that God brought Israel out of Egyptian bondage, attended with stupendous manifestations of his glory and power, is not *only* the reason why they were to keep the seventh day holy, but also God's reason for *instituting* the command, as a part of his covenant with Israel. "*Therefore* the Lord thy God *commanded thee* to keep the sabbath day;" and, for *this* reason, God could give this command to no other people but those so brought out of Egyptian bondage.

By the enactment of God on Mount Sinai the decalogue was formulated and ordained law, conjointly with the statutes and judgments that rendered it operative *p*. And by virtue of the covenant entered into, and sanctification and ratification with blood, it became *binding*—of force *q*. And such a process with regard to any precept, ordinance or observance, is its *institution*. And thus we have the manner of the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath as well as the place where, and the time *when*, and God's reason *why*, all plainly revealed.

o Deut. 5: 1-21. *p* Deut. 4: 13, 14. *q* Ex. 24: 1-8.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EDEN IDEA OF THE SABBATH INSTITUTION EXAMINED.

It has been assumed by nearly all classes of professors of religion in Christendom that, because at the conclusion of the creation God ended his work on the seventh day, and on that day he rested, and, because that *after* having rested that day "He blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," that he therefore *instituted* the seventh-day Sabbath *in* the garden of Eden *a*. That this idea is an *assumption* is shown from the fact that there is not a passage of Scripture supportive of it in all the Bible. The reason assigned, and only one, why God sanctified the seventh day of the creative cycle is "because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." Nor is there a word connected with the narrative, giving the faintest idea of a Sabbath institution there for man, much less of a Sabbath enactment in Eden.

This Eden Sabbath theory assumes that the six days of creation were of only twenty-four hours duration each, as man measures time, and as a consequence the absurd idea goes with it that God just spoke the material world into existence out of nought—*nothing*—in just one hundred and forty-four hours of common time! Of course, it would not do to admit that *before* the creation "*the earth WAS*" *b* yet *unformed*—not *created*—even if the

a Gen. 2: 3. *b* Gen. 1: 2.

Bible does so affirm; for that might involve the gradual development or scientific idea of the creation, and that would make the six days of creation too long, and, consequently, the seventh day, to suit the theory of the Sabbath in Eden, as inferred from the passage in Genesis, chapter two, would be too long. Now, it appears from the history we have of the creation, that the adjustment of our solar system to the earth, and of its parts to each other, so as to measure and create for us day and night, was a part of the fourth creative day's work. We do not know how long it took the light of the sun, after God created it, to reach the earth, nor do we know the length of the first three creative days. But the six days of creation are all summed up as one day—"the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens" c.

In Paul's reference to that seventh day when God ended his work, although writing to the Hebrews, he does not call it the Sabbath, but seems to refer to it as being *typical* of the "rest" that God offered to Israel, and classes it with "another day" of rest, of an *indefinite* length, that remains for the people of God. And further, he says that Israel was the *first* to whom this *rest of God* was preached, and in the wilderness was the time *when* it was "first preached." Now, if this be true, it was not first preached to Adam in Eden d.

But if that seventh day that God rested on was a day of twenty-four hours, he did not rest on that day *because* he had previously appointed it and sanctified a sabbath, and of course Adam did not *sabbatize* on *that* day, for it had not yet been appointed a sabbath. Adam was not created till the sixth day of creation. The seventh was his *first* full day of life. He had not worked six days, and the Sabbath is to succeed six days of labor. It is just as great a sin not to *labor six days* before we rest

the seventh, as to refuse to keep the seventh; just as much a transgression of the law, "*Six days shalt thou labor*" *e*. To refuse to keep the letter of that law, was to vitiate the spirit of it, and that was sin.

In harmony with this fabled idea of a Sabbath in Eden, it is imagined that our first parents retired to some quiet spot in the garden on the Sabbath, and there, in solemn seclusion, with reverence, did "remember the Sabbath day, to keep it *holy*," just as though they were sufficiently developed, mentally and morally, to discern between one day as being *more holy* than the others, or as though the distinctions between the *sacred* and the *profane* then existed and were by them recognized and appreciated. But, unfortunately for this idea, it is all imagination; such a condition of things had not obtained with Adam and Eve till they progressed sufficiently to eat of the fruit of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," for after eating of that fruit they became sensible of the fact that it was necessary to get some "fig leaves" and make aprons with which to clothe themselves. Eating of that fruit had such a wonderful effect on their mental powers and developed them so that God said, "Behold the man is *become* as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth *from* the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken" *f*. Now we have no evidence that Adam was permitted to remain in the garden of Eden over another seventh day after partaking of the fruit, and these facts show plainly that the idea of a *Sabbath institution* for man in *Eden* is not correct.

The Bible says that *after*, and *because* God had rested on the seventh day of the creative cycle, he blessed and sanctified that day; but *how long after* we are not told

in the book of Genesis, and hence we look elsewhere for this information. The first time the injunction to observe the Sabbath was given, was to Israel *after* their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. This is the *exact* fact, so far as the Bible record shows. We pass over the patriarchal age as nothing is found in the record of those times pertaining to the Sabbath, and, arriving at the waters of Marah along with the children of Israel, and being camped there, with no water that they could drink, they "murmured against Moses," and "he cried unto the Lord; and the Lord shewed him a tree, which, when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet. *There he made for them a statute and an ORDINANCE, and there he proved them*" *g*. The Lord informed Moses what this "statute" and "ordinance" was that he *there made* to prove them with; but Israel went on to Elim, and from Elim they "came to the wilderness of Sin," on the fifteenth day of the second month after leaving Egypt. At Sin they murmured for bread, and here the Lord sent the manna, and gave certain regulations about the daily gathering of it, to "*prove them, whether they*" would walk in *his law*, or no *h*. No law seems to have been specified by Moses till the twenty-first day of the second month, and then, when, on the sixth day, the people gathered twice as much as on either of the previous five days, the "rulers of the congregation came and told Moses," and he then informed them what *the Lord had said*, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord." . . . "See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath" *i*. Then Israel being informed what the "statute" and "ordinance" was, that God had made *for them*, that he might "*prove them,*" . . . "rested on the seventh day" *j*. This narrative unlocks to the understanding this statement of our Savior: "And he said

unto them [Pharisees], The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" *k*, as to the place *where*, the time *when*, and the people for *whom*, the Sabbath ordinance was made. This "ordinance," like the Pass-over, afterward became a part of the national code; was the *sign* of the covenant made at Sinai, and a *memorial* of the deliverance of Israel from their rigorous servitude in Egypt and was attended by the grandest series of wonders of the Divine hand ever seen displayed *l*.

Having taken a review of the assumptions underlying the position of those holding to the perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath, viz., that *that* Sabbath was instituted in Eden, and that it is therefore a memorial of the creation, or of God's rest; also the assumption that the decalogue is God's perfect law, the acme of all moral law, and is *therefore* immutable and eternally perpetual and unchangeable, and found them to be simply taking for granted the things that ought to be proved, and the very points for which no Bible proof exists, we now submit the following: The assertion that the decalogue is the moral, immutable law, and therefore *perpetual*, implies that that part of the law not contained in the ten commandments and that was (as is admitted) abolished and not perpetual, was not perfect nor moral, and that God gave a law to Israel that was not moral! Yet notwithstanding this anomalous position, our Savior found two divine commands in the law (and not found in the ten) that gave to the ten whatever moral effect they exerted or possessed, and on which they depended, and were therefore "*the great*" commandments in the law, viz.: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is *the first and great* commandment. And the second *is like unto it*, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" *m*. By this statement of Christ, we learn, not only that "the great" commandments of the law were found elsewhere than in the decalogue, but also that he recognized that the law, in its entirety, was a *unity*, and not *divided*, as to its moral and ceremonial phases.

The phrases, "Law of the Lord," or "of God, and "law of Moses," do not imply two distinct and separate laws, the one moral and the other ceremonial. The law given of God to Israel through Moses is all *one law*, as a *code*. It was ordained for, and applied to, a government that was at the same time *civil* and *religious*—a union of church and state—and hence it is that the decalogue, the fundamental basis, the constitution of the code of law, contained four obligations relating to the service of God, and six that pertained to the relation of man to his fellows. This law that constituted Israel a "kingdom of priests," is, by the apostle James, called "the royal law," and included the ten commandments: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law" *n*. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, and *if* there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" *o*.

This law required that a man only love *his neighbor*, for "he that loveth another, hath fulfilled the law." But

m Matt. 22: 37-40.

n James 2: 8-11.

o Rom. 13: 9.

James desired the Saints to conform to a law higher yet than that "royal law" in moral culture, more wealthy in spiritual endowments; one which did not limit their charitable services to *neighbors only*, but a law involving this principle, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them [only] which love you, what thank have ye? for *sinner*s also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But *love your enemies*, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" *p*. And while this is the law and the prophets, it is to be noted that it is not the doctrine of the ten commandment division of it. And hence it is that James cites us at once to "the perfect law of liberty," exhorting us to "so speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty" *q*.

Thus the apostle recognizes the *unity* of the law—"royal law"—and does not appear to know anything whatever of this *artificial division* of the covenant God made with Israel at Sinai, which division is made, evidently, in the interests of the seventh-day Sabbath theory. The world of mankind will be judged at the last day by "the law of liberty"—the gospel of Christ—that which makes men "*free from the law of sin and death*" *r*.

Luke recognized that the law which was called by Jewish custom "the law of Moses," was "the law of the

p Luke 6: 31-36. *q* James 2: 12. *r* Acts 17: 31; Rom. 2: 16;
Heb. 10: 28, 29.

Lord," "the law," and was a unity *s*. Likewise our Savior called that law, "the law given of Moses," as also "*the law*" *t*, and quoted from any portion of it suitable to the case in hand, as may be seen by referring to Matthew, chapter five, calling it *all* by the simple title, "the law."

The modern idea, then, of *dividing* the law, designating the divisions, *moral*, and *ceremonial*, respectively, is unauthorized either by the Bible or any inspired precedent. And until its abrogation, according to the original design, Christ enjoined strict obedience to *all* its requirements, including the "least" commandment, the jots and the tittles *u*; nor did he follow the example of those who "have been *partial* in the law." (Mal. 2: 9).

s Luke 2: 22-24; 10: 25-27. *t* John 7: 19. *u* Matt. 5: 18, 19;
8: 1-4; 15: 1-6; 23: 2.

CHAPTER IV.

ABROGATION OF THE LAW.

We now pass on to notice briefly the end, or abrogation of the law, as a code, in order to the establishment of the "better covenant, which was established upon better promises." For, says Paul, "if that first covenant had been *faultless*, then should no place have been sought for the second" *v.* "Everlasting righteousness" awaited the advent of the Messiah for its introduction. (Dan. 9: 24). "A law" should "proceed from Him;" "and the isles" waited for "*his law*." He was to be, and is, "for a covenant of the people, for a light to the gentiles."—Isa. 51: 4; 42: 4-6. "Behold the former things are come to pass, and *new things do I declare*; before they spring forth I tell you of them."—verse 9. Thus did the prophets view beforehand, by the Spirit of Christ which was in them, the bringing in of the "better hope," by grace and truth.

If, then, the Messiah came that we might have life, and that, too, because the law could not give life, and, therefore everlasting righteousness was not introduced by the law; and, also, inasmuch as the inheritance of the Saints is not of the law, what was the *purpose* of the law?—"Wherefore then serveth the law?" Answer:—"It was added because of transgressions, *till* the seed should come to whom the promise was made, and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." And "knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous

man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; *according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust*" *w*. Because of transgression it was necessary that a law be made and given to the children of Israel, the *penalties* of which should not be deferred to "the world to come" for visitation on the transgressor; hence the law was *added* to the "promise" made to Abraham, which promise embodied the gospel preached to him, namely, that in Abraham and his seed, [Christ], all nations shall be blessed *x*. This added law was "ordained by *angels* in the hand of a mediator." The angel that appeared to Moses in Mount Horeb called himself "the Lord God of your fathers" *y*. Again, "And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way. And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them" *z*. "And the angel of his presence saved them."—Isa. 63: 9. The explanation to thus using the term "angel" interchangably with the name of God is thus given: "Behold, *I send* an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, *for he will not pardon your transgressions; for my NAME is in him*. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that *I speak*, then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries" *a*. The *authority* of the angel was the authority of God; and the *voice of the angel* was to Israel

w 1 Tim. 1: 9-11.*x* Gal. 3: 8-19.*y* Ex. 3: 2, 14.*z* Ex. 13: 21.*a* Ex. 23: 20-22.

the voice of God. In the light of the explanation here given, the following is of force: "This is he [Moses], that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him *in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers*; who received the lively oracles to give unto us." . . . "Who have received the law by the disposition of angels and have not kept it" *b*. Of the words spoken by the angel in Mount Sinai it is said: "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with *a great voice*; and *he added no more*. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me" *c*. Paul says of this law, "It was *added* because of transgressions *till* the seed should come to whom the promise was made." . . . "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded *all* under sin; that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto *the faith* which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be *justified* by [the] faith. *But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster*" *d*. Such is the apostle Paul's explanation of the *purpose*, and *duration*, of the law given to Israel, (that law including the decalogue), and, therefore, the seventh-day Sabbath.

Again: The law given to Israel, including the decalogue, is called "the covenant," and "the words of the covenant." Further: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: *for after the tenor of these words* I have made a *covenant* with thee and with Israel. And

b Acts 7: 38, 53.*c* Deut. 5: 22.*d* Gal. 3: 19-25.

he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of *the covenant, the ten commandments*' *d*. "And if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my *covenant*." Here we learn that "the covenant" included *all* the commandments, the statutes and judgment. The tables of stone upon which were written the ten commandments, are called "the two tables of the covenant" *e*. And the *book* wherein were written by Moses, the Lord's "commandments and his statutes" and *all* "the words of this covenant," was called "the book of the covenant" *f*, as also the "book of the law;" and the *Ark* wherein the tables of the covenant and the book of the covenant were deposited by the priests, was called "the ark of the covenant" *g*. To engage in idolatry and thus violate the second commandment, was to break the covenant: "Then will they turn unto other gods, and serve them, and provoke me, and break my covenant" *h*. Likewise to "covet" was a transgression of "the covenant of the Lord" *i*. To observe the passover, was to keep the covenant of the Lord—"Keep the passover unto the Lord your God, as it is written in the book of this covenant" *j*. When Israel, as a nation, broke the covenant of the Lord as found written in the book of the law, God visited the iniquities of the fathers on the children, and this peculiar procedure, is based on the second commandment of the decalogue: "Go ye, enquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found; for great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against *us*, because our fathers have not hearkened unto

d Ex. 34: 27, 28.*e* Dent. 9: 15.*f* 2 Kings 23: 3, 21; 22: 8.*g* Dent. 32: 26.*h* Dent. 31: 20.*i* Josh. 7: 15, 21.*j* 2 Kings 23: 21.

the words of this book, to do according unto all that which is written concerning us" *k*. Rebellious Israel broke the covenant of the Lord in allowing the uncircumcised in heart and flesh to minister in the sanctuary at the altar *l*: "And the king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of *this covenant* that were *written in this book*. And all the people stood to the covenant" *m*. To refuse to liberate the Hebrew servant, in the year of release, was to transgress the covenant of God, made with Israel when he "brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen" *n*. While the typical features of the covenant were of great importance, there were other matters pertaining thereto that were far more important, yet these less important matters were part of the covenant, or law *o*.

Having thus briefly summarized, under the term "covenant," that we may understand what the Bible writers meant when referring to it; and having found that the first covenant included the entire law given to Israel, including the decalogue, with *all* the commandments, statutes, and judgements, we can better comprehend just what was superseded by "the new covenant;" and we have found that those writers recognized the "covenant" and "the law" as being identical, and that it is a *unity*. By the law the service of God was regulated, in all its requirements, and by the law was the relations of society regulated, and by the law was the ministry constituted; "For *the law* maketh men high priests." Now, with these considerations fully before us, the following is of force: "For there is verily a disannulling [abol-

k 2 Kings 22: 13. *l* Ezek. 44: 6-24. *m* 2 Kings 23: 3. *n* Jer. 34: 13.

o Hos. 6: 6, 7; Matt. 23: 23.

ishing] of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God" *p*. This statement of the apostle indicates a *formal abrogation* of the "first covenant"—"testament"—"the law" as a code, giving the reason *why*;—it was unprofitable; it could not, in so far as man's eternal welfare was concerned, "make him that did the service perfect, as *pertaining to the conscience*." The old covenant (the law) was "unprofitable" as a moral and spiritual code when compared with, and in the light of, the glorious gospel that superseded it, and, in that regard, rendered it useless. Hence "it vanished away."

p Heb. 7: 18, 19, 28.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FIRST COVENANT WAS FAULTY.

“For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah” *q*. We have cited evidence to show that the covenant comprised the entire law as a *code*—decatalogue, rites and ceremonies—with whatever degree of morality attached to them; also that the ten commandments, when separated from the rest of the law, is inoperative, and absolutely useless, because they lack the elements necessary to their execution. In this division of the subject we present some additional considerations illustrative of the statement above quoted, as follows: That element in the law representing God “visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children” *r*, and that gave rise to the proverb in Israel, “The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children’s teeth are set on edge,” is “found fault with,” and at the introduction of the new covenant it ceased; for, “every one shall die for his own iniquity, every man that *eateth* the sour grape, *his* teeth shall be set on edge.” The occasion for using this proverb in Israel is admitted, (Ezek. 18: 1-3), but in “those days” of “the new covenant” they should use it no more *s*. Again: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of *old time*, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment” *t*. Under that law a man might hate his

q Heb. 8: 7, 8. *r* Ex. 20: 5. *s* Jer. 31: 29, 30. *t* Matt 5: 21.

brother, be angry with him, bring charges of vanity or of being a fool, and yet no conviction of sin could be had till the act of murder or killing had been done. But under the *new covenant* this law supersedes it: "But I say unto you, that whosoever is *angry* with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, [vain fellow], shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire" *u*. Moreover, according to the requirement of the "better testament," when a man so acts as to *offend* his brother in the least, his offering or service to God is not acceptable, till reconciliation is made *v*. And this: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:" But as a moral and spiritual—a *gospel*—precept, its great lack is plainly seen by noticing closely that which annuls it and takes its place as gospel law, viz.: "But I say unto you, That whosoever *looketh* on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already *in his heart*" *w*. Likewise the following: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Thus "the law" allowed the course of human nature. A man could resist [retaliate] evil, and "hate" his "enemy." It also admitted of revenge. Nor is anything herein to be construed to contravene the letter or spirit of the decalogue, for no violation of the law in these things can be shown by it, and by it they are allowable so long as it stands unrepealed as a law. But, under the law of Christ, we are to "resist not evil;" "turn the other cheek also;" "love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you" *x*.

By the old covenant no one was guilty of the sin of

murder till he had killed some one. But, under the new, “whoso *hateth* his brother is a murderer” *y*. The difficulty with the law, then, as here brought out, is, it was too “*weak*” to “*condemn sin*” in its inception in the heart, and it was therefore necessary for Christ to establish the law condemning evil in the conception of man: “For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man” *z*.

But we notice further, that, in a gospel sense, the covenant or law contained not “*the righteousness of faith*,” and the “Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness” by doing “the works of the law,” nevertheless attained to “the righteousness of faith” by obeying the gospel, while the Jews who sought after righteousness (or the law of righteousness) “*by the works of the law*,” failed *a*. “The law is not of faith”—Gal. 3: 12. “But now the righteousness of God *without the law* is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets” *b*.

Justification to life comes not by the law; for, “*by the deeds* of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.” “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith *without* the deeds of the law.” “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ” *c*. “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, *from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses*” *d*.

Nor will the future inheritance of the Saints be obtained by the law, “For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, *through the law*, but through the righteousness of

y 1 John 3: 14, 15; 4: 20. *z* Rom. 8: 2, 3; Matt. 15: 19.

a Rom. 9: 30, 32. *b* Rom. 3: 21. *c* Rom. 3: 20-23;

Gal. 2: 16. *d* Acts 13: 39.

faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise of none effect." Again: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise" *e*. By a careful comparison of the epistle to the Romans with that to the Galatians, it will be seen that the same law, or covenant, is referred to. The identity of idea is plainly proven by the foregoing scriptures from the two letters quoted. The law commented on by Paul in Romans is admitted by the most zealous advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath, to be the law including the decalogue, and is therefore the law "received by the disposition of angels"—"ordained by angels." It is the law that, in the *days of Moses* "entered that the offence might abound," and that was given of God to Israel "four hundred and thirty years" *after* the covenant of the gospel with Abraham; and that was "added" to the gospel (which was offered to the Jews at the exodus) *f*, "*till* the seed should come." It "was the schoolmaster to bring" Israel unto Christ that *they*, with the Gentiles, might be justified by faith. "But after that faith [the faith revealed—the gospel] is come, we are *no longer under a schoolmaster*" *g*. It could not justify from sin; is not of faith; does not produce the righteousness of God, in a gospel sense; cannot constitute us inheritors in Christ, nor can it give life. But it worked "wrath." "For I was alive without *the law* once: but when *the commandment* came, *sin revived*, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death" *h*. It is "the letter" that "killeth;" "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones" *i*.

In using the phrases "commandment," and "the law," interchangeably, when referring to the law in the

e Rom. 4: 13, 14; Gal. 3: 18. *f* Heb. 4: 2. *g* Rom. 5: 12-20;
Gal. 3: 17-25. *h* Rom. 7: 9, 10. *i* 2 Cor. 3: 6, 7.

foregoing statement, Paul is but following divine precedent. The term "commandment" is used to comprehend *all the law given to Israel* *j*. Peter calls "the way of righteousness" . . . "the holy *commandment*;" and he is evidently referring to the gospel in all its comprehensiveness *k*. And with this additional fact before us, as we study the contrast between the law and the gospel, "the word spoken by angels," and the "great salvation" which "began to be spoken by the Lord," is graphically set forth by the writer of the letter to the Hebrews in this inspired statement: "For there is verily a disannulling of *the commandment* going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. *For the law* made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope did, by which we draw nigh to God." This enforces, with all the power of an *inspirational* declaration, the *abolishment of the law*, and doubly convinces us of its abrogation, relegating it to the domain of civil governments, where the penalties for its violation may still be, and are, administered, so far as the elements that it possessed relating to civil matters are concerned; (1 Tim. 1: 9). And the gospel, as a code of moral and regenerative principles and religious guidance, as, "the law of the Lord [that] is perfect *converting the soul*," takes its place. For, "In that he saith, A new covenant, *he hath made the first old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" *l*.

Lest I be thought somewhat *harsh* in this exhibit of "fault" found with the decalogue, I quote the following statements found in "Thoughts on the Revelation," by Elder U. Smith, third edition, a work approved by Seventh-Day Adventists generally. It reads: "The first three commandments mention the word God; but we cannot tell from these who is meant; for there are multi-

j Ex. 25: 22; 34: 32. *k* 2 Peter 2: 21. *l* Heb. 7: 18; 8: 13.

tudes of objects to which this term is applied. There are 'gods many and lords many,' as the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 8:5. Passing over the fourth commandment for the time being, the fifth contains the words Lord and God, but does not define them; and the remaining five precepts do not contain the name of God at all. Now what shall be done? With that portion of the law which we have examined, it would be impossible to convict the grossest idolater of sin. The worshiper of images could say, This idol is my god, his name is God, and these are his precepts. The worshiper of the heavenly bodies could also say, The sun is my God, and I worship him according to this law. Thus, without the fourth commandment, the decalogue is null and void so far as it pertains to enforcing the worship of the true God" *m*. The above is stronger, perhaps, than any imperfection we have noted in the decalogue, and is an admission that *nine out of the ten* commandments, are "null and void so far as it pertains to enforcing the worship of the true God" is concerned. But, when the fourth commandment is included with the nine, does the decalogue then "enforce the worship of the true God"? The first two commandments *prohibit* bowing to or *worshipping idols*, but *do not enjoin worship at all*. The fourth commandment enjoins the keeping of the seventh day of the week "holy," but it contains not one word as to *what* it is, or *how* "to keep it holy," except in one regard, and that is, "in it thou shalt not do *any work*." It does not *enjoin* or define any manner of worship whatsoever, unless the suspension of all action be "holy," and is worship to God. The decalogue, including the fourth commandment, does not enjoin prayer, assembling for song or preaching service, says not a word about giving alms, does not once mention charity, contains not the remotest

hint about rewards for right doing, either in this world or that to come, or punishments either. But why prolong this examination of the decalogue?

God chose Israel as a nation, and for a purpose. That purpose could not be accomplished through them as a *nation* without law—a law suited to their condition as a nation among nations on the earth. That law was the law given to them at Sinai, in *all its entirety*. The destiny designed of God in them under the law, was attained at the coming of the Messiah, through whom God gave the gospel through which “*life and immortality*” is “brought to light.” And the destiny that God designed in the nation having been accomplished, the end obtained, the law that was ordained and suited to the peculiar condition of Israel and designed to bring about the desired end being now no longer of use, as a code, reached an *end* and passed away. And so the Savior when he came announced: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets. *I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.*” “The law,” as here treated of by the Savior, includes the regulation on divorcement, and also the statutes on justice—“an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth”—as the connection shows *n*. Jesus came to *fulfill* that law, even *all* of it, and the prophets too. The word “fulfill” applies to the law just in the same sense in which it applies to the prophets. It is admitted that Jesus fulfilled the ceremonial department or division of the law, in the sense of *completing* it, and therefore abolished it, brought it to an end. A part of Jesus’ mission then, was to bring the law to an end, as a religious code, and establish the gospel. If the word “fulfill” as applied to the ceremonial law means “to complete; to bring to a close, end, finish,” as defined by Webster, Greenfield and others, could the same word, used by the same speaker

(not in the same connection merely, *but at one and the same time*) mean something else when used respecting the other portions of the same law?

When slavery, as an institution in the United States, was abolished, of necessity all laws then existing and designed to regulate it, were ever after useless and fulfilled. So it was with the Israelitish institution. Jesus came to bring the "commonwealth" of Israel to an end, and of course the law that governed that commonwealth was no longer of use. But while Jesus taught the disciples that he came to fulfill the law, he also taught that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass," than "one tittle of the law to fail" *o*, "*till all be fulfilled.*" This latter statement of our Savior shows that he understood that all the law would, in the future from the opening of his ministry, "be fulfilled," completed, ended, its purpose being served. So when the work was done he said: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me" *p*. At the cross, then, was the law given to Moses fulfilled, giving way to the "perfect law," the "law of liberty," the "better hope," the "better covenant," that was "*based on better promises.*" "For he is our peace, who hath made both [Jew and Gentile] one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" *q*. "The law of commandments contained in ordinances" that is here said to be abolished, is, in the Hebrew letter, thus referred to: "Then, verily, the *first*

covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary" *r.* In that sanctuary was the ark, in which was "the tables of the covenant." But, by all that appertained to that first covenant, the sanctuary and all that was therein, "the way into the holiest" according to the gospel, "was not made manifest while the first tabernacle was yet standing," hence the *service* was only "imposed on them *until the time of reformation,*" then "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and, having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect to an holy day, or of the new moon, or the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ"*s.* By the phrase "*handwriting of ordinances,*" Paul speaks quite peculiarly. He does not here say "the law of ordinances," or "commandments." Some special authority must be referred to as attaching to this "handwriting of ordinances;" and after careful consideration of the matter I have concluded that reference is here made to the law, not only as *copied* by Moses and others after him, but to the authority belonging to it by virtue of having been *originally written* by the hand of God, or his angel, thus: "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was *the writing of God*, graven upon the tables"*t.* "And the statutes, *and the ordinances*, AND the law, *and the commandment*, which *he wrote* for you, ye shall observe to do forever more; and ye shall not fear other gods"*u.* "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone, *and a law, and commandments*

r Heb. 9: 1, 8-10. *s* Col. 2: 14-17. *t* Ex. 34: 16. *u* 2 Kings 17: 37.

which *I have written*; that thou mayest teach them" *v*. By these texts we learn that God wrote "*a law and commandments*," also "*the statutes, and the ordinances*," for Israel. And, surely, no one would controvert the fact that these, all together, constitute "*the handwriting of ordinances*," nor deny that they include "*the law of commandments*"—the ten commandments with the *Sabbath thereof*.

At the cross, then, the law, including all these statutes, ordinances, holy days, and commandments, as a code of *religious* law, was "annulled," "fulfilled," "broken down," "taken out of the way," "abolished," "blotted out," "nailed to the cross," "cast out," and Christ became "*the end of the law* for righteousness to them that believe" *w*.

As long as the law was in force, not only our Savior, but the prophets also, enjoined the most strict observance of all its rites, ceremonies, ordinances and commandments. This no one who believes that the Bible contains the word of the Lord questions in the least. A few examples are here cited. Moses says: "Ye shall walk in *all* the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you, that ye may live" *x*. Isaiah exhorts Israel to keep the Sabbath holy that their "burnt offerings" at the altar, and "their sacrifices," may be acceptable to God, and they be fed "with the heritage of Jacob" their father *y*. For the disobedience of Israel, Jeremiah denounced against them "*all* the words of this covenant, which" God commanded them to do, "but they did them not" *z*. When Israel had "*forgotten the law of their God*," and failed to keep it as he designed, perverting the "*holy offerings*" ordained of God *a*, he said he would forget her children, and "also cause all her mirth

v Ex. 24: 12. *w* Rom. 10: 4. *x* Deut. 5: 32. *y* Isa. 56: 1-6;
58: 13, 14. *z* Jer. 11: 8. *a* 2 Chron. 35: 13.

to cease, her *feast days*, her new moons, and *her sabbaths*, and all her *solemn feasts*" *b*.

On this subject Isaiah addresses Israel touching their apostasy and the ultimate cessation of the requirements of the law given of God to them: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto *the law of your God*, ye people of Gommorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread *my courts*? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination also unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even your *solemn meeting*" *c*.

It is well to notice that both Hosea and Isaiah connect the ordinances, and the Sabbaths here referred to, with "the law of your God," when thus addressing Israel; and by reference to the book of Leviticus *d*, we discover that "the feasts" which Israel were to "proclaim to be holy convocations," to be "*the feasts of the Lord*," were, first, "the seventh day is the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation;" second, "the Lord's passover," on "the fourteenth day of the first month," followed by "seven days" of unleavened bread, including two first-day sabbaths, and an offering daily of beasts; third, the "statute" of the offering of the first fruits of harvest; fourth, Pentecost, with all attendant offerings; fifth, the "memorial" of "trumpets," the first day of the seventh month; sixth, atonement day; and seventh, the feast of tabernacles. And "*beside the sabbaths of the Lord*," the seven days harvest-feast. Thus we see the *Lord* includes the seventh-

b Hos. 2: 11; 4: 6. *c* Isa. 1: 10-13. *d* Lev. chapter 23.

day Sabbath, and its offerings, in the list that he inspired the prophets to predict would cease.

Paul says they ceased at the cross. The same power or authority that ordained the law, had the right to abrogate it. But so long as the law was binding on Israel, Malachi, with the other prophets, exhorted them to "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments" *e*. So also did Christ *f*. And while it is a fact that Jesus observed the law, to the completion of it, he also taught and exemplified the higher law—the gospel—which *included and retained all the moral and religious elements found in "the law,"* and these were generally found in that higher law, on which hung all the law and the prophets. That this is true, is seen by the comparison of what he taught his disciples as *his* law, with "the law," as in Matthew chapter five, and Luke chapter six, etc. His law made the hatred of a brother "murder;" fasting to be seen of men "hypocrisy;" "*covetousness*," to be "*idolatry*;" and a lustful look, "adultery." To love ones "neighbor" *only*, made one no better than other "sinners." His law forbids profanity. The decalogue does not. His law makes the "*thoughts*" of evil doing, sin. The one is the law of COERCION; the gospel is the LAW OF LOVE and *incentive*—love to God and man. "The *goodness of God*" leadeth to right doing, and "thinketh no evil." Christ, the Redeemer, having come to usher into effect the law of the reign of peace, "the law of faith," of righteousness and truth and grace, in fulfillment of the promises made to the faithful long before the times of the law *g*, accomplished the work assigned him. He was the second Adam—"last Adam." In Adam the first, the head of the natural race, under "the law," "all died." In "the last Adam," the representative head of

e Mal. 4: 4. *f* Mat. 5: 19; 8: 4; Luke 5: 14; 22: 7, 8. *g* John 8: 56.

the regenerated race—under his law all are to be made alive *h*. The law of “grace and truth” having been introduced, established and ratified by the Savior’s death and glorious resurrection, and by his death “*the ministration of death*, written and engraven in stones,” having been “slain” *i*, it is thence that, after the cross, the law *is no more enjoined*.

The new covenant being established, and embracing “the law of the spirit of life,” those who avail themselves of the high and holy privileges of that divine institution are no longer bound by the terms of the old covenant, are no longer under obligation to observe the *letter* of the law, as a religious guide, “But now we are delivered from the law, that being *dead* [slain] wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter” *j*. And hence it is that Paul affirms the ministry of “the new testament,” were not constituted ministers of “the letter,” a “slain,” a “*dead*” law! A law that while in force killed only—“the letter killeth.” “But our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament” *k*.

By the resurrection of Christ, and the establishment of the new covenant, all who accept Christ as the Savior, are begotten to the hope of living again, in endless glory. A kingdom of “righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,” “a spiritual house,” “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people,” “to offer up spiritual sacrifices” to God, and “acceptable to Jesus Christ,” was established, “to the intent that now *unto the principalities and powers* in heavenly places *might be known by the church* the manifold wisdom of God.” Because that “*the law* having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never

h John 1: 4; Rom. 5: 17-19; 1 Cor. 15: 45, 46. *i* 2 Cor 3: 7;

Eph. 2: 15, 16. *j* Rom. 7: 6. *k* 2 Cor 3: 6, 7.

with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. *For then would they not have ceased to be offered?* . . . because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sin" *j*. "Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offerings for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein, *which are offered by the law.*" Hereby we learn that it was "the law" that cast the "shadow" of "good things to come," and that the "offerings for sin" were "by the law." When the *substance* or "body," the gospel is reached, the types or shadow are no longer of use. And because the law could not, in part or in whole, "take away sins," but only memorialize it, God had no "pleasure therein," and therefore annulled it. The shadow will remain as long as the law casting it remains binding. Please remember that "the law" here referred to is "the first testament" and "the first covenant" of the previous chapter of the letter to the Hebrews; and the covenant, as we have already learned, has for its basis the ten commandments. Moreover, it is *assumed* that the decalogue is the supreme, unchangeable, eternal law of God, and, that the ceremonial law was the law "added because of transgression *till* the seed should come to whom the promise was made," and that *it* was done away by Christ, leaving the decalogue still of force, and that therefore the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is now binding. So far as "burnt offerings" and attendant ceremonies are concerned, are not the intimations of the Bible more favorable to the idea that they existed before the decalogue was formulated at Sinai? All the patriarchs who lived *prior* to the exodus, so far as history shows, offered typical sacrifices, beginning with Abel. And further; if the ceremonial law is "the law" that "entered, that

the offence might abound," as stated in Romans, chapter five, it is *the law* that is afterward, in the same letter, said by Paul to be designed to cause sin to "*become exceeding sinful,*" and also the law that is *holy, just and good!* *l.* That law by which comes "the knowledge of sin;" that law, of which Paul further argues, "Yea, we establish the law" *l.* But this position could not be admitted for a moment by the seventh-day Sabbath advocate, for by so doing he admits that the law containing the Sabbath is abolished. But such is the logical deduction from their chosen premise. The fact is, their attempt to *divide* the law by that line of reasoning is solely an assumption, and the attempt to prove the perpetuity of the decalogue thereby fails. That the apostle Paul does refer to the same law in the Roman letter he does in that to the Galatians is evident, for he *quotes* the same text in both epistles thus: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of *the law*, that the man that doeth those things shall live in them" *m.* "And *the law* is not of faith, but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." *n.* Can the same word "law" found in the same text, when used by the same writer, on two different occasions be construed to signify that two distinct laws are meant? More than this, when the prophet Ezekiel reproveth the children of Israel for not observing that same law referred to by Moses and Paul, he included not only the "statutes" and the "judgments," but the *Lord's* "*sabbath*" also *o.* Thus does the testimony of Ezekiel and Paul concur in applying the statement of Moses to "*the law*" as a *whole*, statutes, judgments, and that which the Lord calls "*my sabbaths.*" And the Holy Ghost was the inspirer of all three.

l Rom. 5: 20; 7: 12, 13. *l* chap. 3: 31. *m* Rom. 10: 5.

n Gal. 3: 12; Lev. 18: 5. *o* Ezekiel 20: 21.

Of the law thus identified as including the Lord's Sabbaths, Paul says to those in the new covenant, "For ye are not under the law, but under grace." What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid" *p*. And why? Answer—"Wherefore, my brethren, *ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ*, that ye should *be married to another*, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth *fruit unto God*."

p Rom. 6: 14, 15; 7: 4.

CHAPTER VII.

THE WEEKLY SABBATH.

It is denied that Paul referred to the weekly Sabbath when affirming the "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances," because it is classed with the meats and drinks and "the new moons," etc. But in doing this the apostle but follows the precedents of the prophets and *authorized* teachers of the law, as the following references conclusively show. Moses, through whom the law was given, so classes the Sabbath of the law, as we have seen *q*: "And he said, Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? it is neither *new moon*, nor *sabbath*" *r*. Solomon says, "And for the burnt offerings morning and evening, on the *sabbaths*, and on the *new moons*, and on the solemn feasts of the Lord our God. This is an *ordinance* forever to Israel" *s*. "And to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord *in the sabbaths*, in the new moons, and ON THE SET FEASTS" *t*. Here "the set feasts" include every legal Sabbath except the weekly Sabbath, and hence "the sabbaths" of the text are the weekly Sabbaths. For the writer to say "the sabbaths," meaning the *annual Sabbath*, and then in the same breath to use the phrase "set feasts" with reference to the SAME days, would be a species of tautology hardly chargeable to an inspired historian, unless the one was used as an *expletive* of the other. Such is not the case here. But further: "Even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the

q Lev. 23: 3, 5, 16, etc. *r* 2 Kings 4: 23. *s* 2 Chron. 2: 4.

t 1 Chron. 23: 31.

year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles" *u*. "And the burnt offerings for the sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, as it is written in *the law of the Lord*" *v*. The distinction between the weekly Sabbaths, and the *set* or *solemn* feasts—annual Sabbath—is by these texts plainly indicated, yet these writers, like the apostle Paul, associate the weekly Sabbaths *with* the new moons, and set feasts.

The prophet Amos attaches the same degree of sacredness to the new moon as he does to the Sabbath, saying, "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat" *w*. Likewise Isaiah, placing it with the Sabbath among the memorials of the age to come: "And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord" *x*. And so the apostle, in the Colossian letter, following the foregoing examples, associates the weekly Sabbaths of "the law of the Lord" with the other holy days, "*new moons*," meats and drinks, affirming that all these were blotted out, "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross," because it "was *against* us," and "contrary to us" *y*.

In what respect was the law "against," and "contrary to us?" It was *national*, enacted especially for the nation brought out of Egypt, "out of the house of bondage," and more especially was the decalogue so designed *z*. Being national, it was a civil—ecclesiastical law. This no one will deny. In its very nature and intention it could apply to no other people, seeing no other nation was so brought out of Egyptian bondage. It is the "title" of any given law, or code of law, that determines

u 2 Chron. 8: 13. *v* 2 Chron. 31: 3. *w* Amos 8: 5. *x* Isa. 66: 23.

y Col. 2: 14-17. *z* Ex 20: 2; Deut. 5: 6, 15.

its application. God, who brought Israel out of Egypt, "out of the house of bondage," foreknew the future conditions of his chosen people and what he designed to accomplish through them, and so determined and suited his enactments for them—"from his right hand went a fiery law for them, . . . even the *inheritance of the congregation of Jacob*" *b*. And thus was it designated that Israel was *the chosen* people, "above all people that" were "upon the face of all the earth" *c*. It will be well to note that Moses, when making this statement, was instructing Israel with special reference to the principles of the decalogue against idolatry. Now, Israel being so chosen of God above *all other* people, were, by all the circumstances and the peculiar law given to them, "*separated*" . . . "*from all other people.*" "For thou didst separate them *from among all the* people of the earth, to be thine inheritance, as *thou spakest* by the hand of Moses thy servant, when thou broughtest our fathers out of Egypt, O, Lord, God" *d*.

By the law given to Israel was the distinction between them and the Gentile world maintained, and hence it became necessary for Christ to *nullify* the *cause* of this distinction—separation—that was created *at the exodus* and that discriminated "against" all other people, and thus take this "*middle wall of partition* between us" down.

Another respect in which the law was "against" us, and "contrary" to us was, that so long as it remained in force there could be no such thing as *the forgiveness of sin*; hence, *repentance* was not an element of the law. It was a law of absolute justice, without any intermingling of mercy. When a *willful* or "presumptuous" sin was committed, the law was *inexorable*; the sinner *must* be put to death. "Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment, that soul

shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him"^e. If the sinner did "the like to *any one* of" the things contrary to the law, he was "guilty of all," his blood should be upon him^f. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses"^g.

When the nation of Israel or any individual of it sinned *ignorantly*, the law provided a *substitute*—the life of a beast, instead of the life of the transgressor—and an atonement was thus made in a typical sense, or, in a figure. But in this there was no more of *real* forgiveness than the *transfiguration* of Christ upon the mountain was the second advent of Christ in glory—in *fact*. Those typical offerings but *memorialized* sin, annually, pointing forward to the great antitypical sacrifice to be offered for the race in the person of Jesus Christ, God's Son, "who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," to "*purge your conscience from dead works* to serve the living God. And *for this cause* he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, *for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance"^h. "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is *not possible* that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, *but a body hast thou prepared me*. . . . Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all"ⁱ.

The Israelites alone were under the law. The Gentile nations were not placed under its rule. Under it, as we

^e Num. 15: 30, 31. ^f Ezek. 18: 10-13; James 2: 10. ^g Heb. 10: 28.

^h Heb. 9: 14, 15. ⁱ Heb. 10: 3-5, 9, 10.

have shown, there was no future rewards. Its penalty was death. It provided no remedy for sin in fact, but only in figure. Now it is proposed by the advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath to abolish that part of the law (the ceremonial) that provided for the substitution of the life of the beast for the sin of ignorance, which allowed the sinner the continuation of *this* life, and no more, and perpetuate the decalogue, which they affirm is perfect, have it incorporated into the new covenant; for by the new covenant, say they, or under it, God will write the ten commandments in the heart, instead of on the tables of stone, and thereby procure pardon for the transgression of it. If a circle be perfect, to *add* anything to it renders it imperfect. To add anything in any way to a perfect dollar according to the authorized standard, renders it useless. To add the ten commandments to the gospel would not change their *effects*, unless there was a change in their INTENTION by the Lawgiver. To assert that the ten commandments are the perfect and immutable moral law of *God*, and then say that their *intention*, *office*, or *effects*, under any circumstance whatever, *can be changed*, is a glaring inconsistency, and a contradiction in logic.

Now, we have seen that under the law (the law including the decalogue) the effects were temporal—on the one hand long life—on the other, *no remission*—but death. “without mercy,” Therefore to combine the decalogue, unchanged in any respect, whatever, with the gospel, will not alter its effects—reward and penalty—an iota. To make it of universal application is to bind its *effects* upon all nations. And, to make it a part of the new covenant—“the everlasting covenant”—would be to render its *intended* effects everlasting. And “as there is *no* man that sinneth not” *j*, “there is none that doeth good,”

no, *not one*" *k*, but *all* are under sin, and "the wages of sin is death;" there is therefore no salvation for anyone hereafter, so long therefore, as this immutable law of the unchangeable God is in force and unrepealed, *death only* awaits the race!

"But," say they, "God has transferred the commission of execution of the penalty, from men to the hands of the Savior, and from this age to the judgment day." Then the *original intention* of the unchangeable God in ordaining this *immutable law* was, that the Son should execute *hereafter* the penalty for breaking this law, and, that the penalty should be "*sorer*" *i* than is simply death here, at the hands of a fellow mortal. Then God varied just a trifle from the *original intention* in the establishment of the covenant with Israel at Sinai! *For under it man executed the penalty!* This position involves *three changes*. One in God, and two in his moral, perfect, *immutable law*! A change on his part with respect to the *time* of executing the penalty; a change *from man to his Son* in the execution of the penalty; also a change of the *degree of intensity* of the penalty, *with* the change of the time and agency of its execution! But to add to the penalty a "*sorer punishment*" than death at the hands of our fellows, is really a change of the penalty, and therefore a further *change of the law—the immutable law!!* Such are the logical conclusions deducible from the grounds offered us by the seventh-day Sabbath advocates.

As a constitutional *basis* to the commonwealth of Israel, in its intended place and time, it was "good," carrying on its bosom its just judgments, statutes and precepts, given of *God* to Israel; it was "holy" as a "schoolmaster" leading Israel up to Christ and "the narrow way;" enforcing its types and shadows it was "spiritual." But

so far as providing a remedy for sin was concerned, it provided none; hence when the Savior came he gradually and cautiously (among the Jews) introduced the long promised covenant of peace (the law of "*grace and truth*") that as gradually annulled the law (the first covenant), he living and dying under it. But in his death he struck it a fatal blow, slaying it and forever blotting it out, that the law wherein the remedy for sin was provided might be established; that, whereas sin abounded by reason of the Mosaic law, the law of faith and grace might much more abound.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE COVENANT—THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

In order to save the ten commandments from abolition *with* the covenant that was taken away, it is strenuously maintained that *they* are not in reality a part of the covenant made *with* Israel, and written in the book; that while the book contained the covenant made *with* Israel, the decalogue was God's *commanded* covenant *to* Israel; and that, therefore, the abrogation of the "first" covenant did not carry with it the ten commandments. We quote: "Concerning the term 'covenant' we must express our surprise that any should take so limited views of the subject as to conclude that God's covenant *commanded to them* by his own voice, is identical with that covenant or agreement *made with them* through Moses as the mediator"*j*. That this position is an *assumption*, and opposed to the Bible on this point, the following from Moses, the mediator of the covenant, demonstrates: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant *with thee and with Israel*. . . . And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments"*k*. "The Lord our God made a covenant *with us* in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, *but with us*, even us, who are all of us here alive this day"*l*. By this statement Moses refers to the *place where*, and the

j Signs of the Times, Editorial, Aug. 10 h, 1882, p. 351. *k Ex. 34: 27, 28.*

l Dent. 5: 2, 3.

"time" when, this covenant was made, also with *whom*; and then to show what he meant by the "covenant" he proceeds to identify the decalogue with it, as an integral part thereof, by quoting the ten commandments at length and saying that this is "the covenant" God made "*with us*."

Solomon thus understood this subject, for he says: "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is *the covenant* of the Lord, *which he made with our fathers*, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt" *m*. Was "*the book of the covenant*" in the ark, at the time of the dedication of the temple? Yes; for "there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt" *n*. On the tables of stone, then, was written "the covenant" which God "*made with Israel*," or the constitutional basis of it, at least. And, as we have before found, to break one of these basic laws, was to break the covenant, or be "guilty of all."

But the ten commandments were copied into the book of the covenant, with the statutes and judgments, and it is to the book we are indebted for the copy of them we now have in the Bible, and it was "*concerning all these words*" that God made a covenant with Israel. "Moses came and told the people *all the words* of the Lord," and "*wrote all the words of the Lord*," and called the writing "the book of the covenant" *o*. The ten commandments are a part of the covenant that God made with Israel at Sinai, therefore, and being (as is admitted) in their nature adapted to a government theocratic in form and nature, to a government at once ecclesiastical and civil, they as formulated at Sinai could be adapted to no other form of government; and so far as any other covenant,

m 1 Kings 8: 21. *n* Verse 8. *o* Chapters 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24: 1-8.

or *form or nature* of government is concerned, are inoperative and useless. Under their operation, there is no "reconciliation for iniquity;" repentance is not provided for; the transgressor *must die* "without mercy." Hence, to *transfer* the ten commandments to the gospel covenant would but destroy the effects of the atonement and defeat the purpose of God intended by the mediation of Jesus Christ. So we read: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" *p*. "But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were *by the works of the law*. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone" *q*. And since all are under sin—for "all have sinned"—and since the law says the sinner must die, therefore, if the law has been transferred to the new covenant, it is, of course, a part of its conditions, and then the new covenant is no better than the old. In fact, it were but a *re-enactment*, or a *renewal* of the *old* covenant, and not a new one at all. It is therefore no better than before. It visits "the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation," according to its own terms *r*. In the nature of the law the promises of the renewed covenant are no better than before, for the basis is the same. And since all, both Jew and Gentile, "have sinned," all must irretrievably die! Moreover, if the law of the ten commandments, "written and engraven in stones," are "transferred" to "the new covenant" and incorporated therein, Christ and his ministry are constituted ministers of "the ministration of death." For the law is of no use, whatever, unless preached and administered, and this is a positive contradiction of what the apostle Paul says of the ministry of Christ and the

nature of their service *s.* And thus the gospel—"new covenant," and "the spirit"—is bearing along in its bosom the law that works wrath, "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," but now "transferred" and written "in the hearts" of all who embrace the new covenant; for when the commandment comes "sin" revives, and, as all are sinners, *all* die. A transfer of the law *does not change the nature of it*. It simply places the law in a position and relation where it can eternally magnify sin and destroy the sinner! As sin was only atoned for *typically*, under "the ministration of death" so *mediation* was typical. And to constitute it a cardinal element in the new covenant would be to exalt it to a position where it (*so reenforced*) could *nullify* all the mediation of Christ *in fact*. Hence Paul denies that the ministry of the new covenant are constituted ministers of "the letter"—the law that "killeth"—"the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones." "*That which is done away*"—"abolished"—has for its antecedents, "the ministration of condemnation" "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," even the ten commandments, which were the base, life and force, of the law of the commonwealth of Israel. And it follows that, as long as the cause of that "glory," or "glorious" ministration, continues to operate, the effect—the "glory"—remains. And if it becomes a part of the better covenant, even the "glory" abides and *increases*, instead of being "abolished"! *t.*

DECALOGUE NOT TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW COVENANT.

From the foregoing considerations we conclude that the decalogue is not transferred to the new covenant, nor from the tables of stone to the hearts of the Saints.

s 2 Cor. 3: 6, 7. *t* 2 Cor. 3: 7.

But that "in Christ" the "vail is done away," so that al in him can see "*to the end of that which is abolished;*" can see that "Christ is the *end of the law for righteousness* to every one that believeth," and are able to see plainly that Paul shows there is a marked distinction between "the righteousness which is *of the law*," and "the righteousness which is *of faith*." The one speaks of this life only, while the other speaks of the life to come through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead *u*; also that by obedience to the law of faith they "*conclude*" with Paul "that a man is justified by faith *without the deeds of the law*" *v*. And further; those in Christ are able to see that, since the law and the prophets "*witnessed*" to the righteousness of God through the gospel without the deeds of the law; and, as Christ came in fulfillment of their witness or testimony, that testimony is *established* as being divine. In his argument on Christ's coming in fulfillment, and as being the end of the law, Paul says, "Yea, we establish the law" *w*. In his argument with the Jews in demonstrating that Jesus came, by the evidence of the law he *proves* its truthfulness and its divinity. It is only in this sense that *Paul* could "establish the law," just as any other minister would establish the truth of any prophecy, or evidence, by exhibiting the fact testified to.

Paul, an apostle inspired of God, would *not presume* to "establish" the law, in the sense of ordaining and causing it to go into effect, authoritatively, especially if the claim that the law was established by God before the foundation of the world be true!

THE NEW COVENANT.

Our Savior when on earth *offered* the gospel (the new covenant) to the house of Judah, but as a "house" they

u Rom. 10: 4, 5, 6.

v Rom. 3: 28.

w Rom. 3: 31.

rejected it *x*. But God is yet to *make* a covenant *with* both "the house of Israel *and* the house of Judah," and it will be when the two houses become *a party to* the covenant. Paul places this in the future from his day *y*, at the fullness of the Gentile times. Jesus says, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" *z*. Jerusalem and the Holy Land are not yet fully delivered from the power of the Gentiles, but the time is surely near at hand when God's covenant will be sent "out of Zion," to all Israel, and ungodliness be turned away from Jacob, and their sins be taken away to be remembered no more. The "new covenant" is to be made with that same Israel and Judah whose fathers God brought out of Egypt, and it is not to be like the covenant made with their fathers, for God's "law of the Spirit of life" is to be written in their hearts, and as a result they are to "*know*" God, "from the least of them to the greatest of them." Then their sins will be forgiven *in fact, a*, and as a final result the "two houses" of Israel will be united into one kingdom, no more to be divided. For this covenant, is to "be an everlasting" one *b*. At that time God "will give them one heart, *and one way*," nor shall they after depart from God *c*. And let us be assured of this one thing, at the time this "everlasting covenant" is made with Israel, the law of the former covenant will form no part or element of it, for thus testifies the word of the Lord, saying, "Turn, O, backsliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion; and I will give unto you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. *And*

x Jn. 1: 11; Matt. 23: 36-39; Rom. 9: 31, 32. *y* Rom. 11: 25-27.

z Luke 21: 24. *a* Jer. 31: 31-34. *b* Ezk. 37: 21-26.

c Jer. 32: 39, 40.

it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord; neither shall it come into mind; neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, neither shall that be done any more. At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart" d.

The pastors herein promised will not be teachers of the seventh-day Sabbath. They could not advocate it and not have the ark "come into mind," nor "remember it not." This prophecy could not have been fulfilled at any time prior to the first advent of Christ, for the law preserved in "the ark of the covenant of the Lord" was then the *governing law*, and the ark was had in continual remembrance for that reason. In ancient Israel "the ark of the covenant of the Lord" was considered to be the symbol of God's presence and power, an emblem of the strength and glory of Israel. But such is not the case under the new covenant, for Christ and his law—the everlasting covenant—are the embodiment of the power and glory of the Christian Institution.

We notice one more text cited to support the assumption that the law, and therefore the Sabbath, is yet in force and binding on all men. On one occasion during the ministry of Christ, as he and the disciples passed through the cornfields on the Sabbath day, the disciples "began to pluck the ears of corn," and the Pharisees objected, charging that such an act was "not lawful." The Savior justified the act of the disciples by citing the unlawful act of David when he, having "*need*," did eat "the shewbread," and gave of it to his associates, "which is not

lawful to eat but for the priests." The Lord then proceeds to teach the Pharisees that the necessities of man, in certain exigencies, were *superior* to keeping the letter of the Sabbath law, and that the Sabbath itself was intended of God to subserve the interests of those for whom made, and not that the interests of the Sabbath were to be subserved by those to whom given, to their disadvantage: "And he said unto them, The sabbath was made *for man*, and not man for the sabbath. Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath"*f*. Hereby we learn that Christ, as Lord, is superior to the Sabbath also.

THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

The ceremonial service, in its requirements, seems to have had the precedence as compared with the Sabbath; and so Jesus cites the rite of circumcision being performed on the Sabbath, that the law requiring it to be observed the *eighth* day might be kept *g*, saying, "Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane [put to a wrong use; pollute] the sabbath, *and are blameless?*"*h*. The priests worked diligently all day during the sabbath, slaughtering and dressing animals for the sacrifices, and offering them, thus profaning the seventh-day. The Sabbath, under the law, seems to have been specially devoted to ceremonial exercises and the celebration of "ordinances." Two lambs were killed, dressed and offered; meat and drink offerings were made also. "This is the burnt offering of every sabbath"*i*. And this was ordained "an *ordinance* forever to Israel"*j*; and in Ezekiel it is specified that *seven* beasts were to be slain, prepared and offered by the priests on the Sabbath, at the door of the tabernacle, with the *prince* and the

f Mark 2: 23-28. *g* Jno. 7: 23; Lev. 12: 3. *h* Matt. 12: 5.

i Num. 28: 9, 10. *j* 2 Chron. 2: 4.

congregation participating *k*. This array of rites observed on the Sabbath surely entitles it to a prominent position in "the handwriting of ordinances" that was nailed to the cross. The Sabbath was a regular theatre "of commandments contained in ordinances." Just strip the seventh day of all the regulations, ceremonies, observances and rites that characterized it, as provided for it in the ceremonial law, and what have we left of it *as it stands in the decalogue*? An unconditional injunction—a positive one—to suspend all exercise sinks into a condition of absolute rest both man and beast, without an incentive to move, or to encourage its observance; not a promised blessing for obedience to it relating either to this life or that to come; not a penalty for its violation. Jesus did not charge the Jews with sin for seeking to preserve the life of animals when endangered on the Sabbath day. Animal life, when endangered, seems to have been of more importance than the letter of the Sabbath law *l*. Would not Sabbatarians of to-day do as much under like circumstances? Would they not labor during the Sabbath in the emergencies of flood or fire to save their goods from destruction? With themselves and Jesus as the judges, the mere letter of the Sabbath law is not a matter of the highest importance. From all these considerations we draw the lesson that the Sabbath is not of greater importance than man for whom it was made, as modern Sabbatarians, by their assumptions, falsely teach.

MAN—THE HUMAN RACE.

But it is urged that, by the use of the term "man," as used in its unrestricted sense, all the race is intended, and that, therefore, the Sabbath was made for *all* men (and domestic beasts of burden, I suppose), and the following rule from *Barrett's Principles of English Grammar*

k Ezek. 46: 3-6. *l* Matt. 12: 11.

is applied to the text,—“A noun without an adjective is invariably taken in its broadest extension, as, Man is accountable” *m*.

This is not an “*invariable*” rule, however high the authority, especially when applied to Bible usage, and the following examples will sustain us: When revealing his intention to bring a flood upon the world “the Lord said: I will destroy *man* whom I have created from the face of the earth” *n*. If this statement includes *all the race*, who will be saved? Again: “And the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” *o*. Are *all* men, therefore, thus directly created by divine agency and supplied with life *miraculously*? We cite one more passage which applied to the people addressed by our Savior in the text under consideration, and in which the term “*man*” is evidently used in the same sense. It reads: “*Man* did eat angels’ food; he sent them meat to the full” *p*. In this text the term “*man*” is confined to *Israel* in the wilderness.

THE SABBATH—PART OF THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES.

And when we examine the subject of the Sabbath, how that it was *first* given to the children of Israel, *in and by command*, and then only after the Exodus and in connection with law given *to them* after the gospel had been preached to them and by them rejected, thus transgressing, and that the Sabbath was a part of the law “added because of” that “transgression” *q* “*till* the seed should come” in whom all nations were to be blessed; and that the Sabbath was given them as a *memorial* of their deliverance from the servitude of Egypt by the

m Hist. of the Sab., J. N. Andrews, p. 22. *n* Gen. 6: 7. *o* Gen. 2: 7.

p Ps. 78: 25. *q* Heb. 4: 2; Gal. 3: 19; Deut. 5: 22.

miraculous power of God *r*, also in consideration of the fact that the Sabbath of the law was a "sign" and "a perpetual covenant" between God and the children of Israel "throughout their generation"—a "sign" to them that God had sanctified—separated them—from all other nations to be his people *s*; and, further, the fact that God did not enjoin the observance of the Sabbath on any other people than Israel, at any time, so far as the Bible shows, and, seeing that the gospel law does not *enjoin* it, we are led to the conclusion that Israel was "the man" *for* whom "the sabbath was made," *as* he was the "man" that "did eat angels' food."

THE SABBATH, OF NATIONAL LAW.

In this connection let us carefully note the fact that the law of which the seventh-day Sabbath was a part, was a *national* law, politico-ecclesiastical in nature; special in its character and application, applied to specially chosen people of God, and constituted a government by the law of a two-fold nature, in which the ecclesiastical element of the church was dominant. Israel was a nation *among* nations. God gave the laws and supplied or appointed the administrators. God chose no nation as he did Israel "since the day that God created man." He dealt wondrously with them, manifesting himself to them in a most marvelous manner, and ordained a special law, suited to their peculiar needs and circumstances, and adapted to the peculiar *end* he had in view *t*. That we are correct in the conclusion here reached is plainly manifested by the Lord's *preamble* and *title* to his unprecedented and momentous act of giving the law to Israel. It reads: "*And God spake ALL these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of*

the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" *u*. This is God's title to the law there and then given. God gave it to Israel, and *for* Israel. The Sabbath is a part of it. It was given to, and made for, those who had been brought out of the house of bondage in Egypt by the direct agency, supervision and marvelous display of God's power and glory. Now unless it can be shown that God has taken that law as there ordained, formulated and applied to Israel under their peculiar circumstances in that dispensation as a politico-ecclesiasticism, and appropriated that same law to some other people and to a similar government, for us to do so is to act without authority, and to handle "the word of God deceitfully." Inspiration thus, in after times, specified the intention and purpose of God in ordaining and giving the law including the Sabbath: "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, and good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto *them* thy holy sabbath, and commandedst *them* precepts, statutes, and laws by the hand of Moses thy servant" *v*. Doubtless Moses had as good understanding of the import, spirit, intention, and specific application of the law, in all its bearings, as any man that has ever written on the subject, he being its mediator, and its expounder, also being inspired by the Spirit of wisdom of Him who ordained and gave the law.

WHEN, WHY, AND TO WHOM THE SABBATH WAS GIVEN.

Now, as to *when*, *why*, and to *whom*, the Sabbath was enjoined, also as to *why* God enjoined it, he wrote: "And remember that *thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt*, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out

thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; *therefore the Lord thy God commanded THEE to keep the sabbath day*" *w.*

Surely, the foregoing is sufficient evidence to show most fully the Savior's intent and meaning when he says "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." It was *for* Israel and *to* Israel.

w Deut. 5: 15.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WEEKLY REST DAY UNDER
THE GOSPEL.

Having taken a summary view of the seventh-day Sabbath and its relation to the covenant made with Israel at mount Sinai, also the *reasons* why the Sabbath was given to them, and, having discovered that the "covenant," and "law," of which it was a part and "a sign;" was designed for Israel for a specific purpose; was temporary; was imperfect (as compared with the gospel); was faulty, and that its *purpose* culminated with the coming of Christ and the establishment of the "better covenant" that was based on "better promises" and by which life and immortality is brought to light, we now turn our attention to the appointed weekly rest day to be observed by those who enter into covenant relationship with God through Jesus Christ, who is the mediator of the new and everlasting covenant, and engage to observe its requirements of service and worship.

That a weekly *day of rest from secular avocations* was appointed to be devoted to worship and reverence to God, in the capacity of *an assembly*, is implied in the statements of our Savior, when he says: "And if he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church," etc.; also; "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" *x*; as also *a place where* the assembly

was convened, is evident. James, addressing the Saints, says: "For if there come into your assembly," etc. *y*.

Paul enjoins this among other "good works," "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching," indicating that to "willfully" refuse to assemble to worship was to sin against the blood of the covenant, and that punishment awaits those who so transgress *z*. But what day of the week was appointed for the disciples of Christ to assemble for worship under the new covenant? A new "leaven" and a new "lump;" the "new wine" and the "new cloth," could not be put into old "meal," "old bottles," or the old "garment." In other words, the gospel system being perfect of itself, as the plan of redemption, could not with safety be *joined to* any of the then existing laws or systems of worship, not even the law excepted. To join two systems of law together, one of which in its *nature* cannot justify man under any circumstance, while by the other he may be, is to have them work "contrary, the one to the other," like the woman married to two husbands without being divorced from either *a*. Jesus, having been born "under the law, to redeem those who *were* [not *are*] under the law," consistently observed the day required by the law, till its fulfillment at his *death*, as he did the other requirements of the law, such as circumcision, offerings, the passover, as also the feast days. But after this most wondrous and glorious event, his triumph over death and hell *b*, he having conquered *this* and *the unseen world*, and having performed the grand, central miracle of the ages, making it *the basis* of the hope of the inhabitants of both worlds and around which cluster the glory of all the dis-

y James 2: 2. *z* Heb. 10: 25 26. *a* Matt 9: 16, 17; Rom. 7: 1-3, 10;

Gal. 3: 17. *b* Rev. 1: 18.

pensations of divine grace; and having slain (broken) the power of all systems of law (as religious codes) that could not justify the imprisoned and bound sinner *c*, thus becoming the representative head of the new creation, the head of "the church of the first born," the "general assembly" *d*, he thereby rendered *the day of his resurrection* (the first day of the week) ever memorable to all who trust in Him!

By His mission into this world, and to the world of condemned spirits, he became "both *Lord* and Christ," even "Lord of all" *e*. But after that exhibition of "God manifest in the flesh," Jesus met no more with his followers to worship on the seventh day, so far as the record shows, but he did meet with them on that day wherein all heaven was joyful with praises because the redemption of man was secured—"the first day of the week," which by the common consent of the church, was recognized as "the Lord's day" *f*. God had "determined" the time "before appointed" for the resurrection of his Son, namely, "the third day" from the day of his crucifixion, "according to the scriptures;" hence he was "the first born from the dead" into the incorruptible life, "*that in all things he might have the preeminence.*"

The Scriptures that the Spirit of inspiration applied to the "third day" from the crucifixion—"the first day of the week," known to the Gentile world as "Sunday"—reads thus: "Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten thee" *g*. Jesus often referred to his rejection by the Jews and Gentiles, his death, and his triumphant resurrection "on the third day," or "*after three days,*" indicating that he well understood what "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" had purposed to bring to

c Rom. 3: 19, 20. *d* Eph. 1: 10. *e* Ezek. 32: 21; 26: 20; 32: 22, 23;

Rom. 14: 9; 1 Pet. 4: 5, 6; Acts 10: 36; Eph. 4: 9.

f Rev. 1: 10. *g* Act# 13: 33; Heb. 5: 5.

pass in "the times before appointed" *h*. Since, then, David, Peter and Paul have applied the word of the Lord to *this day*, the day of the resurrection of our glorious Lord, no marvel that the apostle John, that disciple "whom Jesus loved," should call that day "the Lord's day."

We have now discovered the fact that the first day of the week, our Lord's resurrection day, is specially referred to and designated in the Scriptures in connection with the establishment of the new covenant. God pointed out and devoted that day to the resurrection, receiving then the "first fruits"—his Son—"from the dead." And fifty days from that day, on the day of Pentecost, which was also "the first day of the week," during "a holy convocation" of the saints, was the antitypical "wave offering" of the "first fruits" of the gospel harvest offered to the Lord. And the evidence of the acceptance of the "offering" to God was the ringing of the antitypical bells on the robe of our "great High Priest"—the endowment of the saints with the baptism and gifts of the Holy Ghost *i*, thus further rendering the first day of the week ever *memorable* to the church.

It was on the *evening* of "the first day of the week," the *same day* of our Savior's resurrection, that he met with his disciples to *confirm* the fact to them of his being raised to life *j*. And on the next "first day" Jesus met with the assembled disciples again, in further confirmation of his triumphant resurrection from the dead, and to *instruct* them regarding the endowment of the Holy Spirit and their work of the ministry in carrying the gospel of life to the nations *k*.

"But," says the seventh-day advocate, "this second meeting was 'after eight days' from the first meeting.

h Mark 8: 33; 9: 30; Acts 2: 23. *i* Lev. 23: 15, 16, 21: Ex 28: 35;

Acts 2: 1, 33, 36. *j* Jno. 20: 19, 20. *k* verses 16-29.

That would bring that meeting later along than the next Sunday—perhaps Monday or Tuesday!"

Let us see. 1. "Destroy this temple, *and in three days* I will raise it up" *l.* 2. "And be raised again *the third day.*" 3. "And *after three days* rise again." Here are three forms of expression in which the time elapsing from the death to the resurrection of Christ is expressed. But because the form of expression used by the Savior himself is, "*after three days,*" may we contend that Jesus did not rise from the dead till the *second or third*, instead of the *first* day of the week! Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, was taught the gospel by revelation from Jesus Christ, and according to the gospel he taught that Jesus "rose again *the third day according to the scriptures,*" as much so as he affirms that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." By the Scriptures, then, the third day from the death of Christ was noted, pointed out, and by the Father determined. It was set apart as the day when the world should be begotten "*to the hope of living again*" *m.* Before the conclusion of that "same day" Jesus met with his disciples to demonstrate *the fact* of the resurrection, bestow on them the divine blessing, give instructions concerning when to begin, and how; also as to the universal extent of their great and divine mission; also to open their understanding and expound the Scriptures to them *n.* That was one of the most important conferences recorded of Jesus and his disciples—one wherein he expounded "the things pertaining to the kingdom."—Acts 1: 3. And notwithstanding he could have afterward renewed the "custom" of convening on the seventh day, yet he did not, but waited till the next "first day of

l Jno. 2: 19; Mat. 16: 21; Mark 8: 31. *m* 1 Pet. 1: 3. *n* Luke
24: 33-48; Jno. 20: 19-25; Acts 1: 3, 4.

the week," and then held another service with the disciples.

Passing by the day of Pentecost, and leaving these examples of our Lord holding religious services on "the first day of the week" after his resurrection, we next notice Paul's instructions and *injunction* to the churches among the Gentiles: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, *even so do ye*. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come" o.

In the Church of Christ, charity and benevolence are to be cultivated as religious duties. The poor among the Saints, as well as the families of the ministry, are to be aided by the church. In order to accomplish the greatest amount of good to the satisfaction of all concerned, some regulation is to be established of a general character so that concert of action may be had on the part of the entire body. A general treasury is necessary. The contributions of each individual must in some way reach that treasury. The apostle, recognizing the sacredness of this duty of devoting of their means to the cause of Christ, enjoins on the members of the church to observe this among their religious duties when assembled for worship, "upon the first day of the week." Hence each one, on preparing to assemble to worship, should devote of his or her means, to be placed in the treasury of the assembly, and the reason assigned by Paul for all this regulation is, "that there be *no gatherings* [collections] when I come."

Concerning this passage, some argue that its entire strength is found in the phrase, "*lay by him*," meaning, they say, "let each one put a portion of his earnings

aside on the first day of the week, *at home*," and, of course, keep it "at home" "with one's self," "near himself," *till* Paul should arrive at Corinth, and the other churches, when he would proceed to *gather* it together! But this would necessitate *collections* at each church *after* his arrival! Yet one strong Sabbath advocate asserts of that phrase, "They ordain precisely the *reverse* of a public collection" *p.* That is, Paul arranged with the churches for a general "collection" to be taken for the poor Saints, and to be collected *before* his arrival among them, "that there be *no gatherings*, [collections] *when I come*," and yet afterward when writing further instruction concerning the matter speaks in such a manner as to *defeat* the very object he had in view! A "collection," a *gathering* of means, is the object had in view by the apostle. *When* and *how* to accomplish it is the question. He did not desire the "gathering" to be *deferred* till his arrival, and hence he gave "order to *the churches*" to do "*on the first day of the week*" just what he did not wish them to wait to do till he came—gather their bounties together. An agent going around from house to house "on the first day of the week" in order to gather their bounties, that there might be "no gatherings" when he came, would just as much interfere with the members of the church, keeping that which he devoted to the cause "by him," as to go to the public assembly "on the first day of the week" and put it into the treasury himself. Paul desired "the *collection*" to be made *prior* to his arrival among them that *none* be taken *after* he came; therefore he "gave order to the churches," to do this duty on the day of their assembling for worship—"the first day of the week."

Paul, as an apostle of the church, was a public character and officer. The church was a public institution in

the world—the light of the world. Paul received the gospel by revelation from Jesus Christ *q*. On him fell the care of the Gentile churches for a time, as their representative minister *r*. As such he spoke to them “by the word of the Lord” *s*, and by “the revelation” of God to him, even the “counsel of God” *t*. And since Paul in the letter and subject before us is giving “the churches,” as such, directions relating to their duties in church capacity, and more particularly with regard to their public services, as, for instance, he says, “If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak in tongues,” etc.; and, “Let all things be done unto edifying;” again, “Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge;” and, “Let all things be done decently and in order;” and then, in order to correct the mistaken views of some among them touching the doctrine of the resurrection, he introduces his famous argument, telling such he spoke “to their shame,” he concludes the argument for the time and then resumes his instructions to “the churches” respecting the question of public duty, “the collection for the saints” to be carried out “on the first day of the week” as “order” had been given to the churches. The words, therefore, “let every one of you lay by him in store,” *do* “ordain” “a public collection,” and show that it was an ordinance of God. This “public collection” as ordered “on the first day of the week,” and the assembly for religious duty and worship, is apparent when it is remembered that Paul’s “preaching,” was “in demonstration of the Spirit and power,” that their “faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God” *u*, and that he was “not without law to God,” also that he wished them

q Gal. 1:12. *r* 2 Cor. 11:23. *s* 1 Thess. 4:15; 1 Cor. 14:36.

t 2 Cor. 16:1; Acts 20:27. *u* 1 Cor. 2:4, 5; 9:21.

to be *followers of him* as he was of Christ *v*, and Christ worshiped with his disciples "on the first day of the week." He further says, "For I have received of the Lord *that which* also I delivered unto you" *w*. And this, "For I delivered unto you first of all *that which I also received*, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, . . . and that he rose again the *third day*, according to the scriptures" *x*. And, lastly, regarding the instructions given the *Corinthians*, "If any man think himself to be a *prophet, or spiritual*, let him acknowledge that the things that I *write* unto you, *are the commandments of God*" *y*. Either God instructed Paul to give this matter in charge to the churches, or he taught them to violate the requirements of God, or Paul was deluded.

It is objected that Christ, prior to the crucifixion, gave no commandment to the disciples to assemble for the worship of God on the first day of the week, and that since the covenant was then ratified, nothing could be added to it after that time. To this we reply that, this objection might be of weight provided it could be shown that the record we have in the Bible *contained all* he said and did up to that time. We have no account of Jesus calling into offices in the church prophets, elders, bishops, teachers or deacons, prior to his crucifixion, nor did he enjoin upon his apostles the duty of going "into all the world" to publish the gospel among the nations prior to his death. We are not aware of any intimation in the Bible anywhere, that *all* that he intended them to know of his "will" was to be revealed prior to the death of Christ. On the contrary, he had *many* things to say to them, but they were not able to bear them during his ministry, personally on earth *z*. He did, however, before his passion, lay the foundation of the kingdom of heaven,

v 1 Cor. 11: 1. *w* v. 23. *x* chap. 15, vs. 3, 4. *y* chap. 14, v. 37.

z Jno 21:25; 16: 12.

set in order in it two of the leading classes of officers, apostles and seventy, made provision for carrying on the work after he should leave by promising to send "the Comforter," . . . "the Holy Ghost"—*the advocate* of his cause (human redemption), explained its office-work as being to *guide* his servants into truth, bring his past sayings to their remembrance, direct them in their official duties, aid them to follow his example, and show them things to come. He also gave them divine "authority" or power, "keys" to properly represent the interests of his kingdom in his absence, saying that whatsoever they should loose or bind on earth (harmoniously with his will) should be loosed or bound in heaven; also saying, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you" *a*; and, "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" *b*. This was their authority to represent Christ and his Father, in their official work in the interests of the church by their teaching, administering, and their example to the world. Christ and his angels stood by these ministers in their official labors. They preached the gospel, baptized and confirmed believers, organized them into local churches, set them in order, ordained their officers, and assembled together "on the first day of the week" "to break bread" or partake of "the Lord's supper," preach, pray, and take up collections to sustain the cause *c*. Jesus set the example for meeting for worship "on the first day of the week." He says he did always those things that pleased his Father *d*. Can we ask for higher *authority* or example than that of Jesus and the apostles for "first-day" service! Did God accept of their labors when thus ordaining, baptizing, confirming, etc.? Yes. Did he acknowledge their assembling "on

a John 20: 21. *b* John 13: 20. *c* Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 11; 16: 1, 2.

d John 8: 29.

the first day of the week" to worship? Yes; God manifested his pleasure at one such meeting by hearing the prayers of his saints in behalf of the young man that fell out of the window, *blessing him* and comforting the saints.

In connection with the foregoing facts relating to the divine authority of Christ and his apostles, also the worth and power of *their example and precepts* relating to our religious duties, the next evidence that we adduce in favor of the assembling together of those who come into the new covenant, "on the first day of the week," to worship God, will have great weight. Paul and seven others of the ministry were on their way to Jerusalem from a tour through some of the Roman provinces, preaching by the way. Luke says of this: "These going before tarried for us at Troas. And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode *seven days*. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together" *d*. Luke here records the *incidental* history of this visit of Paul and the accompanying elders at Troas. The leading and most prominent events, or, rather, incidents, are given. They left Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread," and were "five days" on the journey to Troas. They abode at Troas "seven days," notwithstanding Paul's *haste* to arrive at Jerusalem at Pentecost, then less than thirty days in the future. A "sabbath" occurred during their stay at Troas, but no mention is made of either it or a meeting for worship being held by any body at Troas on that day. But it is mentioned, incidentally, that "on the first day of the week, when the

disciples came together to break bread" (celebrate the Lord's supper, "on the Lord's day"), "Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow"—Monday. It is also related that they "gathered together" in an "upper chamber," and that the meeting was an unusually long one, Paul speaking till midnight, even the "*lights*" being mentioned. Either there were no Jews with their synagogue in Troas, or else Paul did not feel it expedient to meet with them on that occasion. For it had been Paul's "custom" to get into the Jewish synagogues on every Sabbath, if possible, to "reason" with them relative to the gospel *e*. It is not stated in this narrative that the disciples "gathered together" to worship on the seventh day, nor could it be thought at all likely that they would be allowed to meet in the Jews' synagogue to worship, even on the Sabbath day. The Jews were the hottest persecutors the disciples of Christ met with in those days. Luke does not refer to this "first-day" meeting at Troas as though it was exceptional, but simply as a matter of common custom, and of weekly occurrence. He never failed to mention the fact when Paul happened to preach to the Jews on the seventh day, or to Jews and Gentiles included *f*, even frequently stating the number of times he did so in any given place. And if at any time Paul convened a *special* meeting of brethren, this faithful chronicler never failed to mention it *g*. While this is all true, we have no record of a single meeting or assembly for worship of Paul with the disciples on the seventh day. This is peculiar, but then we remember that when Paul was at Jerusalem, the apostle James and others urged him to observe "*the law*" as a matter of policy among the Jewish converts. But they said, "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written

e Acts 17: 1, 2. *f* Acts 11: 26; 13: 5, 15, 42; 17: 2; 18: 4.

g Acts 20: 17.

and concluded *that they observe no such thing.*" Paul was not successful at that time in keeping the law, however, and *had* to abandon it *h.* The conclusion to be reached from a careful study of the text before us *must* be, that Luke refers to the usual custom of gathering "together to break bread" and engage in other religious services "on the first day of the week."

Realizing the force of this example of this apostolic church, with one of the chief of the apostles of our Lord at its head, assembling for divine worship "on the first day of the week," when, with a number of the leading ministry present, they could have assembled on the seventh day (but did not), Seventh-day Sabbath advocates have assumed that this meeting was held on *Saturday evening*, instead of "*the first day of the week*" as the Bible affirms. And of course they try to *prove* that Luke, who was present at the meeting, was mistaken! And if they succeed in their effort to invalidate this testimony of Luke, Paul traveled nineteen miles to Assos "on the first day of the week" instead of meeting with the saints at Troas and continuing the service till midnight, and till break of day "on the morrow." This objection *assumes* that the disciples began the day at sunset, as under the law regarding the Sabbath. But of this there is no proof. Luke, the writer, was a learned Roman citizen, subject to Roman law and customs, and even the Jews had been subject to these laws and customs for about ninety years when Luke wrote the Acts (A. D. 60), and then there is no evidence that the church at Troas "came together at night," or even in the evening. It might have been in the afternoon, but certainly it was *during the day*. This is Bible usage. Night is never in the Bible called day. Early morning is called "day" *i.* "And God called *the light day* and the darkness he called

night" *j*. Thus did God, and inspiration has ever so recognized since. Jesus "continued *all night* in prayer to God" *k*. "Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in a day?" The night was never called day; therefore if the disciples at Troas did not *meet* "on the *first day* of the week," they met on the seventh! For they did not *come together* during the night. It is not an unusual thing for assemblies to meet during the day and continue them during the evening. The disciples never expected to hear Paul preach again. He did not anticipate ever meeting with those brethren at Troas again in this life, hence he continued the service "till break of day," and then departed.

The mention of "the lights" simply goes to show that their usual place of meeting to worship was conveniently arranged for services, and that it was the customary place of assembling. 'Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow.' Assembling to worship "on the first day of the week," would "the morrow" be the same day? That to-day is to-morrow, is a falsehood, a direct contradiction in terms. But this is just what the seventh-day theorists make out of it. Contending that as the disciples at Troas met on Sunday, Paul did not wait until the morrow to depart, he really *left* Troas "on the first day of the week" and went to Assos! But the record says, "The disciples came together" . . . "upon the *first day* of the week" . . . "to break bread, and Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow"—the second day—Monday, and all the assumptions imaginable cannot show to the contrary. Let Sabbatarians try such logic on these texts: "The *sixth day* they gathered twice as much bread. . . . *To-morrow* is the rest of the holy sabbath" *l*. "Behold *the day groweth*

j Gen. 1: 5; 19: 2; 24: 55; 32 13-25. *k* Luke 6: 12; 21: 37.

l Ex. 16: 22, 23.

to an end; lodge here, that thine heart may be merry; and to-morrow get you EARLY on your way, . . . but the man would not tarry *that night*" *m*.

The Romans began the day at midnight, and the New Testament writers wrote accordingly. After midnight they never refer to the succeeding hours of light as "the morrow," but as the day then current, thus: "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day" *n*. At the Savior's arrest, from the time the cock crew, it is stated, "And as soon as it was day." The Jews indicated the hours of twelve to three a.m. by the phrase "cock crowing" *o*. Being imprisoned at Philippi, "Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God" . . . "at midnight," and being released preached to the jailer and household and baptized them before daylight — "*and when it was day*" (not "on the morrow"), is the phraseology used *p*.

When referring to the succeeding hours of light, at any given time *prior* to midnight, the phrase, "the morrow," or "to-morrow," is used by the New Testament writers, as indicated of the meeting at Troas. Also in the case of Paul's escape from Jerusalem through the intervention of "the chief captain," who started the guard with Paul "*at the third hour of the night*" to go to Cesarea. But at Antipatris the infantry returned to the castle, leaving the cavalry to proceed "*on the morrow*" with Paul to his destination *q*. Referring thus to the following day as "the morrow," when speaking of it at any hour BEFORE midnight, and as the day current, *after*, demonstrates that "the morrow," from "the first day of the week" could be none other than Monday, and that the evening meeting at Troas, following the assembling of the disciples on "*the first day of the week*," was on Sun-

m Judges 19: 9, 10.

n Mark 1: 35; Luke 22: 61-66.

o Mark 13: 35.

p Acts 16: 35.

q Acts 23: 23, 32.

day evening, and shows conclusively that Luke recognized that the day ended and began at midnight, as John did: "Then the *same day* at evening, being the first day of the week" *r*. Thus we see every item of this narrative goes to show that the meeting of Paul and the elders with the disciples at Troas to worship, expound the word, exhort, partake of "the Lord's supper," was on "the *first* day of the week" and not on the seventh, as some assume.

r Jno. 20: 19.

CHAPTER X.

"THE LORD'S DAY"—THE FIRST DAY OF
THE WEEK.

The Christian economy is an institution at the head of which stands our Lord *s*. His is the church and kingdom *t*. He is "*the head over all things to the church*" *u*. "Both Lord and Christ" *v*. In his name all divine law is to be administered among men. He is the one mediator and ransom for the whole world *w*. At his name every knee in earth, under the earth and in heaven shall bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord *x*. He is "Christ the Lord," "Lord of all," "Lord of glory" *y*. Jesus is officially the Lord of the dispensation of the world's redemption. Hence we read of "the disciples of the Lord," "the brethren of our Lord," "this cup of the Lord," "blood of the Lord," "the law of the Lord," (Ps. 19: 7), "of Christ" *z*, and "the commandments of the Lord." "For ye know what commandments we gave unto you by the Lord Jesus" *a*. And all the Saints are required to "stand fast in the Lord" *b*.

But in all this dispensation of our Lord, is there no day commemorative of our Lord's resurrection from the dead, that event and act that is, in fact, the basis of the world's hope beyond the grave! There was a day commemorative of the redemption of Israel from Egyptian

s Matt. 28: 18, 19 *t* Matt. 16: 18; Col. 1: 13. *u* Eph. 1: 22.

v Acts 2: 36. *w* 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6; 1 John 2: 2. *x* 2 Phil. 2: 10, 11.

y Luke 2: 11. *z* Gal. 6: 2. *a* 1 Thess. 4: 2.

b 1 Thess. 3: 8; Acts 10: 36; 1 Cor. 2: 8.

bondage, and of the acts of God in then redeeming them. But where in "the new covenant" is the memorial of the act of God and our Lord giving the pledge of our redemption from the dominion of death! Is there no "Lord's day" essentially distinct and marked in "*the law of Christ*"—"of liberty!" Answer: "I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. *I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day*, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet" *c*. The fact that such a wondrous measure of the Holy Spirit rested on the apostle John as to give him a vision of the seven churches of Asia, while yet on the lonely isle, and of the spiritual condition of their membership, and of the Son of God personified walking in the midst of the churches, and of having the Son reveal himself to him as "the first and the last," and being commanded to write his revelation and send it to the churches, impressed him so powerfully that he fell at the Savior's feet as dead. He was also impressed that *the time* of seeing this wonderful manifestation of the love of Christ to him was "the Lord's day." Here, then, is the *inspiration of God* designating the memorial day of the resurrection of Christ given through the resurrected One! The seal of divinity is thus placed upon that day—"the first day of the week." The day of Christ's resurrection is "the Lord's day." But does "the Lord's day," as referred to by the Holy Spirit to John, signify "the first day of the week"? We know of no instance either in the Bible or in history where the phraseology, "the Lord's day," is used with respect to the Jewish Sabbath—the seventh-day Sabbath. All history teaches that "the Lord's day" of Revelation is "the

first day of the week," the eighth from the day of our Lord's glorious resurrection. This, the strongest of Sabbatarians concede, that the Holy Spirit, through John, uses a new form of expression, with reference to the Christian's rest day—"the Lord's day." But when we reflect for a moment that it was designed to memorialize one of the greatest events conceivable to man, and also itself an institution connected inseparably with the establishment of the Christian covenant, it is not strange that terms designed to meet the ends sought should be composed, legitimately growing out of the nature of the institution and the attendant events. As, for instance, "Independence day," "New Year's day," relating to the opening of a new era; also "Emancipation day," etc. Events of importance connected with the establishment of the Israelitish economy were memorialized on certain days designated by titles *then new*, as, "the Sabbath day," day of "atonement," "pentecost," etc. So in the gospel economy, the unparalleled event and fact of the resurrection of Christ, the great Head and Lord of the plan of human redemption, was celebrated on the newly named resurrection day—"the Lord's day." Of this Dr. Barnes in his commentary says: "This was a day particularly devoted to the Lord Jesus, for that is the natural meaning of the word Lord as used in the New Testament; and if the Jewish Sabbath was intended to be designated, the word Sabbath would have been used."

In his New Testament Grammar Prof. Winner says: "Entirely new words and phrases were constructed, mainly by composition, and for the most part to meet some sensible want" *d*. But why construct "new words and phrases" to designate old institutions as "the sabbath"? No "sensible end" could have been reached in

this manner, relating to the Sabbath of the law. But the phrase, "the Lord's day," is essentially a *New Testament* formation.

Of their usage of words, Liddell and Scott, in their lexicon say: "We have always sought to give the earliest authority for its use first. Then if no change was introduced by later writers, we have left it with the early authority alone" *e.* And hence when they come to define the Greek term "Kuriakos," it is "Of, belonging to, concerning a lord or master, especially belonging to the Lord Christ; hence *kuriake hemera*, the Lord's day." The New Testament, then, was their earliest authority for this usage, and no authority since had required any change.

Greenfield defines the derivative "Kuriakos, of, or pertaining to the Lord, that is the Messiah; the Lord's, 1 Cor. 11: 20; Rev. 1: 10." And Rolison's lexicon, thus: "Kuriakos—Pertaining to the Lord, to the Lord Jesus Christ; *e. g.*, *kuriakos deipnon*,—the Lord's supper, (1 Cor. 11: 20), *kuriake hemera*, the Lord's day (Rev. 1: 10)."

Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon, thus: "Kuriakos—Pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ; the Lord (1 Cor. 11: 20; Rev. 1: 10)."

Parkhurst says: "This is the usual name of Sunday with the subsequent Greek fathers."

The above learned evidences show most conclusively that the Lord's day was a *new* institution, and pertained to the gospel in the Apóstolic Age, and is identical with "the first day of the week"—Sunday. We do not find the phrase "the Lord's day" once used, in all the Bible, in application to the seventh-day Sabbath.

The new relations connected with the institution of the "kingdom of heaven" would necessitate the use of terms and phrases suited to its heavenly and peculiar charac-

ter, and of such a nature as to convey to all its close relation to its preëminent Head, our Lord. Hence the institution itself, is called "the Lord's body" *f*.

The holy communion is designated "the Lord's supper," and, "the Lord's table" *g*. The observance of "the Lord's supper" commemorates "the Lord's death" *h*. And as the baptism with which our Lord was to be baptized involved the idea of not only being buried or hid away out of sight, but also the act of *rising again* from that condition, "the Lord's supper" was observed on "the Lord's day"—the resurrection *day*, "the first day of the week." No one will contend that "the Lord's supper" is any other than a purely gospel institution.

Since "the Lord's day" is first found in the New Testament institution and ever after associated with the worship of Christ, because of the glory attendant upon his triumphal victory over death, could it be made to appear as any other than the day celebrated as Christ's resurrection day? The foregoing ought to be decisive in relation to this division of the subject.

f 1 Cor. 12: 27, 28; 11: 29. *g* 1 Cor. 10; 21; 11: 20. *h* v. 27.

CHAPTER XI.

HISTORICAL IDENTITY OF "THE FIRST DAY" WITH "THE LORD'S DAY."

Leaving, now, the consideration of the testimony of the lexicographers and commentators, we will notice, briefly, some of the *historical testimony to the identity of "the Lord's day" of Revelation with "the first day of the week" of Paul's divinely inspired instructions to "the churches of Christ."* Our statements under this head are taken from writings of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, also a work—"a collection of ecclesiastical statements"—called, "*The Apostolic Constitutions*," with other accredited historical data.

"The Ante-Nicene Fathers are those *Christian* writers who flourished after the time of the apostles, and before the Council of Nice, A. D., 325." In a little work by Elder Andrews, (Adventist), entitled, *The Complete Testimony of the First Three Centuries*, in his History of the Sabbath, page 204, "Introductory Statement" he remarks: "Many of the Fathers call the first day of the week the Lord's day." Also: "For those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's day"^j. Here is the confession of one of the ablest of modern Sabbath advocates, with "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers" before him, that the seventh-day Sabbath and the Lord's day are *not* identical, but that "many of" them "call the first day of the week the Lord's day," thus admitting the identity of "the Lord's day" with Sunday.

The testimony of the Fathers to the fact that many of

the Saints observed the Sabbath *with* "the first day of the week," is by this able writer not questioned. The Fathers are also admitted as evidence on other points relative to the doctrine and practices of the church in the times immediately succeeding the apostles' days. That the Sabbath was observed by some of the Jewish converts in the Apostolic age is shown by New Testament history *k*. It was evidently done as a matter of policy by those who fully understood the matter. Paul says: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. . . . To them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but being under the law of Christ), that I might gain them that are without law." Again; "to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law." Paul here argues, substantially, that, as a religious code, all other laws *save the gospel*, are simply nothing. And he argues precisely similarly in reference to eating meats and things offered to idols,—that to those enlightened by the law of Christ the idol was "nothing" *l*. To the Jewish convert yet unenlightened by the gospel, circumcision was everything, and just as essential as baptism and the Sabbath; but in the gospel covenant neither circumcision or the Sabbath were profitable *m*. As a matter of policy among the new Jewish converts, James counseled Paul to observe the law, when at Jerusalem; but "as touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and *concluded that they observe no such thing.*"

"Ah! but *the law* that the apostles of Christ wrote to the Gentile believers *not to keep*, was the *ceremonial law*," says the objector! Then, on the same ground, "the law" referred to in the same connection in the statement, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there

k 1 Cor. 9: 20-22. *l* 1 Cor. 8: 4. *m* Gal. 5: 6; 4: 10.

are which believe; and they are all *zealous of the law*”—refers to the ceremonial law! And, of course, they manifested no zeal for the ten commandment law! “A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump.” All the law, or none of it, as a religious guide under the gospel, is the logic of the New Testament argument for keeping the Sabbath of the law *n*. “But,” says the objector, “‘all the law’ is said by Paul to mean ‘all things which are written in *the book of the law*.’” Just so; Paul and the Jews of his day were indebted to “the book of the law” for all they knew of the law, whether of the decalogue or the ceremonial. So are we. After the Babylonish captivity, “the book of the law” was the only source of obtaining the law given to Israel, or any part of it, save as it might be revealed anew through the prophets.

After this slight digression from the line of argument from a historical basis to meet the objection to us and seemingly favorable to the Sabbath of the law, we now resume the subject. We have already seen by the New Testament, that the churches presided over by the apostle Paul assembled on “the first day of the week” for divine worship in accordance with Christ’s example, and divine regulation through this apostle, Paul *o*; also that, John was inspired by the Holy Ghost to speak of a day especially related to the Christian Institution, calling it “the Lord’s day;” and that there is no evidence either sacred or profane that the term “Lord’s day” was ever applied to the seventh-day Sabbath, and that, therefore, it must refer to the resurrection day—“the first day of the week.” Our first witness to the proposition before us is a statement of Pliny, a Roman governor of Bithynia at the opening of the second century, from seven to eight years after John wrote the Book of Revelation. In

n Acts 20: 25; Gal. 5: 9. *o* 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; Acts 20: 7;

1 Cor. 14: 37; 15: 4.

a letter he wrote the Emperor Trajan giving account of what was developed by examination of Christians at his tribunal, he says: "They affirm that the whole of their guilt or error was, that they met on a certain stated day (stato die), before it was light, and addressed themselves in a form of prayer to Christ, as to some God, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purpose of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery; never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to eat in common a harmless meal" p.

This testimony of Pliny is good, not only in relation to the excellent standing of the Saints of his day as to their moral character, but to the fact that they had a "certain stated day" for public worship. What day of the week was this "certain stated day" the Christians of Bithynia kept holy? Prof. Stewart, as we read from *Quotations in Edward's Sabbath Manual*, says: "The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed as well as the Lord's day; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early Christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred" q. Could first-day observance have been so universally accepted by the early Christian church, at so early a period, had it not been received from Christ and the apostles? Why is it that not a single writer of the Christian church for the first three centuries can be produced who wrote against first-day observance? It is astonishingly strange, if the celebration of worship on the first day of the week was wrong and not divinely appointed, that among the mul-

titude of questions that came up for controversy and decision in the church, during the first three centuries of our era, that question never was brought forward!

Right here we quote Elder Andrews again, in connection with the statement of Prof. Stewart, that "those Fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's day"^r. We feel grateful to thus be able to answer our question suggested by Pliny's testimony concerning the "certain stated day" of worship—the "certain stated day," therefore, was Sunday.

Moving along some thirty-six years later than Pliny (A. D. 140), we come to the days of Justin Martyr. We preface his statement with an authoritative observation or two, because of the importance of his testimony. He was born of Greek parentage, in Palestine. His dialogue with Trypho the Jew, was held at Ephesus, Asia Minor, where John wrote his Revelation some forty-four years previously. The Encyclopedia Americana says he was "one of the earliest and most learned writers of the Christian church," and that "he was equally zealous in opposing alleged heretics." Dr. Schaff says: "After his conversion Justin devoted himself wholly to the vindication of the Christian religion, as an *itinerant evangelist*, with no fixed abode"^s. This being true, Justin had ample opportunity to know what the doctrine of the church was, not only in Asia Minor and Palestine, but in Rome and Greece as well. He could therefore know and give unquestioned testimony to the belief and practice of the church. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia states that "Justin professes to present the system of doctrine held by all Christians and seeks to be orthodox on all points. The only difference he knows of as existing between Christians concerned the millenium. Thus Jus-

^r Testimony of the Fathers, p. 11.

^s Ch. Hist., vol. 1, p. 482.

tin is an *incontrovertible witness* for the unity of the faith in the church of his day, and to the fact that the Gentile type of Christianity prevailed." Now we here give the words of this eminent minister of the church found in his famous "Apology to the Roman Emperor Titus Antoninus, who being a heathen, would probably know neither the meaning of the term Sabbath or the Lord's day, hence Justin familiarly calls the day referred to, Sunday: "And on the day *called* Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits; then when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and as we said before, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who through sickness, or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word, takes care of all who are in need. *But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly*,—because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn [Saturday]; and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, hav-

ing appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration" *t*. Here is clear, straightforward, *unquestioned* testimony, authoritative evidence, that the Church of Christ held their "assembly" for the worship of God on Sunday, the first day of the week, and not the seventh day. Let any one analyze this statement of Justin relative to the general belief of the church at that time, the manner of worship, charity, the Lord's supper, and the day of the assembling, and compare it with the practice of the church in the first century *u*, and Paul's example in worship with the church at Troas *v*, his divinely inspired instructions to and regulations among the churches *w*, and it will be clearly seen that the churches were yet abiding "in the apostles' doctrine," as Christ, when appearing to his disciples *after* his resurrection "taught them these things."

Let us now move along ten years later only (A. D. 150), and the testimony of Barnabas unites with that of Justin: "For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead; and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into heaven." The testimony of Barnabas is admitted to have been in existence as early as the date here assigned, by the ablest of seventh-day advocates *x*. It was cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished in the latter part of the second century, and others later along, including Origen and Eusebius. His writings were extensively read in the early church. They are therefore reliable.

We next hear the evidence of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, who wrote about A. D. 170. In his epistle writ-

t First Apology of Justin, chapter 67. *u* Acts 11: 27-29 30;

Rom. 12: 8. *v* Acts 20; 1 Cor. 16: 1. 2. *w* Gal. 2: 10.

x Andrew's History of the Sabbath, p. 218.

ten to Soter, Bishop of Rome, he says: "To-day we have passed *the Lord's holy day*, in which we have read your epistle; in reading which we shall always have our minds stored with admonition, as we shall, also, from that written to us before by Clement" *y*. Some object to this statement of Dionysius and say it is not honest to cite it as evidence favoring first-day worship, for while the term "Lord's day" is used, it is not defined, and we cannot determine what day is referred to, the first, or last day of the week. To this we reply, We have no evidence in the Bible, or church history, of the term here used ever being applied to the Sabbath of the law. This fact sorely tries advocates of the Sabbath cause. Further, the day on which the churches met to worship, and to read the prophets, the memoirs of the apostles and other writings, was "the day after that of Saturn." "Sunday," says Justin Martyr (A. D. 140), is the day on which we hold our common assembly."

Elder J. N. Andrews, in his "*History of the Sabbath and First day*," after devoting an entire chapter in noticing the reasons assigned by the Ante-Nicene Fathers for not observing the seventh-day, and their reasons for keeping, as a day of rest and worship to God, "the first day of the week," Sunday, "the Lord's day"—the resurrection day—confesses that, "The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the sabbath show conclusively that they had no special light on the subject by reason of living in *the first centuries*, which we in this later age do not possess" *z*. The names of all the prominent Fathers are mentioned by this historian as "neglecting to observe the sabbath" . . . "in the first centuries," and hence Dionysius must have meant Sunday by the "Lord's day," and more especially since, as Elder Andrews says, "those fathers who hallow the

Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's day" *a*.

Not only this, but in this testimony of Dionysius, Clement is referred to as a contemporary writer with himself. We will therefore notice in this connection Clement's reference to the first day of the week, or, as was quite usual with the ecclesiastical writers of the early Christian church, to refer to it as the "eighth" day, a custom that grew out of the second meeting of Christ with the disciples, as mentioned in John *b*, Clement referring to a prophecy of the philosopher Plato, says: "And the Lord's day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the *Republic*, in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth day they are to set out and arrive in four days'" *c*.

I do not quote Clement's explanations of Plato's subject, it being unnecessary here, but enough of this father's language and his quotation to show that in the days of Dionysius and Clement the eighth day from Christ's resurrection, the first day of the week, and the Lord's day, were then identical. Clement again observes: "He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself" *d*.

For the sake of consistency, it should not be urged by seventh-day advocates that the seventh day is referred to by the fathers when using the terms "Lord's day," for they, almost without exception, when writing of the seventh day, call it the Sabbath. This statement cannot be successfully controverted. But it is evident that the first day of the week was called "the Lord's day" by

a Testimony of Fathers, p. 11. *b* chap. 20: 26. *c* Book 5, chap. 15.

d Miscellanies of Clement, Book 7, chap. 14.

others than John the apostle, before the days of Dionysius and Clement (A. D. 170-194), for in the writings ascribed to Ignatius, mentioned and cited by Irenæus (A. D. 177), Origen and others still later, and believed by many able men of the past to have been collected by Polycarp, the disciple of John the Revelator, we find the following: "Wherefore, if they who were brought up in these ancient laws came nevertheless to the newness of hope; no longer observing sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's day, in which also our life is sprung up in him" *e.* The translation from which I here quote, is that of William Wake, Lord Bishop of Lincoln, afterward, of Canterbury. I mention this because this translation does not agree in verbiage precisely with those given by Elder J. N. Andrews in his "*Testimony of the Fathers.*" Bishop Wake cites abundant testimony, in the Introduction to his translation of the epistles of Ignatius, to their antiquity. "The Lord's day," referred to in this text, can refer to no other than the first day of the week, for the seventh day is referred to in the immediate connection and called the Sabbath. Here, then, is evidence identifying the Lord's day with the first day of the week *prior* to the days of Dionysius and Clement.

But the earliest use of the term "Lord's day" now known, is that of John the divine. The phrase is a formation by the Holy Spirit, it would seem, and is never applied to any other than the day of Christ's resurrection, the first day of the week, as we have already seen. In regard to the words, "no longer observing the sabbath, but living in observance of the Lord's day," as found in the shorter epistle of Ignatius, according to Elder Andrews he lends favor to a translation of these words that excludes the word "day" and inserts "life," making it read "Lord's life," instead of "Lord's day," "literally,

'no longer sabbatizing, but living according to the Lord's life'" *f*. But his effort on this, as on the text relating to the meeting at Troas, overdoes the matter and causes the writer to deny that *Christ* kept the Sabbath!—"No longer sabbatizing, *but living according to the Lord's life.*" This translation is not only what the writer, or any other of the fathers taught *not*, but does violation to the subject had under consideration by the writer. He was exhorting the Christians to no longer observe the Sabbath of the law, but to observe, as a day of worship instead, "the Lord's day." This is the face of the record as given us. Why this effort to break down the testimony of Luke, John, and the Ante-Nicene Fathers, in reference to first-day observance on the part of the ancient Christian Church? Simply because they believed in keeping "the first day of the week," "the Lord's day," as a day of worship, while the sabbatarians believe in keeping us around the foot of Mount Sinai, in the wilderness, keeping Saturday as a rest day. They celebrate the coming of Israel out of Egypt *g*, while "the children of the kingdom" believe in celebrating the emancipation of the *whole world*, from the bondage of sin, death and hell *h* on the glorious resurrection day of Christ, Sunday, and by an undeniable manifestation of their faith in a Savior who, on that venerable day, broke the bands of death, and drew aside the dark veil that had, until then, wrapt in eternal night the shining way to the world of bliss and eternal peace, (so far as the benighted world was concerned), and by the gospel led the mind of the world, as yet "without hope, and without God in the world," from the *day* by them revered, to *Him who formed the day!* Also that the nations might no longer worship and serve the creature (the sun), but him who had created it.

f Testimony of Fathers, p. 27. *g* Deut. 5: 15. *h* John 1: 29;
Rom 5: 18, 19; 1 Cor. 15: 22; Rev. 1: 18, 20; 2: 13.

The Jews were not far behind the Gentiles who revered Sunday, in their reverence of Saturday, for Paul had "proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." And in that same letter *i*, Paul charged both Jews and Gentiles with having too great regard for certain *days*, and too little *for Him* to whom the day and the whole creation points—the Creator.

Bardesanēs, who flourished and wrote about A. D. 180, a resident of Syria, and a member of the Gnostics, will be cited next. Of the establishment of Christianity, which "Christ at his advent planted in every country," he remarks: "On one day, the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the days of the readings we abstain from [taking] sustenance"*j*. Thus speaks this writer of the assembly of the Christians in his times on the first day of the week. And this day, as we have seen, was the day of public worship in the days of Justin Martyr. And Ignatius, Dionysius (A. D. 170), and Clement call "the first day of the week" "the Lord's day." Bardesanēs belonged to the Gnostics. And Elder Andrews says "This shows that the Gnostics used Sunday as the day for religious assemblies"*k*. Precisely. And Bardesanēs writes of the institution of Christianity, which "Christ at his advent planted in *every country*," and was designed to be published among "all nations." The evidence, therefore, is now before us, that early in the second century the Christian church, including the heretical sects, *all* observed the first day of the week as the day of religious worship, celebrating the worship of God on the day of the resurrection of his Son—the Lord's day.

i Rom. 14: 5. *j* Book of the Laws of Countries.
of Fathers, p. 54.

k Testimony

CHAPTER XII.

DID NOT ORIGINATE WITH ROMAN BISHOPS.
FIRST DAY AND LORD'S DAY IDENTICAL.

A noticeable *insinuation*, amounting in effect to an assertion that Sunday observance, as a day of Christian worship, originated at Rome, after the days of the apostles, is manifest in the works of Sabbatarians on this subject, generally. Now the evidence, as we have presented so far, is just the reverse of this idea. Justin Martyr was, as Dr. Schaff says, "an *itinerant* evangelist." He traveled among the churches in different countries. Dionysius was Bishop at Corinth, in Greece. Bardesanes was of Edessa, in Syria; and Clement resided in Alexandria in Egypt. So that down to A. D. 194, we have offered no testimony specially Roman, unless it be that of Paul or Luke. The church at Rome, having been founded in the apostolic age, no doubt kept sacred the first day of the week like the churches of Galatia, Corinth and Troas, and as Christ and the apostles before them had done. But the testimony of the Fathers goes to show conclusively, that whether the Roman and other western churches kept "the Lord's day" or not, the Eastern and Southern churches did. And this was more than three hundred years *before* a pope had an existence in the church to issue bulls, ordain canons, hurl anathemas, change *times and laws*, or crimson his hands with the sacred blood of the martyrs.

Tertullian, of Africa, also an extensive traveler, who wrote about A. D. 200, and who, as Johnson's *Cyclopedia*

says, "was a representative of the African opposition to Rome," comes next. Elder Andrews says of him: "He speaks of the Lord's day as the eighth day;" also, "He was not so far removed from the time of the apostles but that many clear rays of divine truth shone upon him" *m*. And we add, when referring to the seventh day he called it Saturday, and the Sabbath. And after a number of references to the Sabbath, Sabbaths, and other festivals observed by the Jews, he says while apologizing for the church for observing the first day of the week for the solemn celebration of public worship,— "Not on the Lord's day, not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they [the Jews] have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians" *n*. Again: "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day their Sabbath, and, devoting it to ease and eating, deviating from the old Jewish customs, which they are now very ignorant of" *o*. "The day after Saturday" was "the Lord's day" when Tertullian wrote his able and learned defense of the doctrine and practice of the church in his times. He was among the ablest of the Fathers whose writings have come down to our day. His writings, bold advocacies of what he believed to be true, forbid the idea that he, as a bishop of the church, accepted without question whatever might be presented as truth. He opposed Jew and Gentile, *in the church or out*, in what he believed to be wrong. With examples of Christian heroism like Paul and other noble martyrs of Jesus, he would not yield to what was popular merely for the satisfaction or a love of the glory of men. He, with the other official representatives of the church in the first and second centuries, must have had ample and satisfactory evidence of

m Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 63. 64. *n* On Idolatry, chap. 15.

o Sec. 16.

the sacredness of the first day of the week as a day of worship, and that John by the divine Spirit called that day "the Lord's day."

It cannot be argued with any greater regard for the truth that "Lord's day" observance was an innovation on the Christian religion, brought in by apostasy, than that the continued observance of circumcision, or the Jewish ritual for two or three centuries, was the work of the apostasy. Those who, in the church, during those times, kept the seventh day, did not question the right or propriety of first-day observance. This is most significant. On this point we quote the following facts, and the more readily because they are *accepted* by seventh-day advocates as valid and used by them in evidence *p*. They testify to the verity of first-day worship in the church in the Apostolic Age: "The last day of the week was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship" *q*. Again: "The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted but they derived this practice from the apostles themselves, as appears by several Scriptures to that purpose; who [the apostles] keeping both that day and the first day of the week, gave occasion to succeeding ages to join them together, and make it one festival, though there was not the same reason for the continuance of the custom as there was to begin it" *r*.

That the apostles, and even Christ, kept the Sabbath in the early church, *before* the crucifixion, no one questions. The first day of the week would hardly have been observed as a sacred day prior to the resurrection of

p Andrews' History of the Sabbath. *q* Coleman's Ancient

Christianity Exemplified, chap. 26, sec. 2.

r Morer's Dialogues on the Lord's

Day, page 189.

Christ, for the law embodying the Sabbath did not die as a religious code, till Christ died, and the new covenant, embodying the Lord's day, did not come into effect till after the death and resurrection of the testator which it was designed to commemorate. But there is now the unquestioned evidence before us, that "*the apostles*" and "primitive Christians" did keep "the first day of the week" sacred to "devotion and sermons;" and this fact Elder J. N. Andrews admits, tacitly, when he introduces these witnesses into the controversy. Paul met with the Jews frequently on the Sabbath, in his efforts to convince them of the Messiahship of Christ; but we have no record of his assembling with *the disciples*—the church only—on the seventh day for worship.

William Twisse, D. D., of England, in his *Morality of the Fourth Commandment*, says: "Yet for some hundred years in the primitive church, not *the Lord's day* only, but the seventh day also, was religiously observed, not by Ebion and Cerenthus only, but by pious Christians also" *s*. Yes; and the effort on the part of the Jewish converts to *perpetuate the law* and the Sabbath, sowed the seeds of heresy in the church in the days of the apostles that afterward developed the sects of Nazarenes, Ebionites and the Hypsistarii. Of the first of these Morer says: "They pretended to believe as Christians, yet they practiced as Jews, and so were in reality neither the one nor the other" *t*. Paul was at war with the originators of those heresies during his entire ministerial career, and the church was much disturbed by them. Even the apostles Peter and James were infected to a degree with some of the ideas from which those sects were afterward developed and distinguished *u*. With such examples—apostolical—we need not be surprised to find the superstitions among the converts after-

ward magnifying those apostolic weaknesses. Even some of the ministry among the Gentile churches went off into the error of teaching the perpetuity of the law as binding on the Christians in a religious sense. Of them he gave in charge to Timothy: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, neither give heed to endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do. Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; from which some having swerved have *turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law;* understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But we know that the law is good, *if a man use it lawfully,* [in the hands of the officers of the civil government since the introduction of the gospel, and not in the hands of the gospel ministry], knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for *the lawless and disobedient,* for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing contrary to sound doctrine; according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust" *v.* These men in their endeavor to adopt *the law* and enforce it on the Christians conjointly with the gospel, had *swerved from* the gospel requirements called by Paul here "the commandment." Peter once called "the way of righteousness" "the holy commandment" *w.* And the law, of which they desired to be teachers, was that which embodied the decalogue; that by which liars, thieves,

murderers and "*the lawless*," were tried, condemned and punished; and the only place "the law" could deal with such characters, since the introduction of the gospel, was in the civil courts, and at the hands of the civil officers.

It was by these heretics that the seventh day, with the rest of the law, was observed and perpetuated in the early ages of the church, and by later historians associated with "*the primitive Christians*."

We have now found by the testimony of the Scriptures that the first day of the week was kept as a day of worship to God by the apostles and primitive Christians, and confirmed by the *uncontroverted* testimony of the history; also that the first day of the week and "*the Lord's day*" were identical and those terms used interchangeably from the days of John, A. D. 96, to the end of the second century. Also that the seventh day was observed by the heretical sects that arose through the influence of false teachers, usually resulting in apostasy from the gospel of Christ, and illustrating the truth of Paul's statements, that "*Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace*." "*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*" *x*.

By reference to Elder J. N. Andrews' *Complete Testimony of the Fathers*, I find he mentions the "seventh fragment" of the "*Lost Writings of Irenæus*," preserved by some writer to us unknown, and gives the quotation. In the quotation the "unknown writer" speaks of the custom "*of not bending the knee upon Sunday*," it being "*a symbol of the resurrection*," and then represents "*the blessed Irenæus, the martyr and bishop of Lyons*," "*in his treatise 'On Easter'*," as tracing the origin of the custom of not kneeling on Sunday, to the "*apostolic times*," also mentioning Pentecost, and calling what the

w 2 Peter 2: 21. *x* Gal. 5: 4, 9.

"unknown writer" calls Sunday "the Lord's day." Elder J. N. Andrews represents the "unknown writer" as using the terms "the Lord's day," but the quotation itself shows that the writer quotes it from the treatise of Irenæus. It is strange the Elder would do thus and then give the quotation of the unknown writer!^y

In his "History of the Sabbath" Elder Andrews, after thrice quoting from Irenæus says: "These things indicate that Irenæus was opposed to sabbatic observance." Now, Eusebius, the Father of church historians, and an admitted authority, in his *Ecclesiastical History* z, alluding to a controversy that occurred in the times of Irenæus, A. D. 167-178, concerning the annual celebration of Christ's resurrection called the festival of the passover, states that the bishops of the different countries, of whom Irenæus was one, decided "that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day; and that on this day alone we should observe the paschal fasts."

It is not just nor fair to presume, as some Sabbath advocates do, that because Eusebius lived and wrote after the days of Irenæus, and that because the first day of the week was then known to be called "the Lord's day," that this learned historian, in recording the words and actions of those eminent men who preceded him, would misrepresent them or commit a fraud. There is *no evidence* that he so did regarding the Sabbath, Pentecost, the Passover, or any other day. Eusebius learned, of those preceding him, that the first day of the week was the Lord's day; and besides, he preserved the title to a work written by Melito a, A. D. 177, "*On the Lord's day*."

The testimony of Irenæus and Melito to the identity of the Lord's day with Sunday, the Lord's resurrection

day, precede that of Bardesanes, Clement, and Tertullian, from three to twenty-three years. But Irenæus was acquainted with Polycarp, the friend and disciple of John the Revelator, who first, by divine inspiration, used the phrase the "Lord's day." We cannot well avoid the conclusion, therefore, that that apostle was the *source* of Irenæus' information respecting the identity of the Lord's day with the day of the Lord's resurrection. The apostle John is the first person known in all antiquity to have used the phraseology, "the Lord's day." In all his after writings in the gospel and in the Epistles, it is significant that he never applied the term "the Lord's day" to the seventh day—the Sabbath! He, like the Fathers that followed him, called it "the first day of the week," and the "eighth day" from the resurrection of his Lord. All history points to John's Revelation on Patmos as the *origin* of the appellation, "the Lord's day." All history, and the very *nature* of the combination of the appellation, unite in testifying that "the first day of the week"—the first day that ever witnessed, as an *accomplished fact*, the completeness of the plan of eternal redemption for mankind—the day of our Lord's resurrection—is "the Lord's day."

Origen comes next after Tertullian in witnessing not only to the identity of "the first day of the week" with "the Lord's day," but also to the observance of the Lord's day as a sacred day of worship by the church in his times. He is admitted on all sides to be one of the ablest churchmen of his times, and his writings are numerous. He flourished about A. D. 225. He is supposed to have been born in Egypt, at Alexandria. It is stated that he traveled extensively among the churches and died at Tyre. He speaks of the Sabbath and the Lord's day, in one place arraying them in direct contrast, alleging that "the manna fell on the Lord's day,

and not on the sabbath" *b*. And in defense of the church practice against Celsus he says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we are accustomed to observe certain days, as, for example, the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words, and deeds, serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day" *c*. This testimony of Origen is decisive as to the belief and practice of the church in the opening years of the third century in sacredly observing "the Lord's day" as a weekly rest-day, a Sabbath. Origen's reference to the *daily* practice of righteousness by the Christians, as in contradistinction to the superstitious idea of the heathens that we ought to *live better some days than on others*, and his judicious remarks on the subject, are in harmony with Paul's instructions to the Romans: "He that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it" *d*. And like Paul he looked upon the seventh day of the creation as being typical of the final rest of the people of God *e*. And since Joshua was unable to lead into that rest the people to whom this rest, thus typified by God's rest on the seventh day, was first presented, because of their unbelief, God spoke of another rest day, by the prophet David.

Instead of the Roman church being guilty of the charge, so often made by Sabbath advocates, of gradually changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day, we find the churches of the east and of Africa observing the first day of the week as a day of assembling for divine worship, from the days of the apostles; and, as the witnesses say, *commemorative of the resurrection of our glorious Lord from the dead*, and as typical of,

b Opera Tome 2, p. 158. *c* Book 8, chap. 22. *d* Rom. 14: 6, 7.

Book 4, chap. 31. *e* Heb. 4: 4-10.

or looking forward to; that *rest* and life that is by the Savior's resurrection assured.

As late as the days immediately succeeding those of Origen, a *Roman* presbyter, Novatian (A. D. 245-50), who also is said to be the founder of the *Cathari* or *Puritan* sect, is found contending for the Sabbath of the law, teaching that the giving of the decalogue at Sinai was only a *revival* of the ten commandment law, and trying to wrest the law from Jewish superstition. This was at Rome! But the result was sectism, as other similar efforts had been. Novatian was no doubt an indirect successor to those met by the apostle Paul in his famous argument to the Roman church, wherein he shows that, to be placed under obligation to keep the law and the gospel at the same time, as a religious code, forced the Christian into a condition of spiritual adultery! No wonder those sects who so teach finally die out *e*.

We believe the foregoing testimonies, gathered from the New Testament, the history of the first three centuries of the church by Morer, Twisse and Coleman, together with the statements of the Fathers, so far produced, is sufficient to establish beyond successful dispute the truth of the proposition, viz.,—The first day of the week, the Lord's resurrection day, was the day called by John the Revelator "the Lord's day," and that, therefore, it was the day divinely appointed for the solemn celebration of the worship of God under the gospel, and that the apostles and early Fathers, with the church, so understood it, and therefore so kept it, that day also commemorating the glorious resurrection of the Lord and Savior.

CHAPTER XIII.

DID THE POPE CHANGE THE SABBATH?

In view of the fact that the gospel nowhere enjoins anew the observance of the seventh day as a Sabbath; and, that Christ did not re-enact it; and, of the further fact, that the church as such did not adopt its observance, but only the Jewish converts at first (and not all of them), followed in after times by Judaizing sects; and, further, from the general historical fact, as we have hitherto seen, that the church, with the apostles, at the beginning, and right along down the ages after, did assemble for worship—preaching, prayer, reading the Scriptures, celebrating the Lord's death by partaking the Lord's supper, and also his resurrection—on “the Lord's day”—the question at the head of this division of the subject appears almost impertinent. Moreover, the evidence found in the New Testament of Sabbath observance, so far as the argument is concerned, is just as strong in favor of circumcision and other legal rites. And yet further; we have failed to find the least iota of evidence in either the Bible or the writings of a single one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, so far as examined, that the name—“the Lord's day”—was ever applied to the seventh-day Sabbath of the law, but *invariably*, and without exception, to the first day of the week. Readers of the Fathers will note this fact with special attention.

But it has been assumed, first by the Catholics, in their Catechism, and more recently by Sabbatarians,

that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath from the *last* to the *first* day of the week; and by the latter it is asserted, but totally without proof, that to observe the Lord's day as sacred is but observing an institution of the Pope! This assumption, to be true, must take for granted that the Catholic Church, with a Pope at its head, was *the* church originally established by Christ, and that Christ placed *within* the church the *authority* to annul, or change at will, any divine law, ceremony or institution, at any time it saw fit! These two propositions must be unquestionably established, or the assumption is baseless. But there is no way of proving either of these assumptions to be true, therefore the statement that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath is false. All history accords (backed by previously uttered and divinely inspired prophecy), that the Catholic Church, in its primal organization, was the result of a gradual and deceptive apostasy from original Christianity. There was no such personage in the church, or out of it, as a Pope, with assumed powers of universal control and dictatorial, decretal, or other arrogated right, till the beginning of the sixth century. Andrews, in his *History of the Sabbath*, says: "In the early part of this (sixth) century, the bishop of Rome was made head over the entire church by the emperor of the east, Justinian," and he cites as authority for the statement Shimeall's Bible Chronology*f*. But history, generally, places the universal ascendancy of the Roman bishop one hundred years later, when, (in A. D. 606) Boniface was declared to be "Universal Bishop."

But it is urged that much earlier than this, even in the reign of Constantine (in A. D. 321) that emperor issued an edict to the citizens of the Empire that Sunday should be observed as a day of rest from secular

labor, and that this was an all-important step in the movement of changing the Sabbath of the decalogue, and that the change, by successive steps or stages, was fully accomplished, to the satisfaction of the church, by an ecclesiastical council held at Laodicea (A. D. 364), a city of Asia Minor, and more than one thousand miles from Rome. Let anyone read the edict of Constantine, a copy of which is given by J. N. Andrews in his *History of the Sabbath*, and it will be seen that there is not one word in it having the most distant reference to the Sabbath!^g And, in fact, it is now confessed in a recent number of the *Advent Review*, that "it is safe to affirm that there was nothing done in the time of Constantine, either by himself or any other, that has the least appearance of changing the Sabbath"^h. This confession supercedes the necessity of further argument in rebuttal of the claim that Constantine the Great changed the Sabbath.ⁱ

But what was the result of his edict with the people of the Empire, *heathen* as well as Christian? We will let the ecclesiastical historian, Mosheim, answer this question: "The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of the Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been"ⁱ. Constantine's Sunday law could have had no special influence over the Christians, who had observed that day with sacred regard, as we have shown by Sabbatarian evidence, from the days of the apostles, save as a protection from heathen interruption of religious services on that day. According to the edict itself, whatever veneration the people of the Empire entertained for Sunday, to use the language of

an able Sabbatarian, Elder and Editor Waggoner, "the idea of rest from worldly labor in its worship was entirely new" *j*. By the testimony of Constantine's edict, then, and this confession of Elder Waggoner, the church did *not* borrow, or in any way derive the idea of worship to God on the first day of the week from the heathens!

The Encyclopedia Britannica, Article Sunday, of Constantine's edict, says: "Before him, and even in his time, they observed the Jewish Sabbath, as well as Sunday; both to satisfy the law of Moses, and to imitate *the apostles who used to meet together on the first day*" *k*. Elder Andrews calls this citation "a high authority." We observe in this connection that those sects who adhered to the law of Moses, did not question for a moment the right or propriety of Lord's day observance; not an instance of the kind is found even from the days of the apostles. Those heretics recognized the first day of the week as being the Lord's day.

Another writer of acknowledged authority with Elder Andrews *l* testifies harmoniously with the last passage cited, who, writing of the practice of the church in the days of Pliny, and of Pliny's statement concerning the Christians, says: "As the Sabbath day appears to have been quite as commonly observed at this date as the sun's day (if not more so), it is just as probable that this stated day, referred to by Pliny, was the seventh day, as that it was the first day; though the latter is generally taken for granted."

The "date" referred to here is A. D. 103-104, only seven to eight years after John wrote the book of Revelation. It will be remembered that after the overthrow of Jerusalem, Asia Minor became the principal

j Advent Review, Nov. 22, 1837. *k* Edition of 1842. *l* Testimony of Fathers, p. 25. Obligations of the Sabbath, p. 300.

field of operation and settlement for the Christians. Also, large and important settlements of Jews were made in the localities of the "seven churches." They, doubtless, with their zeal for the law, influenced the Jewish converts among the churches, and some of *them*, no doubt, revered the seventh day, as this writer observed. It is evident that such was the case, as their influence was demoralizing on the lives of some in the church at Smyrna, and also at Philadelphia. And since the coming of the Messiah, by the gospel only can any become Jews in fact *m*. The Holy Spirit denies their claim to Abrahamic descent by virtue of the law, and denounces them as being "the synagogue of Satan." And besides, there were many in the church in those regions, "*specially they of the circumcision,*" who were "unruly and vain talkers and deceivers," whose mouths it became *necessary* to close, who for the sake of money subverted the faith of entire households *n*, hence the sabbatizing sects that began to develop about that "date." But this witness testifies that the first day of the week—the Lord's day—was observed as a day of worship by the Christians at the opening of the second century. No doubt the Jews joined the heathen in casting the observers of the Lord's day "into prison," to try them.

From the foregoing it appears that the first day of the week had been observed from the apostolic age as a day of worship, therefore the edict of Constantine restraining labor on "the venerable day of the sun," on the part of the citizens of the Roman Government, had not the remotest relation to a change of the Sabbath. It would have a tendency to invite the attention of the mind of the Roman world to a consideration of the basic fact of the gospel of God, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from

m Rom. 2: 28, 29.*n* Titus 1: 10, 11.

the dead, the weekly recurrence of the day, as one of the leading reasons *why* the day should be observed, and thence on to the honor of *the Lord* of the day, their Savior.

CHAPTER XIV.

"THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS."

This work is cited by Elder J. N. Andrews, in the *Complete Testimony of the Fathers*, and their evidence to the identity of the first day of the week with the Lord's day, is examined, and admitted also that "they were in existence as early as the *third* century, and were then very generally believed to express the doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important testimony to the practice of the church at that time." Mosheim's notice of these "Constitutions" is also cited and reads: "The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed amongst the Christians of the *second and third* centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions" *o*. Also, the Historian Guericke's reference to the Apostolical Constitutions which says: "This is a collection of ecclesiastical statutes purporting to be the work of the apostolic age, but in reality formed gradually in the *second, third, and fourth* centuries, and is of much value in reference to the history of polity, and Christian archæology generally" *p*. Here we are carried back to the days immediately succeeding those of the apostles, with "important historical *testimony*" concerning the polity, manners, discipline, and archæology of the church of Christ *q*. In these, as in other writings of the Ante-

o Hist. Com. Cen. 1, sec. 51. *p* Ancient Church, p. 212.

q Complete Testimony of the Fathers, p. 13.

Nicene Fathers, Saturday is never called the Lord's day, but invariably "sabbath," and, "the seventh day." By them the Sabbath is recognized as a suitable "fast" day.

Of the manner in which the Lord's day was observed in those times, the "Constitutions" state this: "And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus and sent him to us." This testimony, also, confirms that of Ignatius, Barnabas, and others of the second century, who identify the Lord's day with the first day of the week: "Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection, on which we pray thrice, standing, in memory of him who arose in three days, in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food" *r*. If the churches of Asia had not been taught that the Lord's day—so-called by the apostle John—was the first day of the week, and that it was the day on which it was designed that the Lord's supper, with other religious services, were to be observed weekly, it appears utterly unreasonable that the entire body of the church could have been brought to accept so important a change in less than half a century, and that, too, without valid authority.

That the Lord's supper, a memorial of our Lord's death, should be celebrated on the Lord's day, appears consistent and harmonious with divine arrangement. The Jews, under the law, had a weekly and an annual memorial of their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt—the seventh day of the week and the Passover festival *s*. Would it not be strange, indeed, that the

redemption of *the world* from death, as assured by the resurrection, should not be held in sacred remembrance by those whose hope of eternal life is founded on the great central fact of the gospel, God's power to *their* salvation, the resurrection of their Savior on the Lord's day!

The technical quibble about the word "death," connected with the observance of the Lord's supper, in commemoration of the Savior's death, and that Friday would be a more appropriate time to celebrate his death, is a very insignificant objection to Lord's day sacredness, and equally so as favoring seventh-day observance. Had Paul used the term "crucifixion" when referring to this subject, the matter might have been different. *Men* ("the princes of this world"), crucified, killed "the Lord of glory;" but his death, including his glorious release therefrom, perfected the act on which the perfect faith and hope in the gospel rests. "It is Christ that died, yea, *rather*, that is risen again." The resurrection of Christ was *the act of God*; therefore the celebration of the Lord's supper on the Lord's day is rendering sacred homage to God, *through Christ*.

In the "Constitutions," are to be found extensive commentaries on the law, including the decalogue. But all references to them go to show that the writers understood that whatever degree of morality was found in the law was embraced in the gospel, and that as a religious guide the gospel, therefore, is all sufficient for the disciples of Christ; also that the law was given to the Jews as a nation, and pertained to them as such. On this point we quote: "Thou didst give *them* the law or decalogue, which was pronounced by thy voice and written with thy hand. Thou didst enjoin the observation of the sabbath, not affording an occasion of idleness," etc. But of Christ's resurrection, and since, the same writer

says, "on which account *we* solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's day." Notice, that the writer says "they," the Jews, received the law; to "them" the Sabbath was given. But of the Christians, — "*we* solemnly assemble" . . . "on the Lord's day." By the "Apostolical Constitutions" we are borne out in the position that, during the second and third centuries "the first day of the week" was known as "The Lord's day," and for that reason observed for the solemn celebration of public worship of the Lord. This work shows "the manners and discipline of" the Christians "resident in Greece and the oriental regions," and therefore the charge that the Bishop of Rome changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, does not hold good. If there was a change of the day at all after the days of the New Testament writers, all the evidence points to the churches of the East, and to the time of John the Revelator; and then, if any change could be shown, at the very *utmost* it is only in the fact that the divinely inspired name of "the Lord's day" was applied to the day of Christ's resurrection—the first day of the week. John, in lonely exile on Patmos, was keeping "Lord's day," with the seven churches of Asia, and his Lord met *with* him and opened to him the mysterious vail of the coming ages, giving him a view of the future works of God and men, including the fortunes of the church, in outline, down to the close of the Millennium, and further.

Now, having adduced the testimony of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, also that of Origen, and some of the evidences of the "Apostolical Constitutions," in proof of the identity of the Lord's day with the first day of the week, showing that it was the universal practice of the Christian churches to assemble on that day for the worship of God, celebrating the Lord's supper on the Lord's

day, at the same time commemorating the Lord's glorious resurrection; and having failed to find any evidence, so far, to sustain the assertion that the Sabbath began to pass through a change at the hands of Constantine the Great, A. D. 321, at the Council of Nice, we might now proceed to array the evidence of witnesses later along, including that of Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, in Asia, A. D. 270, and of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, Egypt, A. D. 306, with others; but further testimony here is not essential to our proposition, it not being denied since then to the present time that the first day of the week is the Lord's day.

But it has been asserted that "Eusebius, the special friend and flatterer of Constantine, was the first man to put forth this doctrine" of the change of the Sabbath. But what does Eusebius say touching this subject of the Sabbath and the Jews? "Wherefore as they rejected it, [the Word, Christ], by the new covenant, translated and transferred *the feast of the sabbath* to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, viz., the saving Lord's day" *t*. The transfer of "*the feast of the sabbath,*" *by Christ*, in "the new covenant," was simply the repetition, in substance, of Paul, as follows: "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, [Margin, holiday] *not with old leaven* [systems of doctrine, or leaven of the Pharisees], *neither* with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" *u*.

We have already learned that the churches of Corinth, Galatia and Troas, kept the feast of the holy day on the first day of the week, and that, too, by apostolic instruc-

tion and divine command *v.* Eusebius, then, was seeking to maintain the sanctity of the Lord's day, as a day of worship under the Christian covenant, and to so impress the public Roman citizenship, and stand by apostolic practice.

Again, complaint is made by Sabbatarians that the Fathers and other writers of the primitive church do not attach *Sabbath sanctity* to the resurrection day of our Lord. And, for the very best of reasons, for there is not an iota of evidence that anyone connected with the church in those times, whatever their views may have been regarding the sanctity of other days of the week, ever questioned the sanctity of the Lord's day, or the propriety of assembling for worship on that day. After Jesus religiously washed the disciples' feet, no Christian questioned the sanctity of the ordinance or act. Since Jesus ate the Lord's supper, no professed follower of Christ, except the most extreme spiritualizer of God's word, pretends to call in question the sanctity of the Lord's supper. During the time of "The Fathers," the question in controversy was urged only by *heretics*, and about the seventh-day sanctity. This is the fact.

In looking for the time and place where the alleged change of the Sabbath was finally effected and completed, the Council of Laodicea, held in A. D. 364, was when and where the change was wrought. The Council of Laodicea, in Asia, was not a Catholic-general-council. It was a council composed of about "thirty-two bishops" . . . "from different provinces in Asia" *w.* It was rather a *local* council. Leberius, bishop of Rome, at this date was deposed and exiled. And that he might be released from degradation, he "wrote in a most submissive and cringing style to the eastern bishops" *x.* He was not

v Acts 20: 1-7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; 14: 37. *w* McClintock & Strong's
Cyclopedia. *x* Bower's Hist. of the Popes.

represented at that council, either personally or by proxy. How this bishop, under these circumstances, could change the Sabbath, is a mystery. Surely, if he did, the days of miracles had not yet ended!

This council is barely noticed by some historians, and by some not mentioned at all, as reference to them at this date will abundantly show. But what did this little council do? It simply took measures to meet the encroachments of the judaizing heretics who were becoming somewhat aggressive in the vicinities of Laodicea and maintaining that the Sabbath of the law was equally prominent with the Lord's day. I have failed to find any evidence that the church of Rome had anything, whatever, to do with the Council of Laodicea. Moreover, at this time (A. D. 364), the bishops of Rome had no jurisdiction over other bishops, nor were superior to them. In the very nature of the case, then, the Sabbath could not have been changed by the church of Rome or its bishop at the Council of Laodicea. Anatolius was bishop of the church of Laodicea, in A. D. 270, as we have seen. In one of his canons (also cited by Elder J. N. Andrews), he says: "The solemn festival of the resurrection of the Lord can be celebrated *only on the Lord's day*" *y*.

The Laodicean church was one of the "seven churches of Asia," beloved of God at the time of the writing of John's Revelation, and the subject of God's counsel and severe chastisement through John *z*. It was known to, and perhaps founded by, the apostle Paul *a*, and, like the churches of Corinth and Galatia, no doubt, was taught to observe "the first day of the week" as a day of worship and celebration of the Lord's supper. And having the writings of John, it could not have failed to learn of

him that *that* day was "the Lord's day." In this church was a line of succession tracing "the Lord's day" direct to John the Revelator, who first gave that inspired name to the day of Christ's resurrection, and, for the Council of Laodicea to pass resolutions in honor of, and to express a determination to *continue* its observance, as a day of sacred worship to God through Christ, who was raised from the dead on that day, was reasonable, but it was not to *change* the Sabbath.

Therefore, as no time and place has yet been found where the Pope of Rome, or the Catholic Church, changed the Sabbath; and since there was no Pope known in the world in A. D. 364, the claim that he changed the Sabbath, at any time, is baseless.

From the days of the apostles, and during the times of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the periods of the councils herein referred to, and, in fact, all along the ages since to the present time, there has been sabbatizing, heretical sects, and their reasons for Sabbath observance have been substantially the arguments urged for it by Sabbatarians at the present. Says Elder Andrews, "In 1607, an English first-day writer, John Sprint, gave the views of the Sabbath-keepers of that time, which in truth have been substantially the same in all ages" *b*.

CONCLUSION.

Paul, the great apostle of Jesus to the Gentiles, with the Gentile churches of his time, kept holy the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection, esteeming it as the proper day for celebrating the Lord's supper, the day called by John afterward "the Lord's day." Paul honored it as by divine appointment for solemn assembly, for preaching the word of God, for prayer, for the breaking of bread, for charity and for the remem-

brance of the poor *c*. And then this apostle and faithful witness of Christ wrote to the Corinthians, and to "all that in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ," saying, "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ" *d*. And Christ, as we have seen, met with his disciples, when the new covenant became of force, on the day when he, "*according to the Scriptures*," arose from the dead, "the third day" from the crucifixion day, the first day of the week, and also on the eighth day from the day of his resurrection. Yes; Jesus set the example afterward followed by the apostles, disciples, and Paul. He assembled with his disciples the evening of the same day of his glorious resurrection from the dark, mysterious land of death, and renewed the hope of life in their hearts. And though they "shut the door for fear of the Jews," they nevertheless assembled *that* day, when they might, with greater safety, have waited till the Sabbath. But they omitted to assemble the Sabbath following, because Jesus had evidently arranged to meet with them again on the following first day of the week, to strengthen their faith, and instruct them in the things of "the kingdom of God" *e*. Meetings, after this, were in Galilee, as previously arranged and "*appointed*" by the Lord *f*. In fact, all the circumstances connected with these first-day meetings of Christ with his disciples appear to favor the idea that they were all held in accordance with previous appointment. Had the Savior washed the disciples' feet as often as he met with his disciples for worship on the first day of the week, after his resurrection, who, among the followers of Christ, would not have accepted it as of perpetual obligation, and as a divine institution? Especially since, during a

• 1 Cor. 14: 37; 16: 1, 2; Acts. 20: 1-7. • 1 Cor. 11: 1. • Acts 1: 3;

John 20: 26. • Matt. 28: 7, 16.

forty-days sojourn with them, not a seventh-day meeting was held, so far as the record shows.

With all this array of evidence, including the example of Christ and the apostles and the church during the days of her ancient glory and inspiration, with the divine teachings of the authorized ministry of our Lord, *all honoring the great day of the resurrection of our Lord, "the Lord's day,"* that day that brings to the mind of all nations once every seven days wherever the gospel is proclaimed the Savior, not only as the "Everlasting Father," the Creator of all things "visible and invisible," but as a Savior, Redeemer and Lord of the redeemed and glorified through the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation, may we not with all confidence conclude that the notable day of Christ's resurrection, "the Lord's day," is "the Christian Sabbath, or weekly rest-day," in deed and in truth!

OBSERVATION.—I have followed the lead of Elder J. N. Andrews in examination of some of the evidences cited or used by him in the second division of the subject, because he is considered by many, to be one of the ablest, if not the very ablest Sabbath advocate in the United States at the present time.

C. SCOTT.

CHAPTER XV.

THE ORIGINAL WORDS.

As a fitting conclusion to the foregoing work, we now produce undeniable proof that, after the crucifixion of Christ, the first day of the week was known and denominated by the Chrstians of those times as their Sabbath—a day of rest and worship. The first proof-texts we present are from “Young’s Bible Translation,” a work claiming to be “a strictly literal and idiomatic rendering of the Original Hebrew and Greek Texts.” The scholarship of this translator is above question, for he stands endorsed by the leading Hebrew and Greek scholars of our times. His *Analytical Concordance of the Bible*, his *Hebrew and Greek Lexicons*, and his other popular works, as well as his *Bible Translation*, place him in the very front rank of Hebrew and Greek scholars. The following is his literal rendering of Matthew 28: 1, from the original text as penned by its author: “And on the eve of the Sabbaths, at the dawn, toward the first of the Sabbaths, came Mary the Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.”

Mark 16: 1 and 9 he renders thus: “And the Sabbath [Jewish Sabbath.—Ed.] having past, Mary the Magdalene, and Mary of James, and Salome, bought spices, that having come, they may anoint him, and early in the morning of the first of the Sabbaths [under the New Covenant dispensation.—Ed.], they come unto the sepulchre, at the rising of the sun. . . . And he, having risen in the morning of the first of the Sabbaths, did appear

first to Mary the Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons."

Luke 24: 1 he gives in these words: "And on the first of the Sabbaths, at early dawn, they came to the tomb, bearing the spices they made ready, and certain others with them."

John 20: 1 he gives as follows: "And on the first of the Sabbaths, Mary the Magdalene doth come early (there being yet darkness) to the tomb." And verse 19 thus: "It being, therefore, evening, on that day, the first of the Sabbaths, and the doors having been shut where the disciples were assembled, through fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith to them, 'Peace to you;' and this having said, he showed them his hands and side; the disciples, therefore, rejoiced, having seen the Lord."

Mark it well,—these texts are from the original Greek, being transferred into the English language after an exact, literal manner. Now by these testimonies we learn that the first Christian writers, and the first apostles, held and taught that, after the crucifixion of our Lord, the first day of the week was, and was to be, the Christians' Sabbath—their appointed day for rest and worship.

The phrase, "The first of the Sabbaths," may be readily understood as meaning *the first of the Sabbaths* under the New Covenant order, that order which was fully established by the death and resurrection of the Christ. Indeed, it seems quite impossible for the phrase to have any other meaning.

That Young's translation of the foregoing texts is the exactly correct one, may be seen by consulting the same texts in the Greek as found in Wilson's or Griesbach's *Emphatic Diaglott*, or in any Greek New Testament, for there we find that the Greek word *Sabbaton* is the

same as the English word Sabbath, and that it occurs as in the texts quoted from Young's Translation as before shown.

In the German New Testament, Matt. 28: 1 (translated literally from the Greek), when rendered in the English, reads, — "First holy day of the Sabbaths;" Mark 16: 9 reads, — "first day of the Sabbaths;" Luke 24: 1 reads, — "one of the Sabbaths;" John 20: 1 reads, — "one of the Sabbaths," and verse 19 reads, — "in the evening of the same Sabbath," while Acts 20: 7 reads, "upon one of the Sabbaths," and 1 Cor. 16: 2 reads, — "on each of the Sabbaths." By these texts we see that this German translation is in essential harmony with the translations before quoted and cited, all proving that, in the original Greek texts, what is rendered "the first day of the week," in the *Authorized Version*, and similar versions, is there rendered "the first of the Sabbaths," etc., etc.

Jesus, after his resurrection, commanded his apostles and said, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*;" and he had also said to them, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth;" therefore we conclude that, whatever the apostles observed, and by their writings and examples taught others to observe, these are among the "all things" which Jesus commanded them. Consequently, when we find the apostles and the primitive Christians writing of the first day of the week, after the resurrection of Christ, and calling it "the first of the Sabbaths" and also observing that day, particularly, as their day of rest and worship, it is evident that Christ had so instructed and commanded them.

We further add that, there is not one text in the New

Testament, after the cross, commanding in any way the Saints to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. There is not one text in it forbidding labor on that day after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ; neither is there one text commanding that day as a day of public worship. There is not one text in it that proves the seventh day to have been set apart for the church, as such, for rest and public worship. There is not a text in it proving that the Christians did not abstain from labor on the first day of the week. There is not one text in it commanding that, after the resurrection of Christ, the ministry were to teach or preach the law given at Sinai, nor the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. There is not one text in the Bible proving that the seventh day was ever commanded of God, or kept by man, from the creation to the exodus from Egypt. There is not one text in the Bible, nor one item of history, proving that any other than the first day of the week is called the "Lord's day." There is not one conclusive item in ancient church history proving that the Church of Christ, as such, abstained from labor on the seventh day, and observed that day as a day of worship. Nor is there conclusive proof in such history that Christ's Church, as such, ever observed any other day as a day of public worship or weekly Sabbath except the first day of the week. Neither is there valid historic proof that Christ's Church performed common labor on the first day of the week and did not hold their regular weekly assemblies for worship on that day.

Now in view of all the facts hereinbefore presented, it is clear that the seventh day was first set apart for rest and public worship at Sinai, and pertained alone to Israel and Israelitish proselytes, and, by the will of God and the teachings of Christ and his apostles, terminated at the cross. And it is further evident that, from the

resurrection of our Lord, the first day of the week, by the will and commandment of God through Christ, was ordained and set apart to and for his people for rest and public worship and as the memorial day of the new covenant and new creation in Christ Jesus.

Schaff, "History Christian Church," pp. 478-9, says: "The first day was already in the apostolic age honorably designated as 'the Lord's Day.' On that day Paul met with the disciples at Troas and preached till midnight. On that day he ordered the Galatian and Corinthian Christians to make, no doubt in connection with divine service, their weekly contributions to charitable objects according to their ability. It appears, therefore, from the New Testament itself, that Sunday was observed as a day of worship, and in special commemoration of the resurrection, whereby the work of redemption was finished.

"The *universal* and *uncontradicted* Sunday observance in the second century can only be explained by the fact that it had root in apostolic practice. Such observance is the more to be appreciated as it had no support in civil legislation before the age of Constantine [A. D. 306-337.—ED.], and must have been connected with many inconveniences, considering the lowly social condition of the majority of Christians and their dependence upon their heathen masters and employers. . . . Besides the Christian Sunday, the Jewish Christians observed their ancient Sabbath also, till Jerusalem was destroyed. After that event, the Jewish habit continued only among the Ebionites and Nazarenes."

In Fisher's "History Christian Church," p. 64, we find the following: "The Jewish Christians, who were followed by the oriental churches, not only observed Sun-

day but Saturday also. The Roman Christians, on the contrary, fasted on Saturday."

We close with the following from Smith's Dictionary, Bible, Article Lord's Day: "The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John are as follows: The Lord's Day (a name which has now come out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with our Lord's resurrection than before) existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical and so of Scriptural Christianity. It was *never defended*; for it was *never* impugned, or at least only impugned as other things received from the apostles were. It was never confounded with the Sabbath. but carefully distinguished from it. . . . It was not a day of severe Sabbatical character, but a day of joy and cheerfulness, rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the Holy Eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for alms-giving."

In this book is presented an amount of evidence that is simply overwhelming, and such kinds of proof as are quite irrefutable, and as such we commit the work to the candid judgment of all who will examine its pages.

W. W. BLAIR.













