

THE
Bible Sabbath
DEFENDED

*"The Seventh Day is the Sabbath of
the Lord thy God"*

CHURCH OF GOD PUBLISHING HOUSE
Stanberry, Missouri.

1944



Fifth Edition
Revised 1944

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I
The Seventh Day Sabbath—the only Weekly Sabbath known
to Bible writers.

CHAPTER II
The Sabbath Day not Lost. Its Origin and Preservation.

CHAPTER III
The Week; Its Origin, Nature and Preservation

CHAPTER IV
The Names of the Days of the Week, their Origin and
Significance.

CHAPTER V
The Sabbath not Changed by Divine Authority.

CHAPTER VI
The Sabbath not Ceremonial nor Abolished

CHAPTER VII
The New Covenant

CHAPTER VIII
Objection Considered, Breaking Bread, etc.

CHAPTER IX
The Day of the Resurrection

CHAPTER X
The Sabbath in the New Testament

CHAPTER XI
The Penalty Abolished

CHAPTER XII
Death Penalty Continued; Fire Prohibition, and "Bible
Banner" Position Examined

CHAPTER XIII
Paul's Illustration of Four Figures

CHAPTER XIV
Commandments Abolished; Partition Wall; Hand-writing
of Ordinances

CHAPTER XV
The Sabbath a Sign; Circumcision

CHAPTER XVI
Ministration; Sabbath Day's Journey and Third Day

CHAPTER XVII
Abraham's Two Sons

CHAPTER XVIII
Exposition of Colossians 2:16

CHAPTER XIX
Examination of Sabbaton; Notes and Criticisms

CHAPTER XX
Eleven Questions on the Sabbath

THE BIBLE SABBATH DEFENDED

CHAPTER I.

The Seventh Day is the Sabbath—the Only Weekly Sabbath Known to Bible Writers

What day of the weekly cycle does the Scripture teach to be the Sabbath day? If we appeal to the Bible we shall find no difficulty in the solution of this question. And truly the Bible should be authoritative with all who accept it as their spiritual guide to direct in spiritual matters. We do not reject historians, commentaries, lexicons, or the sciences. We regard them as valuable helps to the study of the sacred Word. But the Bible is chief—the Book of books. The sciences and all other works are subordinate thereto, and should be used as auxiliaries. To use them as authoritative expounders is to transfer inspiration out of the Bible. To illustrate: Suppose some one originates a theory that the first day of the week is the Sabbath and in looking for the evidence examines first the Bible, but finds none; simply finds the first day mentioned eight times, but it is not said to be sacred or holy, or even intimates that Christ, or the apostles, or their converts, ever kept it. He then goes to history, written by uninspired men, to show that it was the custom of the primitive disciples to observe the first day as the Christian Sabbath, and from certain statements collected from numerous conflicting historians he draws out material from which he constructs a theory for first day observance. Is he not guilty of making the Bible subsidiary to history, and of transferring inspiration out of the Bible? We should be careful in this respect. Paul says, when

referring to the Scripture, that we are thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:17. By the Scripture we are to understand the Old and New Testaments.

What day of the weekly cycle does the Bible teach to be the Sabbath day? The Bible says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:8. Here the law of God clearly defines the seventh day to be the Sabbath. All religious societies admit that the seventh day was anciently the Sabbath. Christ refers to this fact when He says, "The sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. And nowhere in His teachings does He even intimate the abolition of this universal Sabbath and the erection of a new one for Christians, or the followers of Christ.

John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev. 1:10. The possessive case, as here used, clearly teaches that the Lord is the owner of the day. "But," says the objector, "I thought the days of the week all belonged to the Lord." Remotely speaking they did, but God thought proper to give to man six days in which He taught him to do his work; but the seventh day He was pleased to reserve unto Himself, and to teach man to remember it and to keep it holy. Through Isaiah the Lord calls it His holy day. The exact words are "My holy day." Mark the possessive case is here again used in reference to the seventh day. Thus the Old Testament Scriptures agree in teaching that God owns the day. The verse reads, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine

-B 148-

own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Isa. 58:13. All parties admit that the seventh day was the Sabbath in Isaiah's time. The Bible speaks plainly when it says, "The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God." Reader, if thou wouldst turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, cease violating it. Many are trampling under foot this sacred and time-honored institution instead of calling it "a delight, the holy of the Lord," "and an honourable" institution. They repudiate it and consider it dishonorable in all its features, and thus in their own ways they walk, seeking their own pleasure, and speaking their own words when they say the first day is now the Sabbath. The words of the Diety are, "The seventh day is the sabbath," and he who says the same speaketh the words of God. If we would honor God we must walk in His appointed ways, not doing our own ways, nor setting up our own institutions, instead of, or in opposition to His. God commands us to observe the seventh day. If we are His soldiers let us march forward in obedience to His command.

Some talk of the Christian Sabbath by way of contradistinction. We remark, such a distinction as this from the seventh day Sabbath, which they call Jewish, or the Sabbath of the Jews, is not in the Bible. First day Christian Sabbath observance is of pagan and Papal origin, and would never have existed had it not been for human creeds, synodical covenants, and conventional doctrines, which have supplanted the Scriptures and made the Word of God of none effect. The seventh day is the only weekly Sabbath ever instituted by divine authority. It bears the sacred title, "The Sabbath," in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. We advocate a return to the observance of

the true Sabbath, which is everywhere in the Scriptures declared to be the seventh day.

CHAPTER II.

The Sabbath Day not Lost. Its Origin and Preservation

Many apparently well-disposed persons very readily admit that the seventh day is the Sabbath, but excuse themselves from keeping it by saying, "Perhaps it has been lost." This word, perhaps, is very well employed. It were sufficient for us simply to reply, "Perhaps it has not." But as we do not wish to evade anything that has the least appearance of an objection, we shall examine it. We invite attention to the words of David. He gives an earnest exhortation both to learn and preach the law of God. He gives divine utterance to the following sublime sentiment: "Give ear, O my people to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth. . . . For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which He commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children, that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children: that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep His commandments." Psa. 78:1-7. Hezekiah's testimony is to the point. He says, ". . . The father to the children shall make known thy truth" Isa. 38:19. Here is the Diety's plan clearly revealed. God, in the very beginning, purposed that His people should be governed by His law, and He designed that the law should be preserved. Has the purpose of God been defeated? Have His designs proved abortive? Why did the Lord call

out the fathers and communicate to them His will, imperatively enjoin upon them the necessity of making known the same to their children? David's answer is:—"That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children." The Lord's object in thus calling out the fathers and prophets was that generations yet unborn should know His truth, and declare that truth to their children, so that the human family, all along the ages of time, might not forget His works; but set their hope in Him, and keep His commandments. Here we have the duty of unborn millions clearly defined to be to keep the commandments of Jehovah. The wise man says, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13.

These passages are of the weightiest import, for they clearly show forth the object and design of Deity in the preservation of His Word, as well as the means used to accomplish that purpose. He has committed His revelations, making known His moral institutions, to the custody of His people, and that too, for all future time; and by them His Word is to be published that the people may know and do the will of God; or, as explained by David, "Keep his commandments."

We might as well argue that God's Word has been lost, as to argue that His Sabbath is lost. One is just as reasonable as the other. The Sabbath is a part of that Word which is styled "the tried word," of which it is said, "it endureth forever." John, in the New Testament, endorses the commandments of God, so highly recommended by Solomon, and says, "Blessed are they that do his (God's) commandments, that they may have right

to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14. The fourth command, which enjoins the Sabbath, is one of these commandments, Ex. 20:8-11. When Israel violated the Sabbath the Lord said, ". . . How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" Ex. 16:28. Paul says, "Man was made," 1 Cor. 15:45. He was made at creation, Gen. 2:7. Christ says the "Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. The Sabbath was made when man was made; namely, at creation, Gen. 2:2, 3. Observe, it is said that the Lord blessed and sanctified the seventh day. Sanctify—to set apart. It could not have been set apart without a precept enjoining its observance. These verses not only give the origin of the Sabbath, but also the fact that a precept was given to Adam enjoining its observance. Now that the Sabbath could easily be handed down from Adam to Abraham, and from Abraham to Moses, we shall proceed to show.

Methuselah was contemporary with Adam. He was one of Adam's students, and from him he learned the wonderful story of creation, the introduction of sin, and his expulsion from the Paradise of God. Methuselah lived to the year of the flood. Shem was born one hundred years before the flood, and was for many years one of Methuselah's pupils, and from him he could learn all the history of the past. Shem lived on both sides of the flood, and was for a long period associated with Abraham, the father of the faithful, whom God chose for that purpose, from the very fact that he kept His commandments and His laws. Gen. 26:5. One of these commandments enjoins the Sabbath, and when Israel, the seed of Abraham, violated the Sabbath, Jehovah said, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" Ex.

16:28. These sacred historic links preserve the Sabbath from Adam to Abraham, whose literal descendants we find observing it in the wilderness, antecedent to the giving of the law from Sinai. And to settle all doubts, when Diety, in awful grandeur proclaimed His law from Sinai's quaking mount, He points out the same Sabbath which they had been keeping as the creation Sabbath, Ex. 20:8-11. In the face of these facts, why quibble, and say, "Perhaps the Sabbath was lost" of why say, as some ministers frequently do, that the Sabbath originated at Mount Sinai? Jehovah, who ought to be good authority in this case, dates its origin back to creation. Who is right? The inspired penman says, "Let God be true though every man be found a liar." And we say, Amen.

Thus we have brought the Sabbath down from Abraham to Moses. And certainly no one will contend that there was any derangement from Moses to Christ. If there had been Christ would have known it and set the matter right. It is said of Him, "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day and stood up for to read." Luke 4:16. Here is a Sabbath in the New Testament, the one and the only one our Savior and His disciples ever observed. And this Sabbath was the creation Sabbath. This is evident from Luke 23:56, "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment." The commandment is found in Ex. 20:8, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." The appended explanation is found in the 10th verse, "The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God." The facts on which it is based are found in the 11th verse, "God rested on the seventh day, wherefore

the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it." Here we have the original seventh day Sabbath brought down this side of the crucifixion. Our Savior, who was divine and made no mistake, kept the same Sabbath that the Jews kept, and He kept no other. He says, "It was made for man." He refers it back to creation, consequently it could not be lost. This is sufficient and ought forever to settle the matter. Christ says, "The sabbath was made for man." The objector says this means the Jew. If so, then Jew and man are identical terms. But what are Gentiles? Who believes that where and wherever we see a man we see a Jew, and that Gentiles are not a part of mankind? Adam was a man, therefore the Sabbath was made for him. If the term man signifies a Jew then Adam was a Jew, for he was a man, and the Bible shows that the Sabbath was made the next day after he was made.

Now we appeal to the people to whom the Sabbath was given, and of whom Jehovah has said, "Ye are my witnesses." Josephus, the distinguished Jewish historian, says of the Sabbath: "Accordingly Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein were made, and that the seventh was a rest and release from the labor of such operations. whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath, which word denotes rest in the Hebrew tongue." Antiquities, Book I, Sec: 1. This historian knew what day was the Sabbath, and so have all other Jewish historians testified from his time up to the present day. And they all agree in dating its origin back to creation. And today six millions of his countrymen rise up to testify that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that the seventh day has been named Saturday. The Jews, though dispersed over the face of the entire earth,

have never lost their reckoning, and their preservation is the greatest prodigy known. Scattered in every direction, and every man's hand against them; for eighteen centuries, yet they have, as Rotticks, the German historian, affirms, "Preserved their institutions." These institutions have been transmitted as legacies from father to son. Consult any one of the Jewish historians of the nineteenth century, and he will tell you that the regular order of the weekly period has been preserved, and that the Sabbath observed by Josephus and his contemporaries, was the same day of the weekly cycle that he and his brethren now observe. In fact all history, whether profane or sacred, Gentile or Jewish, confirms the same fact. More than 195,000,000 Roman Catholics voluntarily testify to the effect, and 97,139,000 Protestants confirm the same with their testimony. In the face of all these facts we conclude that it is not reasonable to suppose the Sabbath day to be lost. The invitation of our Lord is, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith." The words of the Spirit are, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." "Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest." Ex. 31:15. May the Lord help us to hear the words of the Spirit and remember the Sabbath day, and not to forget, but keep it holy.

CHAPTER III

The Week: Its Origin, Nature and Preservation

Lexicographers define a week to mean a period of seven days. The week is not a natural or artificial division of time. There is no motion in the physical system pointing it out. The week is, in fact, a revealed division of time based by Jehovah, Himself, upon the facts of creation. Thomas

Paine, in his researches, sought to find something in nature that would indicate a septenary division of time, but failed. See Paine's Theology. Days, months and years, come under the head of natural divisions, indicated by the physical motion of the natural world. Seconds, minutes, and hours, under the head of artificial. But not so with the week, which is the beginning of all time calculation. God wrought six days and rested the seventh day, and these days taken together constitute the week. There can be no mistake in reference to measuring time by a period of seven days. This method of computation had its origin in the Bible, and in the Bible only. It is not a natural period of time, but disclosed and propagated by the light of divine revelation. The universality of its observance, and the important place it occupies in sacred things, is a sufficient argument in favor of its remote antiquity, reaching back to the origin of all things. In the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, the word "week" is thus defined:—"Week, a period of seven days," p. 1158. Week is mentioned under the name Sha-vu-ah as far back as the deluge, Gen. 7:4, 10; 8:10, 12; 29:27, 28. It must, therefore, be considered a very ancient division of time, especially as the various nations among whom it has been observed, for instance, the Nigri, in Africa, appear to have received it from the sons of Noah. See Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, p. 1158. The expression, seven days, in Gen. 7:4, 10, repeated in 8:10, 12, from Sha-vu-ah, according to the authority quoted, would be literally rendered week. Watson, Calmet, and Jones, confirm the same. These seven days date back to creation for their origin. Read the first and second chapters of Genesis. We find Noah, as A. Campbell says, "religiously counting his weeks, even while incar-

cerated in the ark"—Christian System, p. 135; Gen. 10:12.

The figurative meaning of any word is based upon its literal meaning; or in other words, there can be no figurative sense where there is no literal sense. A word having no literal meaning can never be used in metaphorical sense. The very fact of a word being used in a metaphorical sense is proof positive that it has also a literal sense. The word week in the Scriptures is frequently used in a figurative or symbolic sense. It is so used in Gen. 29:27, "Fulfill her week, and we will give thee this also for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet seven other years." Here week being used in a figurative sense, stands for seven years, having its foundation upon the literal week, period of seven days. Examine the following texts where the word week is used in both senses: "In the midst of the week." Dan. 9:27. "The first day of the week," Matt. 28:1; Mark 16: 2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1; Lev. 12:5. These references show that both the Jews and the Gentiles were familiar with the weekly period. The Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. Acts 13:42.

Now, as the Sabbath was regarded as the principal day of the week, all other days being enumerated therefrom, they could not have possessed a knowledge of the Sabbath without a knowledge of the week. A. Campbell says: "The righteous always remembered the weeks, and regarded the conclusion of the week as holy to the Lord"—Christian System, p. 135. The weekly cycle began at creation, and was known and observed by all the Bible writers. We follow from creation down to the close of inspiration, where profane history takes it up and brings it down to the present time. A. Campbell says, "There is little ques-

tion that the division into weeks of seven days, and a peculiar veneration for the seventh day or Sabbath, prevailed among the Eastern nations from their origin; and there is as little doubt that these customs were received by tradition from the fathers of mankind, and that they were observed in commemoration of the creation of the world. The Egyptians reckoned in this way from time immemorial, and it was doubtless from them that the Greeks, who indeed were wholly indebted to the Egyptians for their early literature and science, owed their knowledge of the sanctity of the seventh day, which we find spoken of by Homer." "Then came the seventh day, which is sacred or holy." Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 7, p. 555. This testimony is very valuable, since it shows that the Egyptians, the oldest nation in the world, have from time immemorial observed the weekly division of time. This statement is also confirmed by Egyptian Antiquities, which makes it one of weighty importance. Let this fact be kept in the foreground of the argument, that Egypt, the most ancient nation in the world, has always reckoned the weekly period of time. Her history reaches back over the waste of ages to the time of Ham, the son of Noah, from which point her history begins, and like a mighty stream has continued to roll on for thousands of years. And today she rises before us as one of God's great monumental records on which He has written with His own divine hand the perpetuation and preservation of the weekly cycle, His own revealed division of time. The Egyptians of today reckon the weekly period, the history of which period forms a part of her unbroken history.

The learned Grotius, who flourished in the 16th century, and was master of sacred and profane literature, says that the Bible story of creation being

performed in six days and God resting on the seventh day, was preserved not only among the Greeks and Italians, but among the Indians and Celts. See his Annotations on the Old and New Testaments. Should we examine the historical records of Assyrians, Arabians, Romans, Gauls, Germans and Britons, we would discover the same great fact relative to the weekly cycle and the Sabbath institution, which looks back over the dreary path of ages to the pleasant bowers of Eden for its origin, when the morning stars evoked the harmonies of heaven, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. Then it was that the light of the holy Sabbath smiled upon a world that was fair and good. Though sin, with its mighty tide of destruction, has since rolled in upon us and marred the lovely countenance of the vast and mighty creation, which the Edenic Sabbath was designed to commemorate; though it has wrought many changes and filled our world with the dying and the dead; yet the Sabbath remains as firm as the pillars of heaven and earth, a perpetual reminder of the divine creative hand that gave birth to our existence. Yes, the ravages of war and the wreck of ages have failed to obliterate the sacred day of God. From the opening to the closing pages of inspiration the voice of Diety proclaims, "The seventh day is the sabbath." And today, though far down the stream of time, over the dim, dusty records of antiquity, from a superintending Providence, whose protecting presence and almighty power is felt and acknowledged throughout the world, is heard the same divine voice ringing through the hall of the ages, proclaiming the same truth, "The seventh day is the sabbath."

As the great stream of time has continued to flow on uninterrupted, so has the weekly cycle continued to flow on from one generation to an-

other, until it has reached us. We may look back through profane history to the close of inspiration, and then through inspiration to creation, and be assured that we now have the weekly period as arranged by Jehovah Himself. What consummate folly for persons to try to mutilate, disarrange, and destroy the week, in order to get rid of obedience to one of God's plain and direct commands, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. Were it not that the seventh day has been thrown into disrepute by Paul's "man of sin," and thus rendered unpopular, no doubts would be entertained or expressed in reference to the week or day being lost. As long as it is preached that the first day is the Sabbath men have no trouble in finding it, or knowing when it comes. With them as with all others, Sunday is the first day and Saturday the last, or seventh day of the week. But when the Bible is introduced and investigated, and it is shown that the first day is not the Sabbath, then, like doubting Thomas, they begin to doubt; and as it is not congenial with their feelings to keep the day God blessed and sanctified, on account of its unpopularity, they conclude very rashly that perhaps the week has been lost. But such a conclusion is preposterous in the extreme, and is contradicted by the records of all civilized nations.

But did the Greeks reckon by decades? We answer, Yes; but this division of time into a period of ten days was by the Greeks acknowledged to be an artificial division, an arrangement of their own, which they finally rejected and adopted the weekly cycle as observed by the Egyptians and the Jews. The Romans instead of reckoning by weeks, divided the month into three parts, by kalends, nones, and ides; and the people living in the country came to market every ninth day. But in the

-B. 154-

time of the Emperors this method of reckoning was rejected and the weekly period of seven days introduced, which period was not and is not the effect of human calculation. It did not originate with the Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, Romans, or any other nation, but took its origin from the mind, plan and purpose of Jehovah, and was by Deity revealed to the sons of men. And the Greeks and Romans bear testimony to its preservation; hence it is clear that there has been no derangement in the week. It remains just as God arranged it in the very beginning. The first day was a secular day; the last day was a sacred day, so it is now. God's people anciently regarded the conclusion of the week holy to the Lord. They should do so now. May the Lord help us all to do so.

CHAPTER IV.

The Names of the Days of the Days of the Week, Their Origin and Significance

Though the idea of lost time and the doubtful conclusion whether Saturday is the seventh day is one of which has not the least shadow of a foundation on which to rest, being contrary to all facts and rejected by astronomers with an air of ridicule, yet, for the benefit of the few who seek to excuse themselves from the observance of the seventh day under this plea, we shall devote a small space to its consideration. We have seen that the Egyptians have observed the weekly cycle from time immemorial; they were also the first to name the seven days from the seven celestial bodies then known. See Steele's Astronomy, p. 330. The first day they named from the sun, Sunday, or the sun's day. The seventh or last day of the week, they named from the planet Sat-

urn, Saturday, or Saturn's day. We will here give the table of days as set down by Steele in his Astronomy:—"1, Dies Solis, Sun's day; 2, Dies Lunae, Moon's day; 3, Tiusdaeg, Tiu's day; 4, Wodnesday, Woden's day; 5, Thurnes daeg, Thor's day; 6, Friges Daeg, Friga's day; 7, Dies Saturni, Saturn's day." P. 24.

When our Saxon ancestors settled in England they continued the same order. Thus the order and names of the days of the week are give by Mr. Sharon Turner in his history of the Anglo Saxons: "1, Sunday, the sun's day; 2, Monday, the moon's day; 3, Tuesday, Tiow's (or Tuisco's); 4, Wednesday, Woden's day; 5, Thursday, Thor's day; 6, Friday, Friga's (or Frea's) day; 7, Saturday, Seterne's (or Saturn's) day."—Heathen Mythology, p. 91. The name Sunday was introduced and applied to the first day of the week before Israel's deliverance from Egyptian thralldom. The first day of the week was set apart by the heathen world in honor of their chief god, the sun. From this worship of the sun on the first day of the week originated its ancient and present title, Sunday. Lexicographers define the word as follows: "Sunday, so called because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun, or to its worship."—Webster. "Sunday, so called because anciently dedicated to its worship; the first day of the week."—Worcester.

Verstegian, the laborious English antiquarian, who wrote in the 16th century, confirms all these statements and gives a description of the seven idols from which the seven days of the week were named. On the first day they worshipped the sun, Sun's day; on the second they worshipped the moon, Moon's day, or Monday; on the third day they worshipped Tuisto, who was supposed to be the founder of the race, Tuesday, or Tuisco's day;

on the fourth day, Woden, the god of battle, Wednesday, or Woden's day; on the fifth day, Thor, the god of thunder, Thursday, or Thor's day; on the sixth day the goddess Frega, or Friga. Verstegian says, "She was the reputed giver of peace and plenty, and the maker of love and amity; and of the day of her special adoration we yet retain the name of Friday; and as in the order of the days of the week Thursday comes between Wednesday and Friday, so in the northern regions where they made the idol Thor sitting or lying in a great covered bed, they also placed on the one side of him the idol of Woden, and on the other side Friga."—Hea. Myth. p. 107. See also Saturday Magazine, published in London, under the committee of General Literature and Education appointed by the Society for promoting Christian knowledge. Please note this fact; according to the Anglo Saxon table, the fifth day, Thursday, comes between Wednesday and Friday, which is in harmony with the order observed by both the Egyptians and Romans.

The Roman table is as follows:—1, Dies Solis, Sunday; 2, Lunae, Monday; 3, Martis, Tuesday; 4, Mercurii, Wednesday; 5, Jovis, Thursday; Ven-
evis, Friday; 7, Saturni, Saturday. The Saxon Thor corresponds with the Jovis of the Romans; both terms designate Thursday, the fifth day of the week, which is the very order that we at the present day observe. On the seventh day they worship the planet Saturn, from whence it has derived the name Saturday. For a description of this idol see Hea, Myth. p. 108. Thus we see under what circumstances the names of the days of the week originated, and their remote antiquity, and the order of their application, and how they have been handed down to us by history. Though by different nations they have been called by dif-

ferent names, yet their order has been preserved. In Jones' Table of Days we have the testimony of languages to the preservation and identity of the Sabbath. In this table of days we have Saturday put down in all the European, Asiatic, and African languages as the seventh day of the week; and in fifty of these languages the seventh day bears the sacred title of Sabbath. This learned, valuable, and reliable document shows at a glance that European, African, and Asiatic nations reckon the days of the week alike. See Jones' "Table of Days."

In all the ancient records of the old countries Saturday is set down as the seventh day of the week. In all public records of America it is put down as the seventh day of the week. It is so written in all the law books of every civilized nation; so recognized in every land and country; all our school books and almanacs teach us that Sunday is the first day of the week and Saturday the seventh or last day. Read the time table attached to the old family Bible and you will find Sunday set down as the first day of the week, and Saturday as the seventh, or Sabbath day. To say that Saturday is not the seventh day is to deny all calculation of time. The Jews, who do not use these heathen names in designating the days of the week, but denominate them from the order of their succession from the Sabbath by the simple ordinals first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh, agree that the name Saturday has by the heathen world been given to the seventh day of the weekly cycle.

Reader, you see the evidence is all on one side. All in favor of Saturday being the seventh day. Can you believe and act contrary to evidence? What is your negative argument to show that Saturday is not the seventh day of the week? You

know as well as you know you are living that you have none; to believe without evidence is weakness. You agree with me that we should live up to the light we have. Now, if we do this we will keep the seventh day, commonly called Saturday, for the Sabbath. We have seen that the position that Saturday is the original seventh day is sustained by an overwhelming amount of evidence drawn from various sources; and there is nothing within the annals of history, sacred or profane, contradicting this position; no art or science with which man is acquainted that even reflects the least shadow of a doubt upon it. In reference to time we simply remark that astronomy, which is a perfect science, and the most ancient of all sciences, shows most conclusively that there can be no such thing as lost time. Astronomers turn their tables forward and calculate eclipses of the sun and moon with the utmost accuracy, foretell the very moment of their beginning, middle and end, and the places where they will be visible; they also give the nature and magnitude of the eclipses, and that too for more than a century before they occur. The transit of the planets across the sun's disk has been pointed out by the science of astronomy one hundred years before the event took place. Dr. Halley, in 1691, predicted the transit of Venus that happened in 1791, one hundred years before it occurred. He even gave the very hour in which the planet would touch the limb of the sun. They also predict the advent of comets and their return; and all of the calculations are made long before the events occur, which is infallible proof of the correctness of the system. They also turn their tables backward, and with the same precision count all the eclipses past; hence if any time has been lost they would know it and correct it.

What is termed Old and New style has nothing to do with the week. Julius Ceasar attempted to make the calendar year coincide with the motions of the sun. He and Sosigenes, an Egyptian astronomer, devised a plan of introducing every year a leap year. This system is denominated Old Style. It was deficient, as it made the year to consist of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, which was 11 minutes too much, and accumulated year by year, until in 1582 the difference amounted to ten days. The vernal equinox occurred on March 11th, instead of on the 21st. Gregory reformed the calendar by dropping ten days, and ordering that centennial years which are divisible by four, should be leap years. The new calendar, or New Style, was adopted by Catholic countries in general, but rejected by Protestant England until 1752. Eleven days were then dropped and the 3rd of September was called the 14th. Dates reckoned according to the Julian Calendar are called Old Style, marked O. S.; and those according to the Gregorian Calendar New Style, marked N. S. Now, it must be evident to all that a suppression of eleven days from any month does not in the least interfere with the order of the weekly cycle. To illustrate: Today is Sunday the first day of the week and the 9th day of November, 1879. Now, suppose you were to drop out eight days and call it the first day of November; would it change the day and order of the week? Not in the least; it would still be Sunday, the first day of the week. Or suppose you were to add nine days and call it the 18th of November instead of the 9th. The added days would simply affect the month and not the week. The week would continue to roll on in the same order as it did before. This fact is sufficient to silence all who have a disposition to quibble about Old and New Calendars. The Sabbath of God is

guarded on every hand, and so completely protected as to leave those who will not keep it without excuse.

CHAPTER V

The Sabbath not Changed by Divine Authority

In the Bible we find no divine warrant for the change or abolition of the Sabbath. The prophets of God never prophesied of any alteration in the Sabbath, or change to take place in the law of God. But they did foretell that a corrupting, desolating power, should arise, which would think to change times and laws. Daniel says of him: "And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and dividing of time." Dan. 7:25. This same power is styled by Paul, "The man of sin." 2 Thess. 2:3. All Protestants admit that the little horn, which sprung up among the ten Roman horns, represents the papacy. Now that the Catholics claim to have changed the law of the Sabbath, we prove from their own documents. Daniel, the Hebrew prophet of God, centuries ago, said they would attempt to make a change in Deity's laws, and would even think themselves able to accomplish it. Let us turn to the Catholic Christian Instructed, pp. 231-233, and hear them plead guilty of the charge preferred against them by the inspired penman of God.

Question—What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?

Answer—We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

Question—Does the Scripture anywhere com-

mand the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

Answer—The Scriptures command us to hear the church. . . . But the Scriptures do not in any particular mention the change of the Sabbath. St. John speaks of the Lord's day, Rev. 1:10, but he does not tell us what day of the week this day was, much less does he tell us that it was to take the place of the Sabbath, ordained in the commandment. St. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week, Acts 20: 7, and St. Paul, 1 Cor. 16:2, orders that on the first day of the week the Corinthians should lay by them in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither one nor the other tells us whether this first day of the week was to be henceforth the day of worship, and the Christian Sabbath; so that, in fact, the best authority we have for this ancient custom is the testimony of the church (the Catholic church). And therefore those who pretend to be such religious observers of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act more by humor than by reason and religion, since Sundays and holy days all stand on the same foundation, viz., the ordinances of the (Catholic) church.

The apostolic tradition is a little Catholic creed, separate and apart from the Bible, which teaches infant sprinkling, see page 30; and also the doctrine of purgatory, page 166. Truly the doctrine of Sunday observance and the abolition of the Sabbath rest on a very sandy foundation.

Another Roman Catholic work testifies as follows:

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy. You Protestants without any precept of Scripture

B-158

change it to the first day, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point that the observation of the first day is proved out of the Scriptures, where it is said the first day of the week. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory, and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath days in which those meetings were kept? or where is it ordained that they should be always observed? or where is the sum of all? Where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God." A Treatise of thirty Controversies.

Here we wish to quote from Mr. W. B. Taylor, an able anti-sabbatarian writer. He says:

"The triumph of the consistent Roman Catholic over all observers of Sunday, calling themselves Protestants, is indeed complete and unanswerable; it should present a subject of very grave reflection to Christians of the reformed and evangelical denominations to find that no single argument or suggestion can be offered in favor of Sunday observance that will not apply with equal force, and to its fullest extent, in sustaining the various other 'holy days' appointed by the (Catholic) church."—Obligations of the Sabbath, pp. 254, 255.

These testimonies clearly show that the Catholic power has fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel in trying to change times and laws. It changed the law of baptism from immersion to sprinkling, and the law of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. It has also changed the ordinary day. The Bible day is from evening to

evening, but it has changed the day so it is now reckoned from midnight to midnight. Hence it has thought to change times and laws. It must, in candor, be admitted that there is no law in the New Testament for the observance of the first day, or the non-observance of the seventh day. The seventh day Sabbath law was never repealed by divine authority. Men may talk of the abolition of the Sabbath institution, but they are unable to find the repealing act. Roman Catholics boast that they have changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and that, too, without any warrant from the Scriptures; and this they take as an evidence of their infallibility and power to legislate in divine things. See the discussion between Mr. Breckinridge, Presbyterian, and Mr. Hughes, Catholic. Mr. Hughes says, "The next evidence I shall produce in support of the Catholic rule of faith, and against the Protestant principle, is derived from a source which I am sure you will respect. It is the doctrine and practice of your own church, laid down in the Westminster Confession. The first is the Baptism of Infants sanctioned by the teaching of the pastors of the church, but certainly not susceptible of proof by any text of Scripture." "The second is the violation of the Sabbath commanded by God to be sanctified (Ex. 20:8), and the substitution of Sunday, without the authority of any single text of Scripture, but in accordance with the constant teachings of the pastors of the church." Controversies of Messrs. Breckinridge and Hughes, pages 159, 132. Also published by A. Campbell in Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 5, p. 180.

The first Sunday law we have any account of was published by Constantine in A. D. 321. This law recognized Sunday, not as being a Christian, but a heathen institution. The wording of it is as

ture is defined to be holy, just, good, and spiritual, Rom. 7:12-14; a law from which emanates all our moral obligations, which to abolish would be to abrogate all morality, and open wide the flood gates of sin and vice, in all their varied forms and wicked combinations. As we proceed in this investigation we shall show that there are two laws; one was abolished in Christ, the other He magnified. It is sometimes asserted that the ten commandments are nowhere styled the law, and the text which calls the ten commandments the law is asked for. We see this demand made in some of the late numbers of the Restitution. To settle this question we will give one or two passages of Scripture, which are clearly to the point. "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 which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." Ex. 24:12. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. Paul refers directly to the ten commandments, and he calls them "the law." We could quote other texts, but these are sufficient. God spake the ten commandments and He added no more. He wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them to Moses. Deut. 5:22. The expression, "He added no more," shows that the ten commandments, spoken on that occasion by the voice of Deity, constitute a perfect law, separate and distinct from the sacrificial or ceremonial law. God spake the ten commandments when He brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, at which time He spake not unto them "concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices." Jer. 7:22. But he says that He did command them "to obey His voice,"

verse 23, or the ten commandments, which He proclaimed with a "great voice," Deut. 5:22, which they had not obeyed, but rejected, as is evident from the language of Jeremiah the prophet: "Hear O earth: behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it." Jer. 6:19. This was the law written and spoken by the voice of God, when He added no more, and which was anterior to the sacrificial law.

Here are two laws, one is violated and the other obeyed. That they were living up to the requirements of the sacrificial code is evident from the reproof administered in the next verse. "To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me." V. 20. We, too, may offer to God "the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips," Heb. 13:15; but if we turn away from God's spiritual and holy law, as ancient Israel did, our offerings will avail us nothing. For it is written, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. Again, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is his delight." Prov. 15:8.

The same doctrine is taught in the New Testament. The great moral law of Jehovah marks its violators as sinners. John, the beloved disciple, says, "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." I John 3:4. Paul, who was commissioned by Israel's God to instruct the Gentiles in the way of life and salvation, says, ". . . Where no law is there is no transgression," Rom. 4:15. Again he says, ". . . By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom.

3:20. This he defines in chapter 7 to be the ten commandments, which is the only law which says "Thou shalt not covet," Ex. 20:17. Paul either taught the building force of the law of God or else he taught that in this dispensation Jews and Gentiles could not sin. "Where no law is there is no transgression," or sin, is the doctrine of the great apostle to the Gentiles. John 9:31. "Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth." No man can be a worshipper of God and do His will, and live in open violation of His law. God's will is that we should keep His commandments, Eccl. 12:13, and He promises to bless those that do them, Rev. 22:14. Hence if we would become members of the Abrahamic family we must die to sin, cease violating God's law, become humble penitents, and obedient to the commands of our heavenly Father. We shall then be heard, and our offerings will then be acceptable.

We shall briefly present the two laws in contrast: No. 1 as the moral law, and No. 2, as the ceremonial, sacrificial, or typical law. No. 1, The moral law is coeval with the race of mankind. When Adam came forth from the hand of the Creator, he was under a moral obligation to have no other gods before the Supreme Being who had created him, Ex. 20:3; and to abstain from idolatry, verse 5; and from profanity, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," verse 7. No one can be saved who violates this precept by using the name of the Creator disrespectfully. "For the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Adam was also under a moral sense of duty to regard God's Sabbath, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," verse 8. For as soon as God, by His almighty power and supreme wisdom, established the earth and gar-

nished the heavens above, and created man. ". . . He rested, and was refreshed," Ex. 31:17. Not that He was weary, for He is the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth, who that He, by His own example, might lay the foundation of the Sabbatic rest as broad and as deep as the heavens and the earth. The expression, "And was refreshed," shows that He delighted in the institution; therefore we are taught to call the Sabbath a delight Isa. 58:13. On the sixth day man was created, hence the reason then for the Sabbath existed, for our Savior says it "was made for man." As long as the reason exists so will the institution; therefore the moral law of which the Sabbath is a part, is not only coeval, but also co-extensive with the human family.

The very next day after the creation of man, for whom the Sabbath was made, God rested. He blessed and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested, Gen. 2:2, 3. The past participle tense of the verb, "had rested," simply proves that the act of resting was completed before the blessing and sanctity were put upon the day. In one hour after the completion of the rest, yes, in less time, it would be strictly correct both in point of fact and language to say, He had rested upon it. For the benefit of some who oppose the origination of the Sabbath at creation, and from the tense of verb, had rested, try to evade the force of the consecutive order of events narrated by Moses, I will quote directly from the Hebrew Student's Manual, the literal translation of the verse. "And were completed the heavens and the earth, and all their host. And completed God on the day, the seventh, His work which He had made; and He rested on the day, the day the seventh from all His work which He made; and blessed God the day the seventh and sanctified it, for in it He rested

from all His works which created God to make." Here "had," which is the sign or the past participle tense, is left out. Hence the argument of Wm. Sheldon, and others, that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day in the wilderness of Sin, because He had rested upon it at creation, fall to the ground, just like all other arguments arrayed against the Sabbath truth.

The Sabbath institution looks back, and not forward; therefore it does not and cannot, according to the nature of things, belong to the types and shadows, which pointed forward. The constant return of the Sabbath day was designed by Deity to be a perpetual reminder to Adam and his posterity of the power and wisdom of that supreme Being who had created all things, and by whom all things continue to exist. It was instituted before the fall, and is therefore interwoven with the other nine precepts, which men, in every nation and in all ages, are under obligations to obey. Let us show our love to God by observing His commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

Law No. 2, The sacrificial law would never have existed had it not been for sin, Heb. 9:22. Law No. 1 was written by God Himself upon tables of stone, and delivered to Moses, Deut. 10:1-4. No. 2 was written by Moses, in a book, and delivered to the people, Deut. 31:9, 24. No. 1 was deposited in the ark, Deut. 10:5. No. 2 was placed in the side of the ark, Deut. 31:26. No. 1 Christ came not to destroy or abolish, Matt. 5:17. No. 2 He abolished, Eph. 2:15. No. 1 He came to magnify, Isa. 42:21. No. 2 He blotted out, nailing it to the cross, Col. 2:14. No. 1 is established by faith, Rom. 3:31. No. 2 He disannulled or abolished, Heb. 7:18. No. 1 is spiritual, Rom. 7:12. No. 2 was carnal, Heb. 7:16. No. 1 is perfect, Psa. 19:7.

No. 2 made nothing perfect, Heb. 7:19. No. 1 is to endure as long as heaven and earth exists, Matt. 5:18. No. 2 was a schoolmaster and passed away when Christ came, Gal. 3:19. No. 1 we are to do and teach in order to be great (or get into) the kingdom of God, Matt. 5:19. It is the royal law, James 2:8. Written by nature in the hearts of the Gentiles, Rom. 2:14; and under the new covenant to be written in the hearts of God's people, Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10. No. 2 is a law which we are not to do, teach, or keep, Acts 15:24. It was one of the carnal ordinances, Heb. 9:10. No. 1 teaches us what our duties are to God and to each other; hence our Savior sums it up in two great commandments, love to God and love to man, Ex 20; Matt. 22:37-39. The first four commandments in the decalogue teach obligation to God, and the last six obligation to our fellow man; hence Paul, in his letter to his brethren at Rome, says, "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." He then quotes from the law a part of the last six commandments, and leaves out the first four entirely, because he is teaching us our duties to each other, Rom. 13:8, 9. No. 2 was a law having a shadow of good things to come, Heb. 10:1. No shadow was in No. 1, the Sabbath being a memorial of creation, points back instead of forward. It was a law in which the fathers and disciples of Christ delighted. "Unless thy law had been my delights, then I should have perished . . ." Psa. 119:92. "O how love I thy law!" verse 97. "I delight in the law of God," Rom. 7:22. The Sabbath was a delight, Isa. 58:13. No. 2 was a yoke which neither the fathers nor the disciples of Jesus could bear, Acts 15:5-10. No. 1 was not to be altered or changed, Psa. 89:34. No. 2 was changed, Heb. 7:12; also ch. 10:8-10.

Now we ask, in the name of common sense and

reason. Can these be one and the same law? Utterly impossible, unless the Bible is a mass of contradictions, perfectly irreconcilable in their nature. As the Sabbath belongs to law No. 1, which is a moral law, it is not therefore ceremonial in its nature, neither has it been abolished. If it was a type what was it a type of? What now is its substance in the gospel dispensation? Do you say it was typical of the eternal rest? Well then, as we always observe the shadow until we reach the substance, what excuse have you to offer for not keeping the Sabbath?

CHAPTER VII The New Covenant

It is often objected that we are under the New Covenant and are therefore not obligated to keep the Sabbath, because, say the objectors, the Sabbath belonged with the old covenant. In the first place, we would like to ask if they keep any of the other ten commandments, or were they not also a part of the old covenant? Do you commit murder, steal, commit adultery, take the name of God in vain, bow down to idols, or tell lies on your neighbor just because those commandments which forbade such were a part of the old covenant? Remember that those commandments were a part of the Decalogue just as much as was the Sabbath commandment.

It would be well for us to examine the Scriptures belonging with this part of the controversy, however, and see.

First: What was the "Old Covenant" and what is the "New Covenant"?

Second: Who are under the "First Covenant," and who under the "Second"?

Third: In what respects do these two covenants differ?

In Hebrews 8:6 we read that Christ is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises. Then, this covenant had some promises in it. In the same chapter Paul refers to the better covenant as a "new" covenant and uses "first" and "second," "new" and "old" interchangeably. We shall also use that liberty in this discussion. In the next chapter of Hebrews and the 15th verse, he states that Christ became the mediator of a "new testament" and refers to transgressions under the "first testament." In this chapter he gives us testimony which allows the use of "covenant" and "testament" interchangeably. Then he gives further information in verses 15 to 20 which indicate that the testament was a "will," for it was based upon promises of an inheritance. Paul explains that the testament which he referred to was like that of a man which is of no force until the death of the one who made the will. Please read these two chapters and study them carefully if you think we are wrong.

If in doubt about our definition, see Webster on "testament" which is defined as—"A solemn covenant; a will."

With the idea that these two covenants were testaments or wills, and that they were based upon promises of an inheritance, let us look up the provisions of those wills and see if any of us may have been mentioned in these wills and also what the conditions are to be met by us in order to participate in the inheritance.

In Exodus 3:17 we find that God promised Israel certain lands to possess under certain conditions. This promise is repeated in ch. 6, verses 6 to 8, in which God stated that He had sworn to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. It was to be unto them an inheritance, hence a testament or will or covenant under the terms of our

proposition. In Heb. 8:6-8, Paul mentions the covenant which God made with their fathers when He took them by the hand to lead them up out of Egypt. If this is not the covenant or promise of inheritance referred to, then we must look further; but this fits the description perfectly, and we take the position that we have found it.

In some wills, or testaments, we find certain conditions that must be met by the heirs in order for them to establish their rights under the will, and in this case we find that God required certain things of these people. In the first place, they were to hearken unto the voice of Moses. Ex. 3:18. They were to follow their leader whom God had ordained for the administration of this will or testament or covenant.

The inheritance mentioned here is sometimes referred to as "The Promised Land," for God promised it to Abraham, Genesis 15:18, to Isaac, ch. 26:3, and again to Jacob, ch. 28:13 and 35:12. Genesis 26:5 shows the reason why God gave it to Abraham: "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws."

That the same conditions were imposed upon the "fathers in the day when He took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt" is proved by Ex. 3:18 when they were told to hearken unto the voice of Moses, and then by reading Deut. 4:1, "Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the Lord God of your fathers giveth you." In verses 13 and 14 Moses mentions the commandments as God's covenant, and also tells them that God commanded that he, Moses, give them certain other laws, etc., that they

might keep them in the land "whither ye go over to possess it."

In 2 Kings 21:8 God makes it quite plain that the keeping of His commandments and the law of Moses were both necessary parts of that covenant. "Neither will I make the feet of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers; only if they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them."

Summing up, we find that the covenant involved the land promised to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Those who were to get it were Israel, the seed of Jacob who was of the seed of Isaac, who was of the seed of Abraham. The conditions were, the commandments of God and the statutes or law of Moses who was the mediator or administrator. This was a temporal inheritance—that is the people could enjoy it only during their natural lifetime. True, the nation would never have lost it if they had met the conditions of the will or testament; but God found fault with them (the people) for they broke their part of the will (Jer. 31:32) and God declared that "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake . . ." Jer. 31:31-32, also see Hebrews 8:6-8. In Heb. 8:9, Paul quotes, "For finding fault with them . . . because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord."

Please notice the ones who should be partakers of this new covenant: the house of Israel and the house of Judah. The reader will probably remember that the tribes of Israel at the time of this

prophecy were divided into two houses, which division occurred under the sons of Solomon, Jeroboam and Rehoboam. Then God was to make a new covenant with the same people who were under the first covenant.

Just as God had a mediator in the first instance in the person of Moses, so in Christ He had a mediator for this new covenant, Heb. 8:6, ". . . he is the mediator of a better covenant based upon better promises." In ch. 9:15 Paul stated that this testament gives the heirs the "promise of eternal inheritance."

In Acts 3:22 we find positive evidence of the status of Christ: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." See Deut. 18:15-19. Then again, Matt. 17:5, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." And now, that we have located the mediator, perhaps it would be well to "hear Him."

Paul said that He came to give us an eternal inheritance. Christ taught the people that "The meek shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5:5. Then, the meek are to be the heirs. Paul said that "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." This status with Christ identifies us with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Galatians 3:27 tells us how we may come into this relationship with Christ. Verse 28 explains that with this relationship the blood lines disappear and all who are in Christ are heirs according to the promise made to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, and to his seed forever.

Paul indicates that Christ was the testator and that being true, we should look for the terms of the will or testament or covenant to be recorded

in the testimony of Christ before He died. For, as Paul said, "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant; yet if it be confirmed, no man disannuleth, or addeth thereto." Whatever Christ wished to have in His testament or will, then, must have been made during His lifetime, for by His death He sealed that will and not even He Himself would have had authority to change it after He died.

Let us peruse the teachings of Christ to find the conditions under which we may participate in that inheritance. In Matt. 4:23 we read, "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." Here we find the new inheritance spoken of as the "kingdom." Christ taught that He was to be the reigning power in this kingdom. When this gospel or good news was told to a certain one, and he learned of this eternal life in an eternal inheritance, he came to Jesus and said, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Here was a direct question that required a direct answer, and Jesus gave it to him, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." This man inquired which commandments, and Jesus identified the decalogue by naming several of the ten commandments. It is true that Jesus named only six of the ten, but enough of them that the man had no doubt of what commandments Jesus meant, and he declared that he had kept all of them from his youth. But there was one which he had not kept and Jesus proved him to be a liar when He told the man to go, sell what he had, and come follow Him. This the man refused to do because he loved his riches more than he did God. That was a violation of the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and while Jesus had not named

this commandment in particular, he told the man that there was one thing he lacked—and that was it. See Matt. 19:17 and Mark 10:21. It is not recorded that Jesus anywhere else required absolute poverty as a condition of inheritance, but in this case He used that to prove to the man himself that he did not keep all of the commandments. As further proof that it is required that we keep all of them see James 2:10, 11, "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. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

Christ kept His Father's commandments, John 15:10, and requires us to keep His own commandments. Then in addition to keeping the commandments that God wrote on the tables of stone, we must also keep the commandments of Christ—as summed up in Rev. 12:17. The saints keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

While many people contend that under the new covenant we do not have to keep the Sabbath, if you will read Jer. 31:33-34, you will see that God had no intention whatever of abolishing the law or excusing us from its obligations under the new covenant. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their in-

iquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Now, if we follow the teachings of Christ on this subject we find how the law is put in our inward parts and written on our hearts: "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Matt. 15:28. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5:19.

Reader, do you have evidence in your heart that you are under the "New Covenant?" Do you have God's law written in your heart or are you one of them who insist that Christ abolished that law? Or do you believe Christ changed the day? He observed the Sabbath while preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and by commanding the keeping of the Decalogue made it a part of the new testament and sealed it by His death, leaving no power of authority to anyone to change it, either to the apostles or the church.

CHAPTER VIII

Objections Considered—1st, It Is Said That the Disciples Broke Bread upon the First Day of the Week. 2nd, That the First Day of the Week Is the Lord's Day, Etc.

We shall briefly consider some of the most common objections offered against the Bible Sabbath. Now we inquire, what position do the New Testament writers assign to the first day of the week? We remark, 1st, that the expression "First day," occurs only eight times in the New Testament, and is found in the following texts: Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor.

16:2. 2nd, it is nowhere recorded that our Savior ever took it upon His lips. How, then, is it possible to prove that our Savior chose the first day, and taught His apostles to keep it in honor of His resurrection, seeing that He never used the expression? When we come to the teachings of Christ and the writings of the apostles, with a determination that we will not speculate, but advance only as far as we can find facts and truths on which to build, we are shut up to the conclusion that the first day is not a sacred or holy day of any kind.

The New Testament recognizes the First Day as being only a secular day. Our Savior and His disciples treated it as such. This is evident from Luke 24:13-15, where we read, "And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about three score furlongs . . . And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them." By reading the chapter we learn that this same day was the first day of the week. Here we have a New Testament fact that our Savior and His disciples did not honor the first day of the week, but traveled on that day from Jerusalem to Emmaus, a distance of seven and a half miles. "And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he (Christ) made as though he would have gone further. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent." Verses 28 and 29. This was the first First day after the resurrection of Christ. How was it spent? Not as a sacred day, but as a secular day.

It is said that the disciples broke bread upon the first day of the week. "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." Acts 20:7. If we adopt Bible time, which begins and closes the day with sunset (Lev. 23:32, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your sabbath"), this coming together of the disciples was on Saturday night. According to this rule, which is a Bible one, Saturday night would belong to the first day of the week, and Sunday night to the second day. But if we adopt the Roman method, which begins and closes the day at midnight, then they came together on Sunday night and broke bread on Monday morning, for it was after midnight when they broke bread. Paul continued his speech until midnight. Acts 20:7. They did not break bread until he had restored Eutychus to life, 9th verse. Either method destroys Sunday keeping. Those who rely on this text as furnishing apostolic precedent for breaking the loaf every first day, ought to be more scriptural in their proceedings; and instead of meeting every Sunday at 11 a. m., and having a sermon, and then breaking the loaf about noon, should convene either on Saturday or Sunday night and break the loaf about midnight, or after.

That this was a night meeting is evident from the 8th verse, "And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." Verse 11, "When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till the break of day, so he departed." Those who urge this text in favor of Sunday observance should keep their Sunday in the night time; and as the disciples on this occasion spent the whole night in religious conversation, so should they. There is no evidence in this that the disciples met to celebrate the Lord's Supper. Klasai arton, translated "to break bread," is frequently used to denote the eating of a common meal. In Acts 2:46, "And they continuing

daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." Other examples might be given, but this is sufficient. We challenge the orthodox world to prove that the disciples, on this occasion referred to, celebrated the Lord's Supper. Where is the proof that Christ taught His disciples to celebrate His Supper on the first day, or that they were in the habit of doing so? It must, in candor, be admitted that there is no such teaching in the New Testament. Where is it stated that the disciples met every first day? The statement is not in the Bible, why teach it then?

It is a fact that but one public meeting of the disciples on the first day of the week is mentioned in the New Testament, and that is the one under consideration. It is a fact that it occurred in the night, which according to Bible time, was Saturday night, it being included in the first day of the week. Now, if it was the constant practice of the disciples to celebrate the first day of the week, is it not strange that only one meeting of the kind is mentioned? If it was their custom, why does not Luke note it as their custom? He was a precise writer, and was very particular to note the customs of the age in which he wrote.

Let us select a few examples from his writings of Christ. He says, "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and as his custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Luke 4:16. "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont (or accustomed) to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts 16:13. Concerning Paul he says, "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reas-

oned with them out of the scriptures." Acts 17:2. "And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts 18:4. In these texts, Luke informs us that it was the practice of our Savior and His disciples to regard the Sabbath; that it was the custom of the Christians to pray on that day, not only in the synagogue, but by the riverside; that it was Paul's constant practice to preach every Sabbath. Had it been a constant practice with Christ and His disciples to meet on the first day to preach, and hold religious conversation, such a careful writer as Luke would have noted it. He would have said Paul preached every first day; and upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, as was their custom, etc.

By reading the entire chapter we learn that it was a farewell meeting. While Paul, on this occasion, was convened with the brethren at Troas, perhaps for the last time; his brethren were sailing for Assos. "And we went before (Paul) to ship, and sailed unto Assos, there intending to take in Paul: for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot," 13th verse. The distance around Cape Lectum to Assos was about sixty miles, while the distance across was only twenty. Paul could spend a few more hours with the brethren at Troas and then reach Assos in time for the ship; he therefore remained with them over Saturday night, and on Sunday morning went on his journey.

Here we wish to give Prof. McGarvey's note on this text. McGarvey belongs to the Christian denomination, and we do this to show that even our most bitter opponents have acknowledged the correctness of our position. In his Commentary on Acts 20:7, he says: "I conclude therefore that they met on the night after the Jewish Sabbath, which

was still observed as a day of rest by all who were Jews or Jewish proselytes; and considering this the first day of the week, spent it in the manner above described, and on Sunday morning Paul and his companions resumed their journey." Com. 249. The doctor thinks Paul's example does not justify traveling on Sunday. We would inquire, Is there any law against traveling or working on the first day of the week? He treats it as a secular day.

It is also said, "The first day of the week is the Lord's day." That this claim is unscriptural we need only refer to the admission of those who teach it. In the Gospel Star, published at Chillicothe, Mo., in the interest of the Christian (or Campbellite) order, we find this question and answer: "Question. By what authority do we call Sunday the Lord's day? Did Christ so name the first day of the week?—H. W. B. Myrick," "Answer, He did not so far as we know . . . The Lord's day occurs but once in the New Testament, Rev. 1:10. It cannot be certainly known from this passage that the first day of the week is meant." This is a grand admission in favor of the truth. We say, Amen to it. But the Star argues that the first day is meant on the supposition that the seventh day is nowhere in all the Jewish Scriptures called the Lord's day. The editor says, "It cannot be claimed that in the very last book in the New Testament it would be introduced under a new name." This fact (he says) stamps the seal of condemnation upon the teachings of Sabbatarians relative to the seventh day being the Lord's day. Now, reader, bear in mind this fact which the editor of the Star admits, that there is nothing in the text to define what day of the week is meant by the Revelator; hence what day of the week is referred to can only be determined by reference to other scriptures.

Now, where are the scriptures that say the first day of the week is the Lord's day? Such a passage is not to be found in the Bible. Where is the text that says Christ is Lord of the first day, or that Christ claims that day as His? The first day of creation signified a common working day. The Bible treats it only as a secular working day. We have no evidence from Christ or any of the apostles that it was ever called by any other name than the first day, unless John, the divine, gave it the title Lord's day. But can we believe that in the very last book of the New Testament it would be introduced under a new name? The editor of the Star says we cannot believe this in reference to the seventh day; but how about the first day? Come, editor, please explain. We are anxious and interested to understand the how of it.

The statement that the seventh day is never called the Lord's day in the Scriptures is certainly wrong. Let us here call attention to one grand fact, that is, the law of God makes all the days of the week common except the seventh day, Ex. 20:9. This distinction was made at creation, Gen. 2:2, 3. The Star intimates that when Christ avowed Himself Lord of the Sabbath He meant the institution, and not the day. But the law of God reads, "The seventh day is the sabbath," Ex. 20:10. In Gen. 2:3, we read, "God blessed the seventh day," and in Ex. 20:11, that the "Lord blessed the sabbath day." Now put these two statements side by side and you will plainly see that the seventh day and Sabbath are identical. So, Christ could not have been Lord of the Sabbath without being Lord of the seventh day. For the seventh day is the Sabbath, Ex. 20:10. Hence Christ was Lord of the seventh day, or else the seventh day was not the Sabbath. The law of Jehovah says, "The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy

God," Ex. 20:10. Hence the seventh day is the Lord's day or God's day. In Isa. 58:13 He makes the Sabbath mean the day, not that the Sabbath is something detached from the day. In Isaiah's time all admit that the seventh day was the Sabbath. Well, the Lord says through him, this (seventh day) is "My holy day." These citations in Holy Writ explain the Lord's day in Rev. 1:10 to be the very day the Lord blessed and sanctified from creation as His day, if any certain day of the week is really meant.

The first day of the week, as a Sabbath has no divine lord. The Revelator never called it the Lord's day. It was Pope Sylvester who thus named it. We have no one to thank for the Sunday institution but the corrupting influence of the Catholic church described in the 17th chapter of Revelation, under the symbol of a drunken woman, who thought herself able to change Diety's laws Dan. 7:25; so she declared the first day to be the Sabbath or Lord's day, instead of the seventh day, whether it was so named in the Bible or not. To this the Gospel Star agrees, for it says, "The first day of the week is the Lord's day, whether it is so named or not, and when we find the expression in holy writ it is the most natural thing in the world to apply it to that day." Gospel Star, Vol. 2, No. 16, Nov. 4, 1879. The Star should protest against the innovations of the Catholic church and confirm to the customs of the Star of Bethlehem, the author of the gospel of God, who said the "sabbath was made for man," Mark 2:27, and whose custom was to observe the Bible Sabbath, Luke 4:16. The Star of Bethlehem has never told us that the first day of the week is the Lord's day and this the Star of Chillicothe admits. Brother Lucas, does not this fact stamp the seal of condemnation upon your theory?

Reader, please bear in mind this fact: There is no law in the New Testament for observing the first day of the week. A. Campbell admits this. We quote directly from his work. He says, "There is no mode of observing the Lord's day—no law upon the subject." Christian Baptist, Vol. 7, p. 269. "No mode of observing the Lord's day is suggested in the apostolic writings," p. 266. Paul says, "Where no law is there is no transgression," Rom. 4:15. The Catholics teach that Christ was crucified on Friday and rose on Sunday morning. The Protestants teach the same, and assign the day of His resurrection the reason why we should observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath instead of the seventh.

CHAPTER IX

The Day of the Resurrection Considered

Though the resurrection of Christ does not figure the least, or have any possible connection with the Sabbath institution whatever, yet we wish to show that the position is an unscriptural one. There is not one particle of evidence in the Bible that Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week. When the visitants came to the sepulchre on the first day of the week it was empty every time they came. See John 20:1. Though it was yet dark Christ was not there, but had risen some time previously. Luke 24:1-3. Though very early in the morning the tomb was empty. Mark testifies that they came very early in the morning of the first day of the week and entered into the sepulchre in search of Him; but the angel said, "He is not here; He is risen." Hence the sepulchre was empty. Matthew, in recording a different circumstance, and visit to the sepulchre made on the day previous to the first day of the week, states that the sepulchre was then empty.

How is it possible to prove that Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week when He could not be found in the sepulchre in the close of the preceding day? The language of Matthew is, "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here, for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay." Matt. 28:1-6. Here are several particulars not related by any of the other evangelists. 1st, The visit was in the end, or late on the Sabbath. 2nd, The earthquake. 3rd, The descent of the angel. 4th, The removal of the stone from the door of the sepulchre. 5th, The keepers or Roman guard becoming as dead men. These things had occurred and Christ had been liberated from the tomb before the first day of the week had been introduced.

Now let us deal with facts. It is a fact that no Bible writer states the precise time of the resurrection of Christ. Neither was it necessary, as the exact time of His repose in the grave and the time of His burial had been given out. The Savior not only foretold of His own death, but He also gave the length of time He should remain in the tomb, in these words, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. 12:40.

Now, if we can learn when Jesus was interred in the earth we shall have ascertained the time of His resurrection. In Mark 15:42, we read, "And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath." This sabbath was not the ordinary weekly Sabbath, but an high day, John 19:31, the passover sabbath. The preparation was the preparation of the passover, John 19:14. Hence Jesus was buried in the evening. So, according to His own prophecy, He must come up in the evening. If He was placed in the tomb in the morning, morning would be the time of the resurrection. If at noon, noon would be the proper time. He must rise at a time corresponding with the time of His burial. Mark is sometimes quoted to prove that He rose from the dead in the morning of the first day: "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." Mark does not intimate that He rose from the dead on the first day of the week, but that early on that day He appeared to Mary. The time He appeared is the fact referred to and not the time of the resurrection.

"Today is the third day since these things were done," Luke 24:21. Some infer from this expression that Jesus must have been crucified on Friday and rose from the dead on Sunday. Whatever this expression may mean it cannot be used to set aside the plain teachings of Jesus that He would be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights. Matt. 12:40. Mrs. H. V. Reed, in her Bible Triumphant, attempts to explain this on the principle of a part of a whole day, p. 87. This will not do in this case for various reasons, two of which I will mention: First, it is given as a sign of Jesus' divinity, see verse 39. His prophecy that

He would stay in the heart of the earth three days and three nights was to them infallible proof that He was the Son of God. Second, If crucified on Friday, which position she admits, she has a fractional part of Friday, and one whole day of Saturday; and as it is claimed that He rose at the very beginning of the first day, where is any part to represent another day? He also according to this position, remained in the earth two whole nights, Friday and Saturday nights, and there is no part of time to represent the third night. "Third day since these things were done." The question naturally arises, What things? The only correct answer is the things relating to our Savior's death and burial. Now just turn and read Matt. 27: 62-66, and you will learn that the next day after the crucifixion they made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting a watch (which also proves that the day following the crucifixion was not the weekly Sabbath, for they did not transact such business on that day). Jesus was crucified on Wednesday. The next day was Thursday, on which the things relating to His suffering, death, and burial, were done, or accomplished. This little word "since" dates from the accomplishment of all these things relating to Christ. Now let us count; Friday would be the first since these things were accomplished; Saturday would be the second day since, and Sunday would be the third day since these things were done or accomplished. Hence the Bible view of the subject clears up the mist. But on the hypothesis of our opponents, that Christ was crucified on Friday, say nothing about sealing the sepulchre and placing a guard around the tomb on the next day, Sunday was only the second day "since". Here is the position: Christ was crucified on Friday. Saturday would be the

first day since and Sunday the second instead of the third.

(For more detailed study on this subject, send for tract "Resurrection of Christ.")

In the American Baptist Flag, published at St. Louis, Mo., we find the following from the editor, after stigmatizing the Sabbath of God as Jewish, and accusing our Savior of justifying His disciples in violating the law of God (if any are disposed to think our Savior guilty of such a serious charge will they please read Matt. 5:19?), says, "That the Jewish Sabbath is not in force in the gospel dispensation is evident from the fact that it is neither incorporated nor commanded in the New Testament. Vol. 5, Nov. 26, 1879. But the first day of the week is in force though it was never blessed, sanctified, or commanded, either in the New or Old Testaments. Is it not singular that men will reason thus? They will not observe an old institution legally sanctioned in the Old Testament and recognized in the New, yet they will observe a day as holy that lacks all of the proper acts to constitute it a sacred day, and one too that never was commanded by divine authority. We often hear it said, There is no command in the New Testament to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Why should there be, seeing the laws of evidence do not require it? The institution of the Sabbath and Sabbath obligation antedate the giving of the New Testament. The Sabbath was made long before the New Testament Scriptures were made. It was made for man when man was made. All know, who are the least acquainted with the science of jurisprudence, that the same kind of evidence is not demanded to prove an old institution that is required to prove the existence of a new one. The evidence required to prove a new

institution is, 1st, The act of instituting it; 2nd, a command to observe it.

The consecration and appointment of the Sabbath are given in the Bible. Why should all the particulars be re-enumerated in the New Testament Scriptures in order to prove the perpetuity of Sabbath obligation? If a necessity exists I should like very much to have someone point it out, and then tell us why, on the same principle, it was not necessary that He should have commanded us not to take the name of God in vain? For the command which says, "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain," associated with the Sabbath precept is not given in the New Testament Scriptures. Who believes that he can now take the name of God in vain without being held guilty, simply because our Savior did not re-command the third precept of the decalog? By what rule of logic do you reject the binding force of the one and yet hold to the other? The command against image worship is not re-commanded. There is no law in the New Testament forbidding a man to marry his sister. That which proves too much proves nothing. Hence the argument is wrong, for it proceeds upon the supposition that whatever is not re-commanded of the law of God, Christians under the gospel dispensation are not under obligation to obey. The editor of the American Baptist Flag ought to be true to his principles and teach his brethren that since Christ did not re-command them not to swear they are under no obligation to regard that commandment; that it was Jewish, and Christ abolished it; and they can swear and violate the Sabbath with impunity. Where the acts of instituting, consecration, and appointment, are wanting, we have no evidence of an institution; and without these acts the evidence of recognition is impossible. These are all found

in the Bible. We have no need to go to the New Testament for them. Does the New Testament repeal the law of God? where is the repealing act? The kind of proof required to prove the existence of an old institution is the evidence of recognition.

CHAPTER X

The Recognition of the Sabbath in the New Testament

Do the New testament Scriptures recognize the existence of the Sabbath institution? Without such explanations as would be necessary were it abolished we most emphatically affirm that they do, and shall now adduce the proof. First, the Lord claims a day in this dispensation as His, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev. 1:10. Now if reference is had to the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, distinct from the seventh day, where are the acts of instituting, consecrating and appointing, of this first day new institution to be found? For without these acts there can be no institution, and recognition and allusion are utterly impossible. These acts and the law of recognition meet only in the seventh day; hence reference must be made to the seventh day, which, as we have seen by other Scriptures, is explained to be the Lord's day. A critical examination of the text would reveal the fact that reference is made to the day of the Lord's house, that is the day on which the people of God were accustomed to frequent the house of the Lord for worship; and all know that the seventh day had been the stated day for worship, for ages prior to John's time, and must have been then, unless it had been changed. But where is the record of the change? Concerning our Savior, we read, "... as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sab-

-B-174-

bath day, and stood up for to read." Luke 4:16. Here Luke, thirty-three years this side of the resurrection of Christ, inspired by the Spirit of the living God, styles the seventh day Sabbath. As this was the example of the blessed Redeemer, so it was Paul's manner to devote a day to religious purposes. "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures." Acts 17:2. The book of Acts was written some thirty-three years this side of the introduction of the Christian dispensation. Here we have the important fact that the seventh day, as late as A. D. 33 of the Christian era, still retained its sacred title, "the sabbath," and was also honored as the day of worship, the same as it had been under the former dispensation.

Of Paul and Silas it is said, "And on the sabbath (Gr. sabbath day) we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts 16:13. The expression, "was wont to be made," simply means, was accustomed to be made. Thus we are taught by this text that it was the custom of the primitive Christians to worship the Lord on the seventh day. The seventh day was by them recognized as being the Sabbath day.

From the 18th chapter of the Acts we learn of Paul's departure from Athens and of his arrival at Corinth, where he finds Aquilla, a Jew, with whom he engaged in the business of tent-making. Paul continued at Corinth a year and six months, teaching the Word of God among them, v. 11. On what day did he teach? The record says, "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks" (Gentiles). Here we find Paul working at his trade with a

Jew, making tents through the week, but worshipping God and teaching His Word on the Sabbath. He was there a year and six months, and preached every Sabbath. Hence we have a record of seventy-eight Sabbaths observed by Paul at Corinth. He and Aquilla, the Jew, could carry on their secular business together very well, as they both observed the same day; not the Jewish Sabbath, but the Sabbath of the Lord.

In Acts 13:14, we read, "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down." Now if the Sabbath be a separate institution from the seventh day, and was abolished at the cross, why does the Holy Spirit deceive us by telling us that this was on the Sabbath, when the Sabbath did not exist? Mark you, this language was spoken in reference to Paul and Barnabas, who were chosen of the Holy Spirit to go to the Gentiles, whose ministry dates this side of the cross, and if the seventh day was the Sabbath, and the Sabbath was abrogated, then the day was abolished and since the crucifixion the seventh day has not existed. On the first hypothesis, instead of saying on the Sabbath, they should have said on the seventh day; and in fact, if the position is tenable such a usage should be uniform this side of the cross. On the second hypothesis they should neither say the Sabbath or seventh day without making some explanations, such as were necessary to guard against false impressions. If God had, by abolishing the Sabbath, which was the seventh day, cut the weekly cycle down to only six days, and the Jews, contrary to the new arrangement, were still continuing the seventh day, or Sabbath day as a part of the weekly period, when it had by Diety, been destroyed, the apostles should have

so explained the matter, and especially to the Gentiles, to whom they were sent.

But we find the Gentiles designating the seventh day as the Sabbath. "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." These Gentiles who sat under the instruction of an inspired ministry, were not so wise as the Gentiles of modern times who sit under the teachings of an uninspired, and in very many instances a worldly and corrupt ministry, for they profess to have learned that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. Where have they learned this? Not from the word, for it everywhere declares the seventh day to be the Sabbath. They must have learned it from the traditions of the elders, who are teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, Matt. 15. "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God," Acts 13:44. This meeting was held on the Sabbath day, at the request of the Gentiles. Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, but he never taught them that God's seventh day Sabbath was abolished, or that a new Sabbath day had been instituted. Christ and all the inspired writers of the New Testament recognize the existence of the Sabbath in this dispensation. If the institution exists so does the obligation exist. We challenge the whole religious world to show that any of the New Testament saints ever secularized the seventh, or Sabbath day.

That the Sabbath commandment is embraced in the New Testament Scriptures, and was observed by the disciples of Christ this side of the cross, is evident from Luke 23:56, where we read, "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment." Now those who advocate that there

is no Sabbath day for this dispensation ought to be able to show when and where this commandment was repealed. When any of the rites or institutions of the Old Testament were taken away we have a plain statement from the New Testament to the effect that they were removed. Were the sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation abrogated? Paul says they were, Heb. 10:1-10. Was the Levitical priesthood erased? Paul says it was, Heb. 7:12. Was circumcision abolished? Paul says it was; and if we are now circumcised Christ shall profit us nothing, Gal. 5:2. Now where is it said that we are to cease observing the Sabbath of Jehovah? Where? Give us the text, and we will obey. "But," says one, "I read that the Sabbath will cease." The text reads, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Hosea 2:11. The seventh day is never said to be the Sabbath of the Jews, her sabbath, or their sabbath, but the Sabbath of God; it is strictly the Lord's day. The text just quoted speaks not of the Lord's Sabbath, but her sabbaths—the sabbaths of the Jews. (Who ever heard of God or Christ being referred to as feminine—her?). The Jews had eight annual sabbaths which stood in the typical law. Paul says they were abolished, and they were shadows of things to come, Col. 2:16, 17. The seventh day, being instituted before there were any shadows, was not a shadow. It is a memorial, and looks back, not forward. We have seen in our examination of this subject that the seventh day, set apart at creation as the Lord's day, continues as such even down to the close of the canon of inspiration by John, who was the last Bible writer to mention it; and like all the other inspired writers from Moses to Christ, and from Christ to John, he speaks not of it as a common day; but a day be-

longing exclusively to the Lord.

We have thus, from evidence of recognition drawn from the New Testament Scriptures, clearly established the existence of the Sabbath institution in the Christian dispensation. We may also prove the perpetuity of the Sabbath from the fact that Christ and the apostles taught the binding force of the law of God, of which the Sabbath was a part. The young man that came to Jesus to inquire the way of life said, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Christ said, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." The young man said, "Which?" Christ then explains which code by quoting several precepts from the decalog, see Matthew, the 19th chapter. Christ does not give a new law as a rule of conduct, but He endorses the law of the Father. Here we are taught by our Lord to observe that law of which the Sabbath was a part. "But," says one, "that law is now abolished, and therefore it is not necessary that we should observe it." Question: Is it necessary to obey Christ? Yes; He says in order for us to attain unto eternal life we must keep the commandments, which include the Sabbath. Now, if it is not necessary for us to keep them then the teachings of Christ are abolished, for His instructions were that men should observe them. The argument that abolishes the law abolishes also the teachings of Christ.

The apostle James endorses the whole law, and says, "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 (or the law which said, margin), 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." James 2:8-11. Here we have the apostle James' writing between the years of our Lord forty-five and sixty-two, enforcing the whole law of God as authoritative in this dispensation. He shows us that whoever in this age shall keep the whole law, and offend in one point, is guilty of all, by which I understand that it is not necessary for a person to violate all the precepts to be a sinner. Sin is defined to be a transgression of the law. The man who transgresses one precept is guilty of being a law violator. He has despised the authority of the Law-giver. Hence he is guilty of all, and by the law stands condemned, a criminal in the sight of God. And as no law can justify its violator, if he is ever pardoned for his offenses it must be through the gospel.

Paul understood this matter, for he taught that the gospel, instead of making void the law, established it, Rom. 3:31. Jesus, in referring to the ten commandments, says, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 5:19. How dare we teach otherwise, after reading these words of the blessed Master? These words are certainly sufficient and decisive in the matter.

CHAPTER XI

The Penalty Abolished

Mr. Preble, of the First Day Adventists, who has written a work in defense of the First Day, refers to the death penalty attached to the violation of the Sabbath, and asks the question, Is this pen-

alty now in force? No one dare say it is. He then states that old thread-bare assertion, "If then the penalty is done away so is the law abolished which required it."—First-Day Sabbath, p. 17. The death penalty was not simply attached to the Sabbath precept alone, but also to the other precepts of the decalog. A violation of the commandment; "Honor thy father and thy mother," Ex. 20:12, was punishable by death. Proof: "For every one that curseth his father or his mother shall be surely put to death," Lev. 20:9. Is this penalty in force? No one dare say it is. Is the law requiring obedience to parents abolished, so that children may do the reverse of the former commandment, viz., dishonor their parents? Who will answer, "yes" to this question? The violator of the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," Ex. 20:14, was also punishable by death. Proof: "... The adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death." Lev. 20:10. Is this penalty now in force? No one dare say it is. Is the commandment prohibiting adultery abolished? If not why say the commandment requiring obedience to the Sabbath is abolished, simply because the civil penalty annexed thereto has been removed, when the other commandments had the same penalty attached to them? and when it was removed from the Sabbath it was likewise removed from the others.

The facts in the case are these: In reference to the ten commandments, we read, "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, ..." Deut. 5:22. But there was afterwards an added law; Paul makes mention of it, Gal. 3:19. Every Bible student must know that the Jewish church was organized a state

church, and therefore had civil regulations concerning moral and religious duties. But the ten commandments had existed independent of these enactments, which were added because of transgression, Gal. 5:19. In the Jewish state church the Levites were the appointed and consecrated ministers of God. They were not only priests but they were judges in all civil causes. Thus we read in Deut. 17:9-12, "And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire: and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment; and thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose shall shew thee: and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee: according to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel." These laws were state laws and were subordinate to the law of ten commandments, which was and is the supreme law of God, and which the ancient church of Israel had adopted as her constitution. To this A. Campbell agrees and defines the ten commandments as being the constitution or supreme law of that people. His words are: "To be religious and moral was the policy of this nation, and hence religion and morality were the politics of the commonwealth of Israel. A constitution is a law; but it is the supreme law, or the general principles, which authorize all the other laws and regulations of a people. That all

the laws afterward promulgated to the Jews by their king were accordant to their nature and obligations to the spirit of this constitution, needs not a single argument to prove." Christian Baptist, Vol. 7, p. 18. He also gives seven facts which distinguish the ten commandment law from the others, which we would like to quote, but space forbids. The other laws were civil, and were designed to enforce obedience to the moral law. The old state church, with her Levitical priesthood and civil penalties, has been abolished, and a new living has been opened by Christ, who removed the first that He might establish the second. But under the new arrangement the moral code remains, and the man who dishonors his parents, commits adultery, covets, steals, profanes the name of God, and kills his fellowman, he is guilty in the sight of God. But the church has not power to punish him by the enforcement of civil penalties. We should not confound the civil penalty inflicted by the Jewish church with the real penalty to be inflicted at the judgment.

We advocate no law without a penalty. "Sin is the transgression of the law," 1 John 3:4. "The wages of sin is death," Rom. 6:23. This is the penalty of God's law. The man who unlawfully kills a human being, violates not only the law of God, but the law of the state. In the civil court he is found guilty. The judge pronounces sentence against him, and by the law of the state he is punished. But the civil penalty inflicted by the state is not the real penalty of the moral law. He must come up in the judgment and be punished by the Law-giver Himself whose law he has violated. Just so in reference to those who were punished under the civil penalties of the former dispensation. They are answerable for their crimes at the bar of God. The Sabbath was placed by Je-

hovah Himself in the bosom of the moral law, and therefore belongs to the moral code. The moral law prescribes no punishment to be inflicted in this world. But our opponents, because God does not speedily execute the penalty for Sabbath violation, are inclined to think they are at liberty to treat it with contempt, and to set it aside as a thing of nought. To such as thing the moral law is not in force because the penalty is not executed in this world, I wish to commend for their study the following passages of Scripture: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Eccl. 8:11. Direct reference is here made to the real penalty of the moral law of God, independent of all civil regulations. The real penalty belonging to the moral law will as certainly be inflicted as the law of right has been violated.

That the stoning penalty as administered by the evil magistrate under Moses has been set aside, and that the removal of this penalty did not abolish the moral law, is evident from the teachings of Christ, as recorded in the 8th chapter of John, where the scribes and Pharisees brought before our Savior a woman taken in adultery. They say to Christ, "Moses, in the law, commanded that such should be stoned; but what sayest thou?" The reply of Jesus was, "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her." Being convicted by their own conscience at this answer, they all fled, and left Jesus and the woman. Jesus said unto her, "Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee." Did Jesus sustain her in the violation of the moral law which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery?" The Baptist

Flag would answer, "Yes," for it says that Christ sustained His disciples in violation of the Sabbath precept, because, when they plucked the ears of corn on the Sabbath day to satisfy hunger, He did not rebuke them. "Neither do I condemn thee," to the stoning penalty of death, as Moses did. Here our Savior clearly sets aside the ministration of condemnation or death, 2 Cor. 3:7, as administered under the former dispensation, but He does not set aside the law against adultery, but preserves it in all its binding force; for He adds, "Go and sin no more." John 8:11.

Sin is a transgression of the law. Go and sin no more, was the doctrine our Savior taught to fallen humanity. Had this woman been brought before our Savior in reference to a violation of the Sabbath, and He had said as He did, "Neither do I condemn thee," His answer would be in the mouth of every Sabbath opposer. But it was concerning a commandment which our opponents admit to be binding in this dispensation without the death penalty, which was attached to it under the Mosaic dispensation. This admission is fatal to their theory, and destroys their arguments against the perpetuity of the Sabbath, for if the precept, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," can be perpetuated under the gospel dispensation without its former death penalty, so can the Sabbath precept, for both stand on the same basis. We have said that the death penalty was not peculiar to the Sabbath alone, but common to the ten commandments: Proof: Deut. 21:18-21; 22:24; 13:6-10; Lev. 24:11-14; Ex. 21:12, Joshua 7:10-25.

CHAPTER XII

Death Penalty Continued. Fire Prohibition, and Bible Banner Position Examined

The oft repeated assertion that the abolition of

the penalty of a law abolishes a law, is not true. Since engaged in the writing of this work, for the satisfaction of others, I sent this question to H. J. Miller, who is in attendance at the Law University, at Lawrence, Kansas: "Does the abolition of the penalty of a law necessarily abolish the law?" which we requested he should submit to the faculty, and send us the answer by return mail, which he did, and returned us the following decision: "It is a settled principle of law that the penalty of a law be abolished and the law remain unrepealed." This answer places the subject upon its legal basis. We dare say there cannot be found a first class theologian in the land who dare meet, in open contest, a good lawyer on this subject. The Legislature may make a law today, and on tomorrow make a penalty for it. Now the law is made and exists at least one day prior to and without the penalty, which refutes the assertion that a law cannot exist without a penalty. A penalty is something affixed to law. A penalty may be detached from a law today, and on tomorrow a different penalty may be attached to the same law. The law-making power may make a law without a penalty, but it cannot make a penalty without a law, for there would be nothing to attach it to. As the penalty of a law may be changed without changing the law, so may the penalty be abolished without abolishing the law. Our object in giving this decision of the Law Faculty, and presenting these facts in reference to law and penalty, is simply to show that the argument founded upon the death penalty under the former dispensation is utterly groundless. But as before remarked, we advocate no law without a penalty. We wish this to be distinctly understood.

In connection with the death penalty the opponents of the Sabbath frequently refer to the pro-

hibition respecting fires, as though it were a part of the original law, and designed to be co-extensive with the Sabbath obligation. But we have seen that when Deity spake the ten commandments He added no more, since they were a complete law in themselves, having their own penalty to be inflicted at the appointed time by the great Law-giver Himself. The precept not to kindle fires on the Sabbath day, was in its local nature, and related only to the wilderness. It was simply a military regulation connected with the falling of the manna, and co-existent with it. The Israelites were an army under Moses, and were in the warm climate of Arabia, where they had no use for fire except to cook their manna, which did not fall upon the Sabbath day. Olney says of the climate of Arabia, "The climate is excessively warm on the plains and subject to a destructive wind, called the samiel, or simoon, but mild and healthy on the mountains."—Olney's Practical System of Geography, page 239. Why should they kindle fires in a climate which was excessively warm? Will some of those persons who oppose the perpetuity of the Sabbath from this circumstance please explain?

That the law here specified was local and of a military character, the most candid of the opponents of the seventh day Sabbath admit. Says Dr. Gill, "This law seems to be a temporary one, and not to be continued." Comment on Ex. 35:3. We might quote from Dr. Bound, and others, admissions to the same effect; but the Scriptures are sufficient and most clearly show the precept to be local, adapted to existing circumstances. The removal of a military law does not affect the civil law, neither does the abolition of a military and civil code abolish the moral code. The Sabbath being a part of the moral law of God, exists inde-

pendent of all military and civil enactments, which under circumstances may be enacted in reference to it. That the fire prohibition was a temporary statute is evident from the very fact that after they passed out of the wilderness over into the promised land they kindled fires on the Sabbath day. The sacrifice made by fire was offered on the Sabbath day, Num. 28:8-10; Lev. 24:4-9. The precept was adapted to the extremely warm climate of Arabia, but not to the climate of Palestine, which is so cold part of the year as to render fires absolutely necessary in order to prevent suffering.

Christ, when instructing His disciples to flee and escape, if possible, the impending doom that was soon to come upon Jerusalem, says, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day." Matt. 24:20. Why not in the winter? On account of the intense cold, "which at particular times was so very intense as to kill man and beast," as Dr. Adam Clark says. See his note on Psa. 147:16-19. Thus the ancient land of Israel still is not without its winter seasons, as our Savior testifies; and as both ancient and modern travelers have testified, and who have had to contend with snow, hail and ice. In the very land in which God taught Israel to keep His Sabbath, Jesus, the Prince of glory, was crucified. Just before the crucifixion the servants and officers made a fire to warm themselves by. "The servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals; for it was cold: and they warmed themselves: and Peter stood with them, and warmed himself." John 18:18. Dr. Smith, in speaking of the climate of Palestine, says, "During the summer the dews are very heavy, and often saturate the traveler's tent as if a shower had passed over it. The nights, especially toward sunrise, are very cold, and thick fogs or mists are common all over the country."

Thunder storms of great violence are frequent during the winter months." Bible Diet., page 686. In the face of these plain Bible and historical facts, what becomes of the objection based upon the fire precept against the perpetuity and universality of the Sabbath institution? The command not to kindle fire was no more adapted to the country of Israel than to our country. The assertion that Israel could not keep it on account of its being adapted to the climate of Judea, is utterly unfounded. The fact is, the commandment was not universal and moral, but local and military in its nature. These local military regulations have long since ceased, but the Sabbath remains as permanently fixed as all the other precepts in the moral law with which it is associated, and since the birth of the world has continued to roll down the cycle of ages, repeating in its weekly anniversary the wonderful story of the vast and mighty works of creation. Those who have conscientiously observed it as the Sabbath of the Lord have shown their faith by their works in the true and living God who hath created the heavens and the earth. In the Bible Banner, published in Philadelphia under the auspices of the First Day Adventists, we find the following question: "Why are we not under obligation to keep the fourth commandment as well as the rest, or any of the others?" with the following answer: "Because it was never given to us to keep, nor to any other uncircumcised people. In other words, it was never given to Gentiles, and we are Gentiles. None but Jews ever had cause to keep a Sabbath and even they did not keep one, nor were required to until that cause existed, Deut. 5:1-16. Their weekly abstaining from all work was by contrast a constant reminder of their continued servitude in Egypt, and their mighty deliverance therefrom by God's outstretched

arm." Bible Banner, Vol. 9, Dec. 18, 1879. Is it not a fact that all of the promises, commandments, religious and moral institutions, the Sabbath included, were by Jehovah Himself committed to the Jews? Why then single out the Sabbath and exhibit it in this light? Why not all the others? We wish it did not look so much like a desire to deceive and mislead the people as it does. Was not the new covenant made with that people? Are they not styled "a green olive tree, fair and of goodly fruit?" Jer. 11:16. Some of the branches were broken off because of unbelief. The Gentiles are a "wild olive tree" and are to be grafted into the green or tame olive tree, among the natural branches. Romans 11, that they may be made "partakers of the root and fatness of the olive tree," verse 17. When the Gentiles are thus made partakers of the fatness of the olive tree, which must refer to the promises, covenants and commandments of God, which He deposited, committed or entrusted to the sons of Abraham, they are no more "strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints and of the household of God," Eph. 2:19. According to the Banner the Sabbath was abolished that the Jews might come out where the Gentiles were. Where were the Gentiles? Let Paul answer. He says, "At that time ye (Gentiles) were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:12. Why were the Gentiles aliens, foreigners, and strangers, without hope and without God in the world? Because God had made the Jews the repositories of divine revelation. Proof: Paul says, "... Unto them (the Jews) were committed the oracles of God," Rom. 3: 2. Now he who rejects the Sabbath because it was committed to the Jews ought to be consistent

and reject the oracles of God. The Banner virtually rejects the oracles of God from the fact that said oracles were not committed to the Gentiles, or any other uncircumcised people, but to the Jews only.

Paul argues that to Israel pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, Rom. 9:4. Why does the Banner have faith and advocate the promises of God? They were not given to the Gentiles, but to the Israelites. Paul says so. Now as the promises, the Sabbath, and the covenants, and all the other commandments were all alike on the same principle given to Israel, by what philosophical or logical rule does the Banner reject the Sabbath, and unhesitatingly receive and teach all the others? In order to observe the ceremonial law the persons had to be circumcised, but not so in reference to the seventh day Sabbath, for the Jews observed it forty years in the wilderness, when they did not practice circumcision. Hence the idea that circumcision was a condition or prerequisite to Sabbath observance is a mistaken one. Deut. 5:15, referred to by the Banner as teaching the origin of the Sabbath, reads as follows: "And remember that thou was 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." The whole controversy turns to the meaning of word "therefore." The Banner introduces it to prove that the Sabbath originated at that time, and argues that the institution of the Sabbath did not exist before. Webster defines the word "therefore" as follows: "1, For that, or this reason; 2, consequently; 3, in return or recompense for this or that." There is nothing

in this definition to justify the construction placed upon it by the Banner. There is no instituting act of the Sabbath found in the Scripture quoted. God simply appeals to their gratitude to show their love to Him by keeping His Sabbath. "I delivered you, and now in recompense for this deliverance keep my commandments, and obey me; love worship, and serve me." Israel, while in Egypt, was under heavy burdens. God commissioned Moses to deliver them, Ex. 6:6, 10. His message to Israel was, "The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you." The complaint which he uttered against Pharaoh was that he would not let the children of Israel go, that they might serve the Lord God. God, through Moses, said to Pharaoh: "... Let my people go, that they may serve me," Ex. 10:3. While in Egypt they were not allowed to serve God. After they had left Egypt Pharaoh said, "... Why have we done this, that we have let Israel go from serving us?" Ex. 14:5. Israel served Pharaoh and his people. It was a work of mercy to deliver them from their miserable condition, and to bring them where they could enjoy the privileges of worshipping God. They had been slaves, bound by a wicked power, worked to death and robbed of their privilege to serve God. God had with an outstretched arm and an high hand, delivered them into a state of freedom. He therefore calls upon them to show the gratitude of their hearts in serving Him by keeping His Sabbath, which was a sign, or signified that they were worshippers of the true and living God, who had created the earth and the heavens, for the Sabbath was and is a memorial of creation.

They were not only to observe the Sabbath, but they were to conform to all other principles of

right. In Deut. 24:17, 18, we have the same "therefore" used in precisely the same sense: "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take away a widow's raiment to pledge: but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee hence: therefore I command thee to do this thing." This word "therefore" is repeated again in the same sense in Lev. 19:35-37, "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: I am the Lord." If the word "therefore" is to be understood as the producing cause of the Sabbath, as the Bible Banner argues, then it must be understood in the same sense in the parallel texts just examined, which proves that all principles of righteousness originated with the deliverance of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt, and that prior to that event there was no such thing as right doing known to any nation of the earth. Does it look reasonable for one moment that a God who is the author of all righteousness would leave the world of mankind without any knowledge of right principles for a period of two thousand five hundred years. When we understand that God called upon them to keep the Sabbath, to conform to the standard of right from the fact that He had, by delivering them from Egyptian darkness, procured their freedom to serve Him, and that on account of His great mercy shown to them in that wonderful event, they were under moral obligation to do so, all is plain and perfectly harmonious with reason and revelation.

The Sabbath is founded not upon the fact that

God delivered Israel from Egypt, but upon the facts of creation. When God gives the producing cause of the Sabbath, He does not say, "For in forty years I delivered Israel from Egypt, therefore (for this reason) I blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it," but He says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it," Ex. 20:11. Here we wish to submit a note from A. Campbell. He says, "Some say it was changed from the seventh to the first day. Where? when? and by whom? No man can tell. No, it never was changed, nor could it be, unless creation was to be gone through again; for the reason assigned must be changed before the observance or respect to the reason can be changed. It is old wives' fables to talk of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day. If it be changed it was that august personage changed it who changeth times and laws. I think his name is Doctor Anti-christ."—Christian Baptist, Vol. 1, 2nd ed., 1824, page 164. The origin of the Sabbath is always referred to creation; and as A. Campbell says, before the Sabbath institution can be changed creation must be gone through again. And we will add, that before the Sabbath can cease to exist, creation, the work which the Sabbath commemorates, must also cease to have an existence. The Sabbath grew up out of the actions of Deity in the creation, which acts are assigned as the cause of the Sabbath. We are sorry to say that the Banner contradicts the plainest facts of divine revelation when it says that the cause of the Sabbath did not exist for two thousand five hundred years after creation. As the reason assigned still exists so does the Sabbath. The pass-over was instituted as a memorial of the deliver-

ance of Israel from Egypt. "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever. . . . And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt; therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever." Ex. 12:14-17.

There is no Scripture that presents the seventh day Sabbath as a memorial of the redemption of Israel from Egypt; neither is there a Jewish historian, ancient or modern, that so understands it. When they treat of their recovery from Egypt they speak of the passover as being a memorial of that event. But the weekly Sabbath they always connect with the facts of creation. Josephus, when he treats of the deliverance of his own people from the thralldom of Egyptian bondage, speaks of the passover, but says nothing of the Sabbath being a memorial of their deliverance. But in treating of the creation he introduces the weekly Sabbath and like Moses, God's inspired Jewish historian, connects it with the facts of creation. Philo styles the seventh day the universal Sabbath; and like all Bible writers and other Jewish historians, refers its origin to the creation. Now I ask in all candor, Is it not reasonable to suppose that these ancient historians understood the memorials connected with the civil, religious and political history of their own nation fully as well, yes, and far better, than the Gentiles of the nineteenth century? Why assume a position which contradicts not only all Jewish history, both ancient and modern, but also the Bible?

The Bible Banner ought to advocate the Bible Sabbath, and read the Bible critically enough to observe that the law of God requires the stranger

(or Gentile) to observe the Sabbath. The Gentile is even named in the law. "Nor thy stranger that is within thy gates," Ex. 20:10. The word stranger signifies a person of non-Israelitish extraction, resident within the limits of the promised land. Smith's Bible Dic., p. 121. Stranger—"In the earlier periods of the Hebrew state persons who were natives of another country, but who from choice or from necessity had come to take up their residence among the Hebrews."—Watson's Bible Dictionary, p. 874. The stranger specified in the law of God was not a Jew. And as Watson says, All who were not Jews, or circumcised, were Gentiles." Watson's Dic., p. 401. Gentile—"In matters of religion a pagan, or worshipper of false gods. The origin of this word is deduced from the Jews, who called all those who were not of their name, Gentiles." Buck's Theological Dic., p. 153. There were in the land of Israel several thousand strangers or Gentiles. Thus we read, "And Solomon numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering wherewith David, his father had numbered them; and they were found an hundred and fifty thousand and three thousand and six hundred," 2 Chron. 2:17. These Gentiles were required to rest upon the Sabbath that they might be refreshed, Ex. 20:10; 23:12. Paul uses the terms Gentile and stranger as being identical in meaning. Eph. 2:11, 12, 19. God committed His divine oracles to the Jews from the fact that the Gentiles, as we have seen, were idolators, worshippers of false gods. But the Gentile had the privilege of being adopted, and of sharing in the name and advantages of Israel. Romans 11; Ephesians 2. They were to learn the ways of God's ancient people, who had all the promises, the covenants, and the law, and observed the Sabbath of the Lord, as is evident from Jer. 12:16,17, "And

it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, The Lord liveth; as they taught my people to swear by Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But if they will not obey, . . ." etc., God said He would cut them off. Hence the Gentiles were required to conform to the ways of Israel. For through Israel God designed to preserve His religious and moral institutions; to them He communicated His divine will, and through Israel, the seed of Abraham, Deity designed to bless nations; hence He styles Himself the "God of Israel," Num. 16:9. "Glory to God of Israel." Josh. 7:19. To Cyrus He announced Himself as being the "God of Israel." Isa. 45:3. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel." Luke 1:68. Both the Old and New Scriptures speak of Deity as being Israel's God. He gave Himself to Israel in the same sense in which He gave them the Sabbath. Will the Banner reject Jehovah as a Jewish God, and say the Gentiles have no interest in Him? If not, why reject the Sabbath because it was given to Israel? The seventh day Sabbath is nowhere said to be the Sabbath of Israel, or Israel's Sabbath; and if it was, the representation would form no argument against its perpetuity, or prove it Jewish any more than such expressions would limit the existence of Deity, or prove Him to be a Jewish God. The Gentiles were required to worship God and to conform to His Sabbath, as we have already shown.

We here present another direct proof that the Gentiles were under obligation to unite themselves with the Lord and to keep His Sabbath. You may call it Israel's Sabbath if you wish, for He who commands it, declares Himself to be Israel's God as we have already seen. "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice: for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed.

Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." Isa. 56:12. Here is a blessing pronounced upon the man, not simply upon the Jew, but upon the Jew and Gentile who will keep God's Sabbath. "Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." Isa. 56:3, 4. This, in connection with the others quoted, forever settles the matter, and utterly annihilates the thread-worn assertion that the Sabbath was binding only on the Jews. Some say that the Gentiles, who were servants of the Jews, were under obligation to keep the Sabbath. Well, this amounts to a surrender of the whole proposition, and is a frank acknowledgment that the Sabbath was binding on others besides the Jews. But the strangers spoken of by Isaiah were not servants, but free men; nor were the "neighbors" (Gentiles) mentioned by Jeremiah, 13:14-17, servants, but Gentiles that lived among the tribes of Israel. Those strangers or Gentiles sojourned and lived in the land. Jew and Gentile conformed to the same law. Ex. 12:48, 49; Num. 15:14-16; Lev. 17:8-10. Many other Scriptures might be quoted but these are sufficient, and must clearly show that our position on the Sabbath is invulnerable.

CHAPTER XIII

Paul's Illustration, Composed of Four Figures Explained

"Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that know the law) how; that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. 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 raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Rom. 7:1-7. This Scripture is thought by some to teach the abolition of the law. But the conclusion drawn by the apostle from the figures used in his illustration positively forbids such an interpretation. Now, let us be candid and look at his conclusion. "Wherefore the law is holy and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Verse 12. "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal (he assumes the condition of the sinner), sold under sin," verse 14. In the verse immediately connected with the illustration Paul asks the

significant question, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet," verse 7. Here the apostle clearly teaches the binding force of the law. He also says, "... I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died," verse 9. That is, he regarded the moral law as the rule by which he was to be justified before God. He was secure and self-satisfied, believing the obedience he had paid to it rendered him acceptable to God. But when the commandment came that is, when the design of it was duly comprehended by him, "sin revived." He thought he stood before God justified, free from sin; but a just conception of the design of the law taught him that he was a sinner, condemned by the law to death. "Sin revived." "The strength of sin is the law," 1 Cor. 15:56. The law became strong in its convictions, and irresistible in its accusations against him. He saw and confessed himself to be a condemned criminal and unpardoned rebel before the holy law of God. His self-security and self-confidence vanished. And he died, died to the law.

The idea is more clearly expressed in Gal. 2:19. "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." Here the apostle confesses that the law, so far from justifying or acquitting its violators, condemns and binds them over to death. He teaches that God's grand design by the law is not to justify, but to condemn every living soul. He therefore renounces all dependence upon the law as able to acquit him from guilt, on account of any obedience he might render to it. This is certainly logical reasoning, and in harmony with known facts.

It is a settled principle in law that no law can

justify its violator. Those who have transgressed the holy law of God can never be justified by that law. Paul says, "All have sinned." John says, "Sin is the transgression of the law." So, if they are ever justified, the work must be done on some other principle than law. Paul tells us how and on what principle it is to be accomplished. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified," Gal. 2:16. Says A. Campbell: "The whole world has been found guilty before God so that, in fact, there is none righteous, no not one. Therefore by the deeds of the law no man can be justified before God. For should a man keep the whole law and yet offend in one point he is guilty of all. He has despised the whole authority of the law and the law-giver. It is then utterly impossible that a sinner can be forensically or legally justified before God by a law which he has, only in one instance violated. If then a sinner be justified it must be on some other principle than law." Campbell on Baptism, Book 5, Chap. 2, p. 277. He further says: "Salvation in the aggregate is all of grace; and all the parts of it are consequently gracious. Nor do we, in truth, in obeying the gospel, or in being buried in baptism, make void either law or gospel, but establish and confirm both." P. 285. To illustrate: the man who violates the law of the state can never be pardoned by the law which he has violated. The governor may pardon him, but does a pardon granted by the governor abolish the state law? Neither does pardon granted by Christ on the principle of faith in His name abolish the law of His Father. Paul clearly teaches that the doctrines of Christianity

do not set aside the law of God. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

From the foregoing it must be plain to all that Paul's illustration was not designed to teach the abolition of the law. Such a construction involves the apostle in self-contradictions, and does violence to the general tenor of the Scripture teaching. Paul introduces four figures in his illustration by the use of which he illustrates four things. The figures are, the first husband, the second husband, the woman and the law. The woman represents the sinner; the first husband that to which the sinner or woman is bound, the "old man," or "body of sin;" the second husband represents Christ, or the "new man;" the law of marriage represents the moral law. Question: What is the first husband? The opponents of the Sabbath say, "The law." But the answer destroys Paul's illustration. Paul makes the law and the husband two distinct things. Question: What is it that dies? The opposers of the Sabbath say, "The law." But this answer contradicts Paul. He says it is the husband that dies. The law of marriage does not die when the first husband dies, but lives on and even joins the woman in marriage with her second husband. Just so with the moral law represented by the law of marriage. Though it does not and cannot pardon the guilty, yet no person can become united to Christ, the second husband, who continues to live in open violation to its holy precepts. It requires of us that we allow Deity to reign supremely in our hearts; that we conceive of Him as He has revealed Himself unto His Word; and that we do not use His name with irreverence. In fact, we must delight in His law and put in practice its holy precepts which forbid theft, covetousness, adultery, and condemn every false way, and ap-

proves of that only which is pure, holy, just, and good, in order to be married to Christ, who is the second husband. Question: Who is the first husband? We answer the "old man," the "carnal mind," the body of sin, which is represented as being "destroyed, crucified, put off," when Christ the second husband is chosen or "put on," Rom. 6:6; 8:11.

Please examine the following texts where the divorce from the first husband and the marriage to Christ, the second husband, is described. Eph. 4:22; Rom. 6:6. The sinner, represented by the woman in the illustration, is joined to the "old man," which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, Eph. 4:22, which he must "put off" or be divorced from. "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him," Col. 3:9, 10. Here are the two husbands clearly defined, and the release from the first and the union with the second clearly thought. The carnal nature represented by the figures old man and first husband, to which the sinner in his unconverted state is wedded, must die, be crucified, put to death. "Our old man is crucified," Rom. 6:6. Here is the death of the first husband. The woman, or sinner, may now form a marriage relation with another, even Christ, the second husband, who hath been raised from the dead, without being chargeable with the sin of adultery. Paul says ". . . If while her husband (not the law,) liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man." Why is it that the opponents of the Sabbath will persist in quoting this Scripture to prove that the law is

dead, when Paul, in the very heart of his illustration recognizes its living, binding force; and the sequel shows that it "slew him"? A dead law cannot condemn the sin of adultery, or any other sin; neither could it have slain Paul or any one else. Paul says, ". . . The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. We understand the figure to embody not only the present carnal desires of the sinner in his unconverted state, but also his past transgressions. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past . . ." Rom. 3:25. Here is the fatal mistake of the moralist. He will not confess himself "dead," or "put to death by the law," as the Diaglott renders it, but thinks if he lives in the morality of the law he will be saved. In the judgment he will find himself by the law bound fast, tied, or held to his past sins, which will condemn him. Obedience to the law can never atone for past or present transgressions. The blood of Christ only avails. These figures, when properly understood, are very appropriate and full of meaning, and agree with Paul's conclusion that the law is not wrong because it condemns to death the transgressor, but spiritual, holy, just, and good.

The expression, "delivered from the law," does not mean that we are released from the obligations of the law. The man who has been sentenced to death and receives a pardon can say, "Now I am delivered from the law; I am free from the law. I am a free man." But who, for one moment, supposes that he is released from the obligation to obey the law? The expression, "that being dead," does not refer to the law. The margin reads, "being dead to that." All Greek scholars admit that the

original word from which the expression, "that being dead" is rendered, does not refer to the law. A. Campbell in his third letter to B. W. Stone, says, "You quote from Rom. 7, 'The Jews are delivered from the law, it being dead wherein they were held.' But it does not so read in my Greek Testament. It is according to Mill, Bengelius and Griesback, 'We being dead, wherein we were held or tied.' We, not the law, have died." Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 4, New Series, p. 472. Such texts and expressions as "If righteousness came by the law, then is Christ dead in vain;" "dead to the law;" "dead through the law;" only teach that we are not pardoned through the law but by or through the Anointed One in whom Deity has invested pardoning power. But when pardoned are we at liberty to transgress the moral law of Jehovah? If so, then we are found sinners and Christ is therefore the minister of sin. Gal. 2:17. There is no Scripture that teaches that the moral law is dead. It was no part of our Savior's mission to abrogate any part of His Father's moral government.

CHAPTER XIV

Commandments Abolished; Partition wall; and Hand Writing of Ordinances

"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," Eph. 2:15. The adjunct element, "contained in ordinances," clearly distinguishes the code of law here spoken of from the moral code, which our Savior magnified. The nature of the ordinances may be learned from Num. 19:2. "This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord hath

commanded, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke." Paul refers to this same law of commandments, and says it stood only in meats, drinks, divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed upon them until the time of reformation. Heb. 9:10. The ten commandment law says nothing about meats, drinks, and washings, or red heifers. This abolished law was the hand writing of ordinances which Christ blotted out. Col. 2:4. In this law stood the holy days and sabbath days of that typical system which Deity designed should reach only to the body of Christ. Hence they were erased when His body was offered upon the cross, and He cried, "It is finished." Paul says that they were only shadows of things to come, Col. 2:16, 17. The seventh day Sabbath not being a shadow was not placed in this shadowy law. If the typical system required the observance of the seventh day Sabbath then it also required the observance of the other nine precepts. But who is willing to attach simply a typical value to such precepts as "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not kill," etc? With these precepts the weekly Sabbath is inseparably connected. The law that commands "thou shalt not kill" also commands to "remember the sabbath day." These facts show to what law reference is made, and also to what the Sabbath belongs.

"... He is our peace who, hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." Eph. 2:14. That this verse has no allusion to the ten commandment law as being the partition wall is evident, not only from the general tenor of the Scripture teaching, but also from what Josephus says who being a Jew, certainly ought

to understand the matter far better than modern Gentile priests, who delight to cast odium upon the Sabbath of God, and who oppose in a rancorous, malignant spirit, that institution which Diety taught us we should esteem a delight. He says, "There was in the court of the temple a wall breast high with pillars at particular distances, and inscriptions on them in Greek and Latin importing that strangers (Gentiles) were forbidden from entering further. Here their offerings were received and sacrifices were offered for them, they (Gentiles) standing at the barrier, but they were not allowed to approach to the altar." Antiq. B. 15; C. 11. These particulars are explanatory of what Paul means by the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentiles being broken down by Christ, the Anointed One, and clearly show that reference is made to a law commanding sacrifices. How strange it is that the opposers of the Sabbath will teach that by the partition law is meant the ten commandments.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Matt. 5:17. Webster gives six definitions to the word fulfil, one of which is to perform what is required; to answer a law by obedience. In this sense Christ fulfilled the moral law. We are to fulfil it in the same sense. James 2:8. "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Gal. 5:16. We are to crucify, abolish, put to death the lusts of the flesh. But if fulfil in Matt. 5:7, means to abolish or do away with the law, as the opponents of the Sabbath argue, then we may understand Paul to teach that if we walk in the Spirit we shall not put to death or do away with the lust of the flesh. To fulfil the lusts of the flesh is to live in obedience to the requirements of our carnal nature. "Where-

fore I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God." Col. 1:25 Here we have the same Greek word which occurs in Matt. 5:17, also rendered fulfil. Its evident meaning is not to abolish or do away with, but as given in the margin, "to teach" or "fully set forth".—Diaglott. Hence Christ came to obey, teach, and to set forth the law fully.

Under the Mosaic dispensation obedience to the moral law, as we have already seen in the examination of the death penalty, was enforced by civil penalties; hence the law, though moral in its nature, was treated as a civil law. Crime was punishable only when committed. Just so in reference to civil law; it takes no cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. A person may be arrested and put under bonds for a threat to kill and other rash threats of violence; but the penalties for crime can only be inflicted when the crime is committed. Wicked plans, impure thoughts, and evil intentions, are not considered violations of the civil law. Just so it was under the former dispensation. The person whose passions willed murder, and whose heart assented to it, but failed to execute his plan, was not punished by the civil magistrate. The former administration enforced obedience to the letter of the law, and punished only when the desire to do wrong was expressed in the deed. But the holy Seer of God foretold of one to come who should magnify the law of God, Isa. 42:21. Webster defines the word magnify, "to make great, or greater; to increase the apparent dimensions of a body; to extol; to exalt in description, or praise, to elevate, to raise in estimation."

When Christ came He elevated the law above the position of a civil law. He "fully set it forth" and

placed it upon its true basis. He brought it forth from under its civil penalties, and presented it in its true greatness. In His very first discourse to His disciples He says, "Blessed are the pure in heart," Matt. 5:8. What a noble thought! This our Savior shows to be just what the law of God demands, which He says He came not to destroy, verse 17. Hear Him as He fulfills, or fully sets forth the law: "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," verse 21. Here Christ teaches that angry passions are a violation of the ten commandment law, for He refers directly to the decalog. And again He says, "Ye shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Verses 27, 28. Here our Savior teaches that with the eye a person may violate the law of God. This was entirely new teaching in reference to the law of Deity. Such principles had never before been announced. Here Christ shows His followers that the moral law demands that man should not think wrongly. His thoughts must be pure and vile imaginations must not be indulged in. According to the civil law for a man to be a murderer he must actually commit the crime. So it had been under the Mosaic dispensation. But he who came to magnify the law of Jehovah, His Father, showed that the person was equally guilty who had even the thoughts of murder in his heart. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3:15. Thus does our Savior make the moral law condemn all revengeful feelings of hate. Is it any wonder that He should preface His address with the words, "Blessed are the pure in heart"?

Just after this statement and before He points out wrong desires as violation of the law, He says, "Whosoever shall break (or violate) one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 5:19. What commandments does He refer to? He refers to the moral law of the ten commandments in the decalog. He quotes directly from them, verse 21: "Thou shalt not kill." "Thou shalt not commit adultery," verse 27. These quotations clearly show to what law reference is made. The Sabbath is a part of this law which the Savior says He came not to destroy but to fulfil or set apart in its fullness. He, in His teaching, recognized the Sabbath institution existing according to law. Matt. 12:12; and taught that works of mercy and necessity performed on that day were lawful, Luke 13:16. Our Savior taught His disciples that they should carry out not only the letter, but also the spirit of the law. They were to "serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter." Rom. 7:6, and instead of despising the law of Deity they were to delight in the law of God after the pattern, the inward man who is Christ; see Rom. 7:22. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:18. Here the word fulfilled is used in a different sense from the word fulfilled in the 17th verse. It is used in the sense of accomplished. In this discourse the Savior says, "The pure in heart shall see God," and "the meek shall inherit the earth," which promises are yet to be accomplished, but look to the future for their accomplishment. Hence the law of God reaches forward, even down to the consummation of all things.

On this text Wesley remarks on the word jot and tittle: "One jot—It is literally not one iota; not the most inconsiderable vowel; or one tittle, one corner or point of a consanant. It is a proverbial expression which signifies that no one commandment contained in the moral law, nor the least part of any one, however inconsiderable it might seem, should ever be annulled." Wesleyan Theology, p. 127. The words "all" and "fulfilled" do not relate specially to the law, as the opponents of the Sabbath argue, but to the accomplishment of all things spoken of by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began, Acts 3:21. One thing is certain: the word all cannot mean all the law. If we apply it to the law we must also apply it to the prophecies. Are all of the prophecies fulfilled? If so where is our part? Luke says, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

The verse above is sometimes quoted to prove that the law was abolished at the cross. "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth (or is invited) into it," verse 16. The word "were" is in italics, which indicates that it is a supplied word, and not in the original, which is true. In Matt. 11:13, which is a parallel text, we get the true idea: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." Instead of the word "were" we have the word prophesied which is found in the original. The law and the prophets taught until John. Then John taught in addition to or in connection with them. Now if these texts prove the abolition of the law, they prove that the law was abrogated at the advent of John instead of at the cross. But the opponents of the Sabbath will not

allow this. What proves too much proves nothing.

CHAPTER XV

The Sabbath a Sign; The Apostles and Elders Consider the Matter of Circumcision

"Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Ex. 31:13. This text is quite frequently used to prove that the Sabbath was exclusively Jewish and ceased with their generations. But there is nothing in the text indicating that the Sabbath was made for Israel when Israel was brought out of Egypt. The Sabbath, in its sign office, pointed right back to creation for its origin. Proof: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Verse 17. The Sabbath was not a sign between Jews and Gentiles, but a sign between God and Israel. He who had created the heavens and the earth, and rested on the seventh day, had separated them from all nations, and given, or committed to them, His own blessed and sanctified day. The reason is assigned in these words: "That ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify," or separate you from the world. The expression, "throughout your generations," doth not limit the Sabbath institution, as the opponents of the Sabbath argue. It does not in itself limit the existence of any ordinance or institution, as is evident from Lev. 3:17. It was an ordinance for Israel throughout their generations not to eat blood. Yet the same ordinance was given to Noah before Israel existed, Gen. 9:4. And after the generations of Israel ceased (as our opponents claim) the same prohibition rested upon the

Gentiles, Acts 15:20.

The word generation has several meanings. Webster gives as its sixth and seventh meanings, A family, race, progeny, offspring. He also defines it, A series of children or descendants from the same stock. In this sense the generations of the children of Israel have not yet ceased. The sense of the word generation in the text in question, is the regular succession of descendants from father to son. This is the only definition of the term that can be given as applied to a particular people or nation. Now the opponents of the Sabbath argue that Israel's generation ceased at the first advent of Christ. Is it true that not a single Jew has been born this side of the cross? Hence we have shown that the expression "throughout their generations," has no logical value whatever. The Sabbath to Israel was a sign, mark, or token, by which it was known that the Lord (Jehovah) was their sanctifier. So God explains it Himself. Exodus 31. Christ Himself was a sign, Isa. 8:18. See the explanation in Heb. 2:13, and the language of Simeon as given in Luke 2:34. "... This child (Jesus) is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against."

The Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel, and signified, by pointing back to creation, that the Builder of the universe of systems was their God. The nation of Israel worshipped the true God. But all other nations were idolaters, image worshippers. God said to Israel, "Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you," Deut. 6:14. Those gods did not create the heavens and the earth, Jer. 10:11. Hence those who worshiped them did not keep the Creator's Sabbath. The Hebrews observed the Sabbath, which signified their relation to the true God, the living God, the everlasting King, Jer. 10:

10, who was pleased to style himself the God of the Hebrews," Ex. 3:18. Christ is now a sign spoken against; when He shall cease to be a sign will He Himself also cease to exist? If not, why argue that the Sabbath ceasing to be a sign between Jew and Gentile has therefore ceased to exist? But we want proof that the Sabbath was a sign between Jew and Gentile. We want proof that Jehovah's Sabbath has ceased to exist. Creation continues; so does the Sabbath, creation's memorial. The council, Acts 15:6, "And the apostles and the elders came together to consider this matter." What matter? The matter of the Sabbath day? This council was not called to settle any thing in reference to the Sabbath day, but convened for an entirely different purpose. The subject discussed before this ancient and venerable conference was the law which required circumcision, verses 1-5. The ~~ten~~ commandment law did not require this rite. Paul says, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." 1 Cor 7:19. Here the apostle shows that there is moral worth in the keeping of the commandments of God, but none whatever in circumcision. Shall we so pervert the decision of the apostolic council as to set aside the commandments of Deity, which embody all principles of morality? Shall we destroy all principles of right in order to get rid of the Sabbath of the Lord? "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear," Acts 15:10. The ceremonial arrangement was a burdensome system. The law of sacrifice, which demanded the offering of animal blood under the Mosaic dispensation, could not make the worshippers perfect.

It was a law of carnal ordinances imposed upon

them until the time of reformation, Heb. 9:10-13. If the yoke refers to the ten commandments then we must understand that the disciples and fathers were not able to allow Deity to reign supremely in their hearts, as the first commandment required. No; they had to have other gods beside Jehovah. And to conceive and worship Him as He had revealed Himself in His divine Word, required by the second commandment, was to them a yoke which they could not bear. Not to take the name of God in vain as exalted by the third commandment was to them a thought of bondage, a galling yoke which they could not endure. And of course they could not conform to the fourth, which enjoined the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship, in memory of their Creator's rest and work. To honor father and mother as commanded by Deity, though a cruel yoke of the disciples of Christ and prophets of God, is thought by the Gentiles to be proper and right. So they educate their children to honor their parents in all lawful requests. Not to kill, steal, commit adultery, covet, and swear falsely against their neighbor, was to the disciples and fathers a burden grievous to be borne. What an immoral class of persons the disciples of Christ and prophets of God must have been, on the hypothesis of Sabbath opposers, who quote Acts 15 to prove the abrogation of the ten commandments to get rid of the Sabbath of the Lord!

The decision of the council is given in these words: "That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Verse 29. The opposer of the Sabbath reads this, and with and air of triumph asks, Why did it not command them to keep the Sabbath? Now that this posi-

tion is wrong is evident from the fact that it assumes that what ever was not commanded by what council is not binding. We ask, Why did it not command them not to take the name of God in vain? Not to kill, steal, commit adultery, covet, or swear falsely against their neighbor? The fact is, these commandments were not involved in controversy; neither was the Sabbath precept. The council had not met to see whether Gentiles could profane the name of God, kill, steal, commit adultery, covet, bear false witness, and desecrate the Sabbath of Jehovah. No; but circumcision and the law of Moses was called in question, and decided by this council. The commandments of God are not grievous, 1 John 5:3. The Sabbath is not a yoke, but a delight, Isa. 58:13. The law of God is not a burden, but a delight, Rom. 7:22.

To those who say we cannot keep the law of Deity, simply to get rid of what they term the old Jewish Sabbath which is placed in the very bosom of his law, and when asked why we cannot are unable to give an answer, we wish to say, Paul furnishes the answer; and if they will acquaint themselves with it, they may be able to give a Scriptural answer. The answer assigned is found in Rom. 7:7, and reads as follows: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Reader, is this your reason? If so have you not good reason to suspect that you are not right in the sight of God? Had you not better read carefully the 119th Psalm, and take heed unto your ways? The oft repeated expression, "Old Jewish Sabbath," is not Biblical. The Sabbath is old; yes, too old to be Jewish. The Sabbath dates back to Jehovah's rest, but the Jew simply to Abraham. Just substitute the word creation for Jewish and you will have the truth. The seventh day is the old creation Sab-

bath, a time honored institution, which has stood the storms of ages. Though the mother of harlots and all her daughters oppose, and are untiring in their zeal to hide away and bury Jehovah's sacred day, blessed and sanctified at creation, yet it shines forth in all its clearness from the sacred pages of Holy Writ. Praise His holy name!

CHAPTER XVI

Ministration; Sabbath Day's Journey, and Third Day

"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." 2 Cor. 3:6. This text is quoted to prove that the Sabbath is done away, and is not now binding on either Jew or Gentile. With the opponents of the Sabbath, letter and spirit mean law and gospel. All parties are satisfied with the other nine precepts of the decalog, the Sabbath precept being the only one that gives them trouble, and with which they are dissatisfied. And if it be read to suit their notions they would have it read, The first day is the Sabbath or Lord's day; others, those who do not believe in any Sabbath, Forget the Sabbath day to keep it holy. But it reads, "Remember," and "to keep holy," and that the "seventh day is the Sabbath." Seeing that all religious societies are satisfied with nine of the precepts, and dissatisfied only with the fourth, it therefore follows that when they quote this text they use it against the Sabbath. Hence the letter means the Sabbath. So it is the Sabbath that kills, according to their position. On this hypothesis the spirit must mean the first day, or no Sabbath, which gives life.

Now, if we fill up the ellipsis according to gram-

matical law, the text will read as follows: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter (letter of the new testament), but of the spirit (spirit of the new testament): for the letter killeth (letter of the new testament) but the spirit giveth life (spirit of the new testament)." Thus we are taught by the inspired minister of God that if we worship Jehovah simply to shun His impending wrath to be poured out upon the ungodly at the conclusion of this age, that our profession and worship is a vain and empty one, and will avail us nothing. Conformity to the letter of the teachings of Jesus Christ and His apostles, while disregarding the spirit, is a cold, dead, lifeless formality, which ranks under the head of lip service. We are to worship God in spirit, John 4:24. Love must characterize our devotions. The love of God shed abroad in the heart should prompt man to regard both the letter and the spirit of the law of Jehovah, and also to observe the letter and teachings of Jesus and His apostles. "Love is the fulfilling of the law," the crowning grace of the New Testament Scriptures—Love to God, love to Christ, love to man, a love for the commandments of God and faith of Jesus. Reader, may you and I ever be found serving God under the influence of divine love.

"But if the ministration of death 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." Ministration is based upon law. Where there is no law there can be no ministration. Here are two ministrations; ministration of death or condemnation, and ministration of righteousness or pardon. This text teaches the abolition of the Mosaic ministra-

tion, and not the abrogation of the law of God. We have seen in the examination of the death penalty that Christ set aside the ministration of the former dispensation, but preserved the law of God. The woman brought before Him charged with the sin of adultery He did not, as Moses, condemn to death, but told her to sin—violate the law of God—no more. Here is a perfect disannulling of the death penalty, styled the ministration of condemnation, and a clear recognition of the perpetuity and binding force of the law of Jehovah. What was to be done away? Sabbath opposers say the Sabbath, but Paul does not say so. He says, "Which glory was to be done away." What glory? the Sabbath? The Sabbath opponent must answer yes, for he always quotes the text to prove that the Sabbath is done away. Reader, be careful; notice Paul's language closely. He says, "Which glory was to be done away." What does Paul here represent as being "glory" and "glorious"? Is it the Sabbath? If so, the Sabbath is done away. "Which glory was done away," is the unmistakable language of an inspired apostle. Reader, do you wish an answer? If so then look in the Word for it, where you will find a true one, and one which is worth more than ten thousand assertions of men, and which will outweigh them all. The seventh and ninth verses furnish Paul's own answer: "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious," 2 Cor. 3:7. What was "glorious"? Ministration of death." Where was it written? "Written and engraven in stones." "For if the ministration of condemnation be glory," vs. 9. What is glory? "Ministration of condemnation." What was done away? Paul says, "that which is done away was glorious," vs. 11, which he himself explains to be the ministration, and not the Sabbath, or any part of the moral law of God. "The chil-

dren of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance (or ministration). When Moses came down from the mount the glory which shone upon his face, skin or countenance, Exodus 24, prefigured his administration. Those who represent us as teaching that it was simply the glory that enshrouded Moses' face abstractly considered, which was done away, are guilty of misrepresenting us. Such should remember that there is nothing to be made by a misrepresentation of the views of an opponent; and also that they are guilty of a violation of the law of Jehovah, which says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

We understand that it was that ministration, prefigured by glory, which Paul, by the use of the same figure, shows is done away. "Which glory was to be done away." Which, in this connection, is a relative pronoun, because it represents a preceding word called its antecedent. The antecedent is "glory" in the preceding phrase. It is conjunctive relative because it joins a limiting clause to the antecedent. The limiting clause is "Glory was to be done away." Hence the grammatical construction of the text does away with the arguments directed against the law of God. Moses put a veil over his face, not over the ten commandments. The expression, "The end of that which is abolished," verse 13, cannot refer to the law, unless Paul contradicts himself respecting the law, for in Rom. 3:31, "We do not make void the law," or abolish the law. The word "abolish," in 2 Cor. 3:13, and "make void," in Rom. 3:31, are from the same original word. Hence 2 Cor. 3 simply teaches two ministrations, and two laws. These two ministrations are both predicated upon the same law, as we have seen that the same law exists under the new covenant that existed under the old; so like-

wise the same law exists under the ministration of pardon that existed under the ministration of death, or condemnation. See the use of ministration in Luke 1:23; Acts 6:1. 2 Corinthians 3 does not furnish the least shadow of a foundation for the belief that any part of the law is eradicated. The Sabbath opposer will quote the expression, "The ministration of death written and engraven in stones," verse 7, and then inquire, "Were not the ten commandments written and engraven in stones?" We may allow our opponent this position; but when, in his struggle he begins to reason, "Are they not therefore abolished," we demur, and at once enter our most solemn protest. There is a figure known as metonymy, which occurs all through the Bible, where the effect is put for the cause, the cause for the effect, the subject for the adjunct, the adjunct for the subject. Under this figure the heart is often used for the moral and intellectual faculties; hence represented as speaking, thinking, considering, etc. Paul uses this figure when he says, "To be carnally minded is death". Carnality being a cause of death is called death. Again, "Is the law sin?" (The cause of sin, margin). Other examples might be given, but these are sufficient.

Now if that which was written and engraven refers to the moral law being written and engraven in stones as that law brought death and death only to its offenders, then Paul has, by the use of this figure, represented the law as death. The word law may then be substituted for death, and the text reads, "But if the ministration of the law written and engraven in stones, was glorious," etc. Now according to this position, we ask, what was done away? Not the law which was written and engraven in stones, but its ministration. The ministration of this law thus written was done away.

The law remains, and a new ministration takes the place of the old, even the ministration of pardon. Reader, you see we are liberal; we give our opponents all they can possibly claim from this text, and yet it most signally fails them. The truth of the matter is, the Sabbath of the Lord is guarded and defended on every hand, and vain is the effort of puny man to overthrow it. In order to do away with the Sabbath men have turned Antinomians and identified themselves with the school of Agricola, who was the first to oppose the law of Jehovah. He taught that evil works could not hinder our salvation; that theft committed by a believer was not a criminality, in a word, that evil actions committed by believers were not sinful. See Neal's History of the Puritans, Vol 7. Here is the founder and the origin of the doctrine we are venturing upon the authority of the Bible to deny. Men who teach the abolition of the law of God may say they are not Antinomians, but facts make them such. Men who opposed Antinomianism had to meet the same would-be arguments that we have to meet relatives to the perpetuity of the law.

Sometimes opponents of the Sabbath challenge us to show anything written upon stones except the ten commandment law, thinking that Paul has direct reference to the ten commandments being written or engraven in stones, which position we have granted for argument sake, and shown that if he did make such references that he used a common Bible figure, the effect for the cause, death for law, and that the ministration of that which was written has been done away, and not the law. The law written and engraven in stones remains, but the ministration is gone. The executive laws were also written upon stones. Proof: Deut, 27:2-8: "And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God

follows: "Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun (not Son); but let those who are situated in the country freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture."—Lewis' History of the Sabbath, p. 123. This law it will be observed, treats the first day not as the Christian Sabbath or Lord's day, but as being the "venerable day of the sun," which was its heathen name. Constantine was not converted for two years after the enactment of this law, and his conversion was not a gospel conversion; he knew nothing of the teachings of Jesus Christ and the apostles. While marching at the head of his army towards the Alps, at midday he discovered in the eastern quarter of the sky, a luminous cross, surrounded by these words, "In hoc signo vinces,"—In this sign thou shalt conquer. He accepted the token and pushed forward, conquering the forces of Maxentius. From this singular phenomenon and fortunate military success he became a believer, which phenomenon was purely imaginary on his part, and shows that he was a superstitious character, a fit subject to enact a Sunday law, which dates from A. D. 321; and his so-called conversion from A. D. 323.—Land Marks of ancient History, pp. 181, 182. After his conversion, in a fit of anger he caused his own son, Crispus, to be put to death, p. 186. In A. D. 337, he was taken ill, and feeling that death was approaching, he was baptized, p. 187. We have been thus particular, in tracing the history of Constantine, from the fact that there is a small work in circulation, of Campbellite origin, charging us with teaching that Constantine changed the Sabbath, which is as false as false can be; therefore the proof that he did not, is ours, and the conclusion drawn therefrom that we are guilty of garbling history, to sub-

stantiate our claim is powerless for evil, with those who are once rightly informed.

We see that Constantine's Sunday law was in reference to the "venerable day of the sun," and was placed on the Statute Book before he embraced Christianity. Sunday was then simply a pagan institution, a venerable day throughout the heathen world. To Sylvester, the Catholic Bishop of Rome, belongs the honor of christening it. He transferred to it the title of Lord's Day, and by his authority he enforced it upon the world and the church as a Christian institution. In the Catholic catechism, Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, we have the following pointed question and answer:

Question—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Answer—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of, and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church."

Hence, Sunday was anciently a pagan institution, observed in honor of the sun-god, and the venerable day of the sun. In process of time it was by the Catholics converted into the Christian Sabbath or Lord's day, and substituted for the seventh day Sabbath of God. This conversion and substitution the professed Protestants endorse and sanction, as being proper and right; but the Bible condemns and rejects it. To be a Protestant is to protest against the doctrines of the Catholic church. Let us be Protestants and protest against this Catholic innovation of the Sabbath.

CHAPTER VI

The Sabbath Neither Ceremonial, nor Abolished

This is evident from the fact that the Sabbath forms an integral part of that law which in Scrip-

giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaister them with plaister: and thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, a land that floweth with milk and honey; as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee. Therefore it shall be when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in mount Ebal, and thou shalt plaister them with plaister. And there shalt thou build an altar unto the Lord thy God, an altar of stones: thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build the altar of the Lord thy God of whole stones: and thou shalt offer burnt offerings thereon unto the Lord thy God: and thou shalt offer peace offerings, and shalt eat there, and rejoice before the Lord thy God. And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly." "Cursed is the man that maketh any graven or molten image," verse 25. That is, the man who shall violate the ten commandment law, which says, "Thou shalt not make any graven image." Read the whole chapter. Joshua 8:32, "And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel." These laws required the death of those who would presume to despise the authority of the moral law of Jehovah. How utterly groundless are the statements directed against the Sabbath of the Lord!

We conclude this very brief examination by calling attention to the fact that Paul teaches that it is the ministration that is abolished and not the law. The text does not even intimate that the Sabbath is done away, or any part of the law of which the Sabbath is a part. Why then quote it to justify Sabbath violation? If because the min-

istration of the former dispensation is done away we may disregard the Sabbath, we may also, for the same reason, disregard the other precepts, and therefore kill, steal, commit adultery, and bear false witness against our neighbor, with impunity. Hence the old adage, what proves too much proves nothing.

Sabbath day's journey—This expression is found but once in the Scriptures, Acts 1:12. It was simply a Jewish tradition, and no part of the original law of the Sabbath. It originated in the wilderness. Tradition says it was the distance they were required to keep between the ark and the tents, which, according to Calmet, is explained to be one mile.

CHAPTER XVII

Abraham's Two Sons

"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Gal. 4:21. Macknight renders this verse as follows: "Tell me, ye who wish to be under the law, why do ye not understand the law?" It seems the height of folly for anyone to quote this text to sustain Antinomianism. If it could be shown to have direct reference to the moral law it would by no means prove its abrogation, but would simply show that persons could not be pardoned by it. Pardon, as we have shown, is of grace, not of law; but grace does not abolish morality. The connection shows that reference is had to the ceremonial law, which other scriptures show to be abolished. The connection is, "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman," verse 22. Where is this written? Not in the decalog surely! What do these two characters represent? do they represent two moral laws, the old law, the law of the

Father, and the new law of the Son? Where is the evidence? An affirmative answer is not only sheer assumption, but is a positive denial of Paul's own explanation. He says they represent the two covenants, see verse 24. The bond woman represents the covenant from Mount Sinai, which genereth to bondage which is Agar. The exposition of the no law advocates is that Agar answers to the commandments. But Paul contradicts and says she "answereth to Jerusalem which now is (present tense), and is in bondage with her children", verse 25. Hence the exposition of our opponents is a forced interpretation, contrary to the teachings of the prophets of God, Christ, and His apostles, respecting the moral law of Jehovah. In fact such a position is nothing but bold infidelity dressed up in the gown of Nolaism: If Agar or Hagar represents the ten commandments, she must be a very moral old lady, for the ten commandments constitute the basis of all morality, as the candid and unbiased in mind are compelled to admit. The oft repeated charge that we have Hagar in our system because we observe the fourth commandment, comes with rather an ill grace from those who will not deny but what they observe the other nine precepts of the decalog; and yet, to get rid of the Sabbath, teach that they are abolished. What crookedness! But error always was and always will be crooked. Sabbath opposers need to straighten up and inquire for the old paths, Jer. 6:16, which will lead them to the origin and rest of the seventh day. Gen. 2:2, which so far from being abolished in the Christian dispensation is to be universally celebrated in the times of restitution, Acts 3:21; Isa. 66:23; when the scepter of the "Lord of the Sabbath," Mark 2:28; shall wave in triumph from his throne from sea to sea, and from the rivers even to the ends of the earth, Psa. 72:7, for He shall then

be King of nations. Jer. 23:5. Under His glorious reign the Sabbath exists, His Father's own blessed and sanctified day.

We have in another chapter sufficiently explained the covenants. Suffice it to say, the bond woman represents the Jewish Church, under the Horeb covenant, which was the made covenant. When this covenant was removed by Christ, the Mediator of the new covenant, the bond woman was cast out. Those who desired to be under the law could not understand that Christ was the end of the law, Rom. 10:4, the sacrificial law. He being the last offering to be offered cried, "It is finished," John 19:30, also Heb. 10:10. Yes, that sacrificial law, which for centuries had typified the offering up of the spotless Son of God, was finished, ended upon the cross of Calvary. But Jesus, as a sin offering, Jerusalem and her children rejected, and in their bondage state continued their offerings. In order to be the children of the free woman, who are the children of promise, they must accept Jesus, who was the promised sacrifice.

Being fully acquainted with the squirmings and twistings of Sabbath opposers, we apprehend some will object to the application, "End of the law," to the sacrificial law, and claim that reference is had to the law of the decalog, and will therefore argue that the ten commandments are ended, have ceased to be. For the special benefit of such, we will for the sake of argument, grant the position, and then show if such reference is made that it does not prove the abrogation of the law. If it refers to the sacrificial law the word "end" is used in the sense of finish, or cause to cease, which is one of the meanings in the Bible; but if to the moral law, it is used in the sense of design, as in the following texts: "Now the end of the commandment is charity," 1 Tim. 1:5, design of the command-

ment. See Heb. 13:7. "Considering the end (or design) of their conversation." ". . . Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord." James 5:11. Ye have seen the design of the Lord in suffering Job to be afflicted. The Sabbath opposer may take either position; the law of God, of which the Sabbath is a part, stands secure. Christ is the end, or design, of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; it is a fact that the righteousness of the law is developed in Him.

"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years," Gal. 4:10. This text is quoted to prove that there are no weekly Sabbaths in this dispensation. Why are men so anxious to get rid of the divine arrangement respecting the weekly Sabbath? An answer is found in Ezek. 22:26. God says; "They . . . have hid their eyes from my sabbath." As Brother Jacob Brinkerhoff's remarks in reply to Mr. D. Howard on this text are so much to the point, we give them in preference to anything we might write. He says, referring to the 9th verse, "Does the word 'again' mean anything? To what weak and beggarly elements had the Gentiles been in bondage? Were they converts to Christianity from Judaism? No, they were Gentile converts, having done 'service unto them which by nature are no gods', but dumb idols. Then it was idolatry that they desired again to be in bondage; and it was the days, and months, and times, and years, of idolatrous worship that they were backsliding into. There was very early a tendency in the church to keep up the forms of idolatrous worship and consecrate the days of heathen worship to the worship of Christ. And among them stands the day they dedicated to the worship of the sun. In the event of their backsliding Paul would have bestowed upon them labor in vain,

verse 11. Away with such an idea that because days are mentioned it must refer to the abolition of the Sabbath, no matter if the connection be so plain as to show that it was the worship of idols that is referred to, and to which there was a tendency to retrograde." Advocate, Vol. 14, March 23, 1880. Brother Brinkerhoff, in his answer, deals with facts, backed up both by Bible and history. These heathen times are forbidden in the Old Testament at a time when all admit the Sabbath to be binding. See Lev. 19:26; Deut. 18:10-14. Robert Patterson, D. D., a Presbyterian, in speaking of the Chaldeans, whom he says were probably the best instructed of the heathen, says, "Yet we find they gave up the worship of God, adored the sun, moon, and stars of heaven, and in process of time degenerated still further, and worshipped 'dumb idols.' From this rock we were hewn; the common names of the days of the week will forever keep up a testimony to the necessity of that divine revelation that delivered our forefathers and us from burning our children upon the devil's altars on Sundays." Fables of Infidelity, p. 128. The Gentiles were heathens, as Mr. Patterson says, the same rock from which we were hewn, and Brother Brinkerhoff remarks, they had a tendency to return back to the worship of these "dumb idols" of their ancestors, to observe the days and times of heathen divinities. Hence Paul's rebuke.

"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," Rom. 14:5. Men desecrate the Sabbath and appeal to this text to show that there is no difference between the holy and profane, they have hidden their eyes from the Sabbath of the Lord, Ezek. 21:27. The word "every" like other words is frequently used in a limited sense; so if the text could be shown to

have direct reference to the weekly cycle it would not prove the Sabbath to be a common day, from the fact that it never was, and we have no evidence that it ever will be a secular day. We say the word "every" is frequently used in a modified sense. Proof: "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day." Ex. 16:4. Here the expression "every day" does not include the Sabbath, for the manna did not fall on the Sabbath, verse 26. "And they gathered it every morning," verse 21. But they did not gather it on the Sabbath morning. Verse 27. Hence the word "every" is restricted to the days and mornings understood. Apply this rule to Rom. 14:5, and all is clear, and Paul is saved from a self-contradiction. Would he, in this text teach that the law is made void, and in Rom. 3:31, teach that it was not made void? Paul makes no allusion to the days of weekly period. To understand him we must understand what he is talking about. Was it concerning subject matter involved in the moral law? Did one think he could have other gods besides Jehovah? A second that he could profane the name of God? A third desecrate the Sabbath of God? A fourth commit adultery? and others that they could kill, steal, etc? You know that these things are not referred to, neither is reference made to the day associated with these precepts. The controversy is respecting eating and drinking. One thought he could eat all things, another herbs, etc. Hence the days here specified are associated with eating and drinking, and therefore reference is had to Jewish feasts and feast days. The church at Rome, being composed of both Jews and Gentiles, the Jews desired to regard the feast days unto the Lord, the same as they wished to observe the communion after the manner of the Jewish passover, 1 Corin-

thians 11. The Sabbath of the moral law was not a feast day, and was never associated with eating and drinking. There was nothing Jewish, about it, in the sense of originating and belonging exclusively to and expiring with the Jewish polity.

We know an effort is made to class the Sabbath with the feast days in Leviticus 23. But the critical reader will very readily discover a clear distinction between feast days and the Sabbaths of the Lord made in the chapter. From verse 2 some infer that the Sabbath was one of the feasts of the Lord. But, reader, if you will note carefully the 2nd and 4th verses you will discover a break in the narrative (which is common not only in the Bible but in all books), which break is made for the sole purpose of introducing the Sabbath as a holy convocation. That such a break is made you must admit from the fact that the fourth verse takes up the feasts anew in the language of the second verse, where they had been dropped. Now if the Sabbath was a feast day this break is unmeaning and unnecessary. But its meaning is given in the 3rd verse, which introduces the Sabbath as a holy convocation, and explains it not to be a feast day, but the Sabbath of the Lord. In the 4th verse, as we have seen, Moses commences the enumeration of the feast days introduced in the 2nd verse, and concludes in the 37th verse by saying "these are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations," and in the 38th verse immediately adds, "Besides the sabbaths of the Lord." What does this little word "beside" mean? Does it mean anything? How can we understand any writer or speaker unless we understand the meaning of the terms he uses? Webster defines the word "beside" to mean over and above, distinct from. Hence the meaning of the expression is, Ye shall not only proclaim these feasts as

holy convocations, but separate from these feasts ye shall also proclaim My Sabbaths as holy convocations. See a few examples of the use of the word "beside," "Beside all this," Luke 16:26, which means, in addition to some other circumstances. "And there was a famine in the land besides the first famine," Gen. 26:1, which means separate from. Now if the feast days and Sabbaths of the Lord in Leviticus 23 are not separate and distinct from each other, then there is no power in language to express anything.

CHAPTER XVIII

Exposition of Colossians 2:16.

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."

Does this text make a general destruction of all kinds of Sabbaths as some infer? This idea of no Sabbath is very adverse to a very natural want of humanity, and contrary to the interest of religion. Toiling man needs a periodical rest from labor, and the cause of God demands a stated day for worship, which wants are wisely provided for in the institution of the Sabbath. As elsewhere shown, there are two laws, moral and ceremonial. The weekly Sabbath is contained in the moral law, Exodus 20. There are no shadows, meats, or drinks, in that law. But there is a law of shadows, Hebrews 10, which "stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances", Heb. 9:10. It was indeed one of types, sacrifices, and ceremonies; hence a ceremonial, shadowy law, pointing to Christ. If we use the adjunct element as used by Paul, the whole matter is clear; for if there is any power in language, the

limiting clause, "which are a shadow," clearly implies there are Sabbaths which are not shadows, and that such are not included. That the weekly Sabbath is not a shadow is evident from the fact that it was instituted at the close of the first week of time; hence it preceded all shadows, and therefore is no part of that shadowy system of things which reached only to Christ. If a shadow it must be a shadow of the eternal rest; and as we always follow the shadow till we reach the substance, we are therefore under a moral obligation to observe it. So you see we are liberal, and grant all that our opponents can possibly claim; yet the perpetuity and binding force of the Sabbath remain as firm and solid as the pillars of heaven and earth. This shows how well the weekly Sabbath, Jehovah's own sacred day, is guarded and defended on every hand. Vain are the efforts of puny man to overthrow it.

But we do not hold that it was a type; for first as clearly stated it was instituted before man sinned. Types and shadows had not been introduced. And second, it was placed in a law in which types and shadows are not found. Third, it is a memorial; memorials point back, and not forward. The Sabbath, being a memorial of creation, points back to the creation and rest of God, Ex. 20:11; and not forward to the coming of Christ and plan of redemption. These facts show plainly that the weekly Sabbath is not in its nature typical.

In the text we have three original words, which merit a passing notice; (1) Sabbaton, (2) Heorte; (3) Noumenian. Sabbaton is rendered Sabbaths; and that it is elsewhere used to designate the ceremonial sabbaths of the Jews, which were to cease, Hosea 2:11, will not be questioned. Heorte rendered holy day is defined by lexicographers to

mean "a solemn feast, public festival, holy day, especially spoken of the passover." The Diaglott renders this text as follows: "In respect to festivals or of new moons, or of sabbaths, which are shadows." H. J. Anderson, a Christian (Campbellite) translator. "In respect to a feast, or the new moon, or sabbaths, which things are a shadow," etc. It were an easy matter to swell this list with names of biblical learning, all of whom coincide with the translation already given; but we desire to be brief. The passover festival occupied seven days, the feast of tabernacles eight. The first and last days of these feasts were days on which the people were to have a holy convocation; in them they ceased from servile work. "Seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day (of the feast) ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein . . . In the seventh day (of the feast) is an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein." Lev. 23:6-8. Feast of tabernacles, "On the first day (of the feast) shall be an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord (the feast of tabernacles occupied eight days); on the eighth day (of the feast) shall be an holy convocation unto you; . . . ye shall do no servile work therein." Verses 35, 36. ". . . On the first day (of the feast) shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day (of the feast) shall be a sabbath," verse 39. Now, reader, we ask you to turn and read this chapter in connection with Exodus 12 and Deuteronomy 16, and be convinced from the Bible of these annual sabbaths which were shadows of things to come referred to by Paul in Col. 2:16. These sabbaths the Jews were to keep "beside the sabbaths of the Lord," referred to in Lev. 23:38, which means the weekly Sabbaths, as distinct from the ceremonial

system. The other days of the feast were not days of solemnity and cessation from labor; they were holidays pointed out by the term "heorte," feast days, rendered "holy day" in King James' translation, "feast" by Anderson, "feast or festival" in the Diaglott. Conybeare and Howson render Col. 2:16, "Therefore suffer not any man to condemn you for what you eat or drink, not in respect to feast days, or new moons or sabbaths, a shadow of things to come."

Noumenia, new moon, was another kind of festival, and did not embrace any which could be properly designated a sabbath. "The new moons themselves were the occasions of regular festivals," —Smith's Bible Dictionary, p. 580. ". . . In the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; that they may be to you for a memorial before your God: I am the Lord your God." Num. 10:10. "And in the beginnings of your months ye shall offer a burnt offering unto the Lord," Num. 28:11. From the 14th verse we learn that these ceremonies were to be kept up "throughout the months of the year." In the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge we have the following in reference to the months of the Jews: "The new moon was always the beginning of the month, and this day they called Noumenia, new moon, day, or new month. They did not begin it from that point of time when the moon was in conjunction with the sun, but from the time at which she first became visible after that conjunction. And to determine this it is said they had people posted on elevated places to inform the Sanhedrin as soon as possible. Proclamation was then made. The feast of the new moon and the beginning of the new month were proclaimed by sounding the trumpet." P. 837.

The first and seventh days of the passover feast and the first and eighth days of the feast of tabernacles were holy convocations; on them there was to be an entire cessation of ordinary labor of all kinds; hence in the text they are designated by the word Sabbath, rendered sabbaths. The intervening days were simply feast days pointed out by the word heorte, rendered holy day and by Conybeare and Howson, rendered "feast days." In addition to these holy days and sabbath days, they had their new moon days, on which they performed ceremonies suitable and peculiar to the occasion. No day was a sabbath because of its being a holy day or new moon day. This view of the text gives grammatical force and meaning to the apostle's language, "which are a shadow." This definite expression shows clearly what kind of sabbaths the apostle was speaking of. Col. 2:16 affords no proof whatever of the abolition of the weekly Sabbath, which is God's own sacred day, blessed and sanctified for the benefit of mankind. He who desecrates the weekly Sabbath and bases his no-Sabbath theory upon Col. 2:16, we fear in the judgment day will find that he has made a fatal mistake in not rightly discerning between the Sabbaths of the weeks and sabbaths of years. Paul had reference only to the sabbaths which were placed in that law which stood only in meats and drinks, Heb. 9:10; hence he associates them with eating and drinking. These "washings," "drinks," and "sabbaths" are all abolished. But the Lord's day, Rev. 1:10, which is the Sabbath, Mark 2:28, Paul refers to in Heb. 4:4, as the seventh day; and in the 9th verse he says, "There remaineth therefore a rest (or keeping of Sabbath, margin) to the people of God."

It is a fact that the seventh day on which God rested, still remains the Sabbath. Rabbi Wise, one

of the ablest Jewish Rabbis in the United States, though a rejector of Christ, never charges Him with violating the Sabbath; but on the contrary, says, "It is foolish of Christian clergymen to attempt any proof from the gospels for the sacredness of the first day of the week, when neither Jesus nor His apostles thought of abolishing the Jewish Sabbath." Origin of Christianity, p. 409. He brings up the case of Jesus going on the Sabbath day through the field and His disciples plucking the ears of corn to eat, in order to satisfy their hunger. He says, "The Pharisees, taking offense at this, accuse the disciples before Jesus of having violated the Sabbath. Here it was proper for Jesus to say the law was abrogated and one day was as good as another But He did no such thing; He argued His case like a sagacious and casuistical Rabbi, proving that His disciples had done no wrong. He first refers to David and his followers, who when hungry, ate of the holy shew bread, which according to the law, should be eaten by the priests only, to prove that necessity knows of no law. . . . 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.' Hence none need hunger on that day on account of any law; thus we know that Jesus taught His disciples the observance of the Sabbath according to the law." Origin of Christianity, page 222.

Modern Gentile priests, who profess faith in Christ, as being the true Messiah, yet accuse Him of being guilty of violating the Sabbath, and of setting it at naught, should learn a lesson from Rabbi Wise, who, though he rejects Him as the promised Messiah, yet prefers no such grave charges against Him as being a law violator, a destroyer of the memorial of creation. Rabbi Wise further says, "The Rabbis of the Talmud never say of Jesus or of His apostles, that they rejected the

law." Page 229. We close our quotations from this distinguished Jewish author by simply remarking that it must be evident to all that had Jesus taught the non-observance of the Sabbath of the God of Israel, some of His opponents, the Rabbis, would certainly have preferred so grave a charge against Him.

Before concluding this chapter it seems proper to notice another position sometimes taken to evade the truth of the perpetuity of the weekly Sabbath. It is said as the word days is supplied by the translators, it can be omitted, and the text read "the Sabbath." But the word Sabbaton is plural. So if the word days be left out, Sabbaton must be rendered sabbaths instead of "sabbath day." So the text would read "sabbaths which are a shadow," etc. Here we wish to present a few translations out of many, which, omitting the word days, render Sabbaton sabbaths. The Catholic Bible reads, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ," Col. 2:16, Douay Bible. The Catholic Bible also gives the following note on this text: "In meat, etc., he means with regard to the Jewish observance of the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and of their festivals, new moons, and sabbaths, as being no longer obligatory." It is evident that the translators of the Douay Bible understood Sabbaton to have reference to the ceremonial sabbaths of the Jews, and not to the weekly Sabbath, for they claim to have changed the seventh day Sabbath, and boast that the Protestants, in their non-observance of it, acknowledge their right to legislate in divine things. Anderson, the Diaglott, Conybeare and Howson, MsKnight, Lange, Noyes, The Syriac, all render it sabbaths. It were an easy

—122—

JN 19:31 upon the Sabbath
the Sabbath (day)
Sabbath (day) Sabbath (day)

matter to extend this list, but these are sufficient, and clearly show that Sabbaton, when not used in connection with the word days, in the text, must be rendered sabbaths.

We are for the present done with Col. 2:16, and we ask the reader to weigh well the evidence, and to decide in favor of the Bible position. If the Bible teaches the first day of the week to be the Sabbath, observe it. But if the Bible says that the seventh day is the Sabbath, you should so regard it instead of the first, for God is not mocked. And if the Bible everywhere teaches that Christ and His apostles destroyed God's holy day, abolished the perfect law of the Father, that Christ and His disciples unlike the prophets of God and holy men of old, dishonored that day which was once sacred and holy, then are you at liberty to disregard it. May you seek to know the truth, act the part of wisdom, prove all things by the law and the testimony, hold fast to that which is good, and finally, in the great consummation age, share with Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, and Redeemer of mankind, the glories God hath prepared for all who love and honor him. Time is short. Our object should be to live in the discharge of duty while we do live; hence the necessity of searching the word to know what is duty. The wise man says, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. Keeping the commandments of God in connection with the faith of Jesus, Rev. 14:12, will make us "wise unto salvation." 2 Tim. 3:15. What more do we desire? ought we not to be satisfied? Let us look for salvation through Christ, live so as to be prepared to meet our God in peace.

—123—

CHAPTER XIX

Examination of Sabbaton; Valuable Notes and Criticisms

In the Swedenborgian paper, called the New Jerusalem Messenger, published in New York City, we noticed the following comment on John 20:1-18; Vol. 40, March 30, 1885.

"The first day of the week' is undoubtedly a literal meaning of the words so translated, but the exact truth about that Lord's day, consecrated by the rising of the Lord of Sabbath day is, in the literal words, 'But on the one-first of the Sabbaths, Mary Magdalene comes' for it became 'the first of the Sabbaths' of the Christian church. Appearing on that day, and again 'eight days after,' and giving His Holy Spirit on the seventh first day of the week, Petecost (Acts 2:1-4), He established that Sabbath, and the former one was 'caused to cease,' (Hosea 2:11.)"

If "the first day of the week is a literal meaning of the words so translated," what right has the Messenger to call it the "Lord's day," or "Christian Sabbath"? According to its own statement it does not mean either. Where is the evidence that the Lord's day was consecrated by the rising of the Lord of the Sabbath? Let us have book, chapter, and verse, before you ask us to subscribe to it. That the first day became the first of the Sabbaths for the Christian church stands greatly in need of proof. Christ's appearing on the first day to His disciples does not make a Sabbath. He appeared on one day at the sea of Tiberias, when His disciples were fishing, John 21. Does the simple act of His appearing on this day make it a fishing day for the church? "After eight days," would not be on the next first day (Sunday), but on Monday,

the ninth day. It was not on the eighth day, but "after eight days." Suppose the Holy Spirit descended on the first day of the week (which is a controverted point), what has that to do with making it a Sabbath? Dr. Hackett says, "The fiftieth day, or Pentecost (beginning of course with the evening of Friday, the second day of the Passover), would occur on the Jewish Sabbath," McGarvey's Com. p. 24. We might quote from several others, but this is sufficient to show that first day observers are not agreed among themselves as to what day the Holy Spirit descended. The sabbaths which ceased are styled "her sabbaths," not "His (God's) sabbaths," and are classed with the feast days and new moons of the ceremonial system. See exposition of Col. 2:16. The seventh day Sabbath is not styled "her sabbaths," or the "sabbaths of the Jews," but the "sabbath of the Lord thy God," Ex. 20:10; "God's holy day," Isa. 58:13.

The word Sabbaton is rendered week nine times, as in the following texts: Luke 18:12, "I fast twice in the week" (sabbaton). This is the same word found in John 20:1, which with its numeral "mia" the Messenger says literally means the first day of the week. Did the Pharisee fast twice in one day? The other occurrences of the word are found in Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; John 20:1, 19; Luke 24:1; Acts 20:7; and 1 Cor. 16:2, which reads: "Upon the first day of the week (mian Sabbaton,) let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him that there be no gatherings when I come." Does this mean upon the one of the first Sabbaths of the Christian church? If so, which one? Is it not plain to be seen that the position assumed by the Messenger is radically wrong, and out of harmony with the Scriptures?

Why is it that Sabbaton, rendered Sabbath, is also translated week? We answer, from the fact

the Sabbath was regarded as being the principal day of the week. In the very beginning there was no week until the Sabbath. When the Sabbath day dawned and closed the weekly cycle existed and not before; hence the days were counted from the Sabbath.

Lest we should be regarded as a special pleader in favor of this position we wish to subjoin a note from A. Campbell. In the Harbinger we find the following question and answer: "Bro. Campbell: In the king's translation, Acts 20:7, we read, 'And upon the first day of the week,' etc. In the new version, 'And on the first day of the week.' It appears to me that the literal translation of the Greek, as contained in Lusden's Greek Testament, would be 'And on one of the first Sabbaths.' If this addition be correct I am at a loss to perceive the reason why, in this instance, Sabbaton is not translated Sabbaths, instead of the first day of the week; . . . and why the import of the adjective mia is thrown out of the translation. Will you explain why it is translated 'upon' or 'on the first day of the week'? Your brother in the gospel,

Wm. R. Erwin."

"Bethany, Oct. 26, 1836.

Dear Brother Erwin:—In order to fully understand the subject you present, it may be well to notice some of the divisions of time used by the ancients. There is little question that the division into weeks of seven days, and a peculiar veneration for the seventh day, or Sabbath, prevailed among the Eastern nations from their origin; and there is as little doubt that these customs were received by tradition from the fathers of mankind, and that they were observed in commemoration of the creation of the world. The Egyptians reckoned time in this way from time immemorial, and it was doubtless to them that the Greeks, who in-

—126—

deed were wholly indebted to the Egyptians for their early literature and science, owed their knowledge of the sanctity of the seventh day, which we find spoken of by Homer; 'Then came the seventh day, which is sacred or holy' . . . The Hebrews, as you are aware, observed with great solemnity the seventh day, which they called Sabat—rest, cessation from labor, because on this day God rested from the work of creation. From this word is derived the Greek word Sabbaton, and the English Sabbath. They used the word Sabat, however, to denote any cessation from work, whether that of the seventh day of the week, tenth day of the month, Lev. 23:32, first day of the seventh month, Lev. 24, or that of the seventh year, Lev. 25. From the great respect paid to the Sabbaths they were accustomed also to reckon by them. Thus in Lev. 25:8, 'Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee; seven times seven years and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years.' Here we have the sabbaths of years. And in the computation of the day of Pentecost, Lev. 23:15, 16, 'And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, shall ye number fifty days.'

"Here we have the Sabbath of days, or the period of seven days. In this way Sabbath came to signify both among the Greeks and Hebrews, not merely the principle day of the week, but the week itself. It is frequently so used in the New Testament. The Pharisee says, 'I fast twice in the week'—Sabbaton, Luke 18:12. Such then are the various uses of the word Sabbaton, which at first denoted the seventh day of the week. The Hebrews denominated the days of the week from the order of their

—127—

succession from the Sabbath. Thus the next day after the Sabbath they called the first of the Sabbath; the next, the second of the Sabbath, and so of the rest, except the sixth, which they styled parascève, or preparation of the Sabbath. The same method is still kept up by the Christian Arabs, Persians, Ethiopians, etc. That this mode is pursued by the writers of the New Testament will be evident by a reference to a few passages. Matt. 28:1, 'When it was beginning to dawn upon the first (day) of the week—literally the first (day) of the Sabbath. See Luke 4:1; John 21:1, 19; Mark 16: 1, 2. In all these passages the phrase in question (miaton Sabbaton) occurs and is evidently used to designate the day after the Sabbath—the first day of the week.

"In conclusion I would remark that the objective *mia*, being the feminine gender, cannot relate to Sabbaton, which is neuter, *miaton Sabbaton*; therefore can never be translated the first of the Sabbaths, or one Sabbath of the Sabbaths, but must be uniformly rendered the first (day) of the week; Sabbaton being here used to denote the Sabbath of days; that is the period of seven days, which we call a week; and *mia* being of necessity constructed with *hemera* (day) understood. In all respect and affection yours,

A. Campbell."

Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 7, p. 555-6, 1836.

In Vol. 4, of the Harbinger, 1833, on p. 96 we find under the head of queries, this question and answer by A. Campbell, "The Presbyterians in our neighborhood assert that the first day of the week is always called the Sabbath in the original Greek. I have examined my Greek Testament to know the truth of the assertion, but the superficial knowledge I acquired of that language when a boy, by neglect, has escaped me. Will you give me your opinion on the subject, either by letter or in one of your

numbers?" Answer: "They who say so have worse than forgotten all their Greek, for it never is once called the Sabbath in the apostles' writings. Sabbaton signifies a week, as every one acquainted with Hellenistic Greek knows, and *mia Sabbaton* is the phrase which all translators render the first of the week, or first day of the week.—Ed."

These notes of A. Campbell's are reliable and clearly refute the position that Sabbaton should be rendered Sabbath and not week. This Swedenborgian position is assumed by Russell (Campbellite) in his work entitled "Materialism Against Itself." He claims that *miaton Sabbaton* should be rendered "the first of the Sabbaths" or "one Sabbath of the Sabbaths;" that the old series of Sabbaths ended, and the new began at the resurrection of Christ. Were it not that he believes the ten commandments to be abolished, I would quote for his special benefit the command, "Honor thy father," etc.

In conclusion we wish to give the decision of Greek scholars to whom the matter was submitted for an answer: "We have taken the matter into a somewhat careful and impartial consideration, and find that it is true that in each of the eight occurrences of the words 'first day of the week' in the New Testament, viz., Matt. 27:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:2; John 1:19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; the Greek word Sabbaton is found in the original. But it is not true that the word should always be translated by the English word Sabbath; on the contrary, we know of no authority for so translating the word, except when it refers to the seventh day. It would never be so translated when applied to the first day of the week, the Lord's day. The word, when found in the plural of the third Greek declension, and in the neuter gender, is very commonly and correctly rendered week. Hence the

literal of Matt. 28:1 would be, 'And late in (the) week, when it was on the point of dawning into (the) first of (the) week,' etc. Of the six different standard translations in our possession, none of them have translated any one of the eight cases above by the word Sabbath. When in our common version we have 'the first day of week,' Greenfield in his lexicon defines the term (singular and plural) sabbaths, a period of seven days, a week. To this agree standard lexicographers. All the above named cases are in the plural, except Mark 16:9; 'Sabbaton,' and Greenfield's Greek Testament makes this plural, 'Sabbatone' in the margin. In Luke 18:12, we read 'I fast twice a week' 'sabbaton' of course it would be nonsense to say, 'I fast twice on the Sabbath.' We know of no reason for rendering the term in the several passages referred to by the word Sabbath; nor do we know of any standard authorities who do thus render it. Yours, etc.

G. T. Carpenter, Pres. Oskaloosa College, Iowa.
G. H. Laughlin, Prof. of Greek."

"Mr. J. H. England:—Dear Sir:—I have examined with some care the passages to which you recently called my attention and will say in my judgment they are very well translated in our English version. Very truly,

S. A. Jones, Prof. of Greek, Latin and French."

It is a fact that the word day, in the eight passages, is not found in the original. The reader will perceive that A. Campbell, and these learned men above referred to, admit it, and in translating they supply the word 'day,' as the word implied in the Greek.

Elder A. C. Long has written so pointedly on this subject that we give it in preference to anything we might write. He says:

"But we are asked, Is not a word implied in these

eight passages in the original Greek? We answer, Yes; but again we are asked, Is not the word day the only word that can be supplied in these passages and make sense, and yet be in harmony with the grammatical construction of the Greek? We answer most emphatically, No. There are other words that might be supplied, and at least one, that will make better sense in most of the eight passages, if not in every one of them. This is the word part, found frequently in the Bible. But the English reader should not get the idea from this, that there is no rule to follow in supplying these words. Wherever a word is to be supplied it must agree with the Greek construction of the sentence.

"In seven, out of the eight passages under consideration, Mian, translated first, is a numeral adjective of feminine gender. The other passage, Mark 16:9, Prooton is the word used which is also translated first. This last Greek word like the first, is also a numeral adjective of the feminine gender. Now, the noun to be supplied must be in the feminine gender, and used in the singular number. This is exactly true of the Greek word meris, translated part. This is a noun of the third declension, and is used in the following passages: "Mary hath chosen that good part," Luke 10:42. "Neither part nor lot in the matter." Acts 8:21, also 16:12. "What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" 2 Cor. 6:15; Col. 1:12. This Greek word meris, part, exactly fulfills the grammatical construction in these eight passages where day is the supplied word, so that this can well take its place, and they would then read as follows: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn to the first part of the week," Matt. 28:1. "The first part of the week," Mark 16:2. "Now upon the first part of the week," Luke 24:1. "Now

upon the first part of the week let everyone lay by him in store," 1 Cor. 16:2, etc.

"Not only do I think that the word part should take the place of day in the above passages, but that the idiom of the Greek language, as well as our own, demands that the word part be understood instead of day, from this fact that the word part is usually omitted, and so understood or implied without being expressed. For instance, it is common to speak of the first of the week, the first of the month, the first of the year, the first of the season, the first of his life, etc., meaning the first part of the week, first part of the month, first part of the year, etc.

"The word last is used in a similar manner. I am informed that all articles of agreement between parties, to expire the first of the week or the first of the month are always understood in law to mean the first part of the week or the first part of the month, and it is never understood to mean the first day of the week, or the first day of the month.

"Now, that this same usage of language runs throughout the Bible, is evident from the following quotations: "The first of the first fruits of the Lord," Ex. 23:49. The same expression is used in Ex. 34:26, the word part is here understood and would read, "The first part of the first fruits." "And the first of the fleece of thy sheep shalt thou give unto him." Deut. 18:4. Here, part is again understood. "Thou shalt take of the first of all the fruits of the earth," Deut. 26:2, this is the same as the above. "The first of all commandments," Mark 12: 29, may mean the first part or first command of all commandments.

"From the above examples we learn it is customary in our language, as well as in Bible language, to omit the word part when preceded by the numeral adjective first. Therefore, according to

this usage, the word part is omitted in the Greek, in the eight passages under consideration; and the sense of the passage does not really require its insertion, for it is understood without it. They would read "the first of the week" as they do now in the original, and there would be no misunderstanding about what was implied. On the other hand, however, when the first day was to be expressed, it was not left for the translators to supply, but was placed in the original Greek. See Mark 14:12, "And the first day of unleavened bread." Here day is in the original.

Now if the apostles and evangelists, in giving us in writing the teachings of Christ and that of the apostles if they desired to make the first day of the week prominent as a great day, is it not surpassingly strange that they should entirely omit the word day in all these passages? Then where in the Scripture is the First-day Sabbath? Nowhere." —Advent and Sabbath Advocate, Vol. 15, No. 25, March 8th, 1881.

CHAPTER XX.

Eleven Questions on the Sabbath

The following eleven questions have been sent us by Elder N. C. Miller, of the First Day Adventists, with a request that we answer them. Many, doubtless, will be surprised to learn that these questions are said to have converted J. M. Stephenson from the Sabbath of the Lord.

After looking the questions over the reader will become satisfied that it was not a difficult matter to turn Mr. Stephenson from the Sabbath, for there is nothing in these questions to weaken the faith of any well-informed Sabbath keeper. While investigating the Sabbath, and before we became an observer of the seventh day, we read and examined

these same questions; but to our mind they had no force, for we could plainly see that every blow directed against the Sabbath was equally against the other nine precepts. If the nine remain so does the fourth. We cannot separate the Sabbath from the moral code without destroying the moral government of God. With these facts before us let us examine these questions which seek to separate what God has joined to gether, and to overthrow Jehovah's moral government.

Question No. 1: "Where is there one command of God to keep holy the seventh day Sabbath prior to the time of Moses?"

Answer: From the creation God sanctified the seventh day, Gen. 2:3. The word sanctified, Webster says, means "to set apart for sacred services." The word sanctify he defines to 'separate, set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use.' To illustrate its meaning he gives Gen. 2:3, as an example, "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." In the beginning of time God separated the seventh day from the other days by devoting it to a different use. See a few examples of the word sanctify. "Sanctified the mountain," Ex. 19:23; set it apart. God did not sanctify, set apart, the seventh day two thousand five hundred years this side of creation. Man was called into being on the sixth day. The next day was the seventh, which seventh day the record says was sanctified, or set apart for what purpose? Christ says, "The Sabbath was made for man," Mark 2:27. "The seventh day is the Sabbath," Ex. 20:10. If God sanctified the seventh day He must have commanded its observance. "Sanctify ye a fast," Joel 1:14. To sanctify a fast was to command its observance, see Joel 2:15. These examples clearly show the Bible meaning of the word sanctify. Gen. 2:3 is not the only text that teaches Sabbath observ-

ance prior to the giving of the law by Moses, in decalog form (on the supposition of our opponent that Moses gave the law. Ex. 16:23, 26, shows the observance of the Sabbath before the arrangement of the ten commandments in the form of the decalog. Moses points back to creation for the origin of the Sabbath, and shows that it was observed prior to the history of Mount Sinai, Seymour and his convert, J. M. Stephenson, notwithstanding to the contrary.

Question No. 2: "Where is there one command of God to any Gentile nation, either in this or any preceding dispensation, to observe the seventh day Sabbath?"

Answer: Were it not that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is so unpopular I am persuaded that Mr. Seymour need not be reminded of the fact that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God, Rom. 3:2. The plan of adoption, covenants, the law, and the promises, were all made with and given to the Israelites. Rom. 9:4. The Gentiles may be saved by accepting the covenant made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, Jer. 31:31, under which covenant God promised to write His law upon their hearts, 33rd verse. Where is the evidence that the Gentiles are released from the obligation to observe the law of God? The Gentiles, as nations, were without hope and without God in the world, strangers from the covenants of promise, Eph. 2:12. As divine revelation was committed exclusively to the Jews, Deity therefore announced Himself to be the God of Israel, Isa. 45:3. The Gentiles have the privilege of joining themselves to the Lord, of becoming His servants; and in order to do so it was their duty to keep the Sabbath, Isa. 56:6. Though God chose Israel as the repositories of divine revelation, yet salvation was accessible to the Gentiles, Isa.

56:3. Israel having in her possession the covenants promises and commandments of God, was named a green olive tree. She was said to be fair, and of goodly fruit, Jer. 11:16. Into this same olive tree the Gentiles, being a wild olive tree, are to be grafted and made partakers of its root and fatness. Romans 11. The instructions given in the Lord's house in which the covenants, promises, and commandments of God were taught, and in which ancient Israel worshipped, were designed for all nations. Our Savior says, "Is it not written, my house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer?" The margin has it "for all nations," Mark 11:17. The question is from Isaiah, 56th chapter, in which it is shown that the Gentiles are to keep the Sabbath.

Question No. 3: "Where is there one command of God to any believer in Jesus Christ to observe the seventh day Sabbath subsequent to the crucifixion of the Son of God?"

Answer: The Son of God was on the earth forty days as a teacher after His resurrection. The absence of a command from God during so brief a period to observe what He had before commanded is no evidence that the Sabbath is not binding. Luke, in his treatise of the life and teachings of our Savior, spans not simply forty days, but His whole life to His ascension, Acts 1st chapter. He is writing up the history of Christ, shows us that it was the Savior's custom to observe the Sabbath religiously. Luke 4:16. Hence Christ observed the Sabbath the forty days He lived upon the earth after His resurrection, or Luke is guilty of testifying falsely in reference to His custom. But as there is no command from God subsequent to the crucifixion not to bear false witness, Luke may have thought the command was abolished, and so was not particular about what he said. It may be

said that the third question is not restricted to the forty days after the resurrection of Christ. If not, then the interrogator is guilty of tautology from the fact that the very next question occupies the very same ground covered by the third, as the third, as the reader will readily observe by a comparison of the two questions. In the Old Testament we pass over a period of eight hundred years; was it abolished? The name of God is not found in the book of Esther. Was Esther an unbeliever in the existence of God? The silence of the Scriptures does not prove anything, neither does it overthrow institutions clearly established and legally sanctioned.

Question No. 4: "Where does the Comforter, or Holy Ghost, or Spirit of truth, which is to guide the church into all truth, command any one to keep the seventh day Sabbath?"

Answer: Isaiah was a prophet of God, and no one but an infidel will deny but what he was guided by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit through him says, "Blessed is the man (any man) that doeth this, and the Son of man that layeth hold on it, that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it." Isa. 56:2. The Holy Spirit also shows it to be the duty of the sons of the stranger to keep the Sabbath, Isa. 56:6. Paul explains the stranger to be the Gentile, Eph. 2:12. The Holy Spirit never revoked the seventh day Sabbath. Neither did the Spirit of truth contradict itself by calling the seventh day Sabbath holy, and then denying it. Here God, through the Holy Spirit, promises a blessing to those who keep the Sabbath. Mr. Seymour would have us believe that Christ rendered the promises null and void; but Paul tells us that the mission of Christ was to confirm the promises, instead of being yea and nay, in Christ, are yea and amen in Him, 2 Cor. 1:20.

Question No. 5: "Where is there one text in all the Word of God stating that the ten commandments alone constitute God's moral, holy or spiritual law, which you say is our rule of conduct, and which J. H. Waggoner says constitutes man's whole duty?"

Answer: Could the apostle Paul answer this question verbally, he would doubtless reply: Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the nature of evidence required to prove a proposition. Paul, in his writings, says the law is spiritual, and holy; by it he knew sin, Rom. 7:7, 12, 14. All must admit that he has direct reference to the ten commandments.

Question No. 6: "Where is there one text in all the living oracles of God, stating that all His (God's) commandments are sure, and stand fast forever and ever, mean the ten on tables of stone, no more nor no less?"

Answer: Our position is that this text does not embrace less than the ten commandments. If all of God's commandments stand fast forever, and the Sabbath is one of His commandments, then it stands fast. Seymour's position is that it excepts fourth. Now, just give us one text from the living oracles that says so.

Question No. 7: "Where is there one text in the blessed Bible that tells us there was more holiness, spirituality, or sanctity, attached to the seventh day Sabbath than there was to the sacrificial offerings."

Answer: The perpetuity of the Sabbath does not rest upon its spirituality or holiness, but upon the express will of the Deity. God commanded the Sabbath, and no where did He ever revoke the command.

Question No. 8: "Where is there one text in Paul's epistles that expressly declares that the

same moral, holy, just, good, or spiritual law, or schoolmaster which brought us to Christ, which Paul says we are no longer under, that is fulfilled, that we are delivered from, that being dead wherein we were held, by which we were held, of which Christ is the end, abolished, taken out of the way, is now obligatory?"

Answer: It must be evident to all that Mr. Seymour fails to rightly divide the Word of truth. 2 Tim. 2:15. He mixes the two and thereby introduces confusion. The spiritual and holy law, the gospel does not make void (abolish), but it does establish it, Rom. 3:31. But the law which was our schoolmaster was abolished. Eph. 2:15. James 2:10, which he defines to be the ten commandment law; see verse 11. But the ceremonial law, which was simply a schoolmaster, pointing by its types and shadows to Christ, was done away in Christ. He was the end of it, being the last sacrifice offered by it, Heb. 6:28.

Question No. 9: "Where is there one iota or tittle of testimony in the sacred will, or testament, or of the spirit, or of faith, or of liberty denouncing any one as a sinner who violates the fourth commandment in the decalog during the whole gospel dispensation?"

Answer: "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. . . . Matt. 5:19. Our Savior then goes on to quote from the decalog as being the code of commandments to which He refers. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10. What law? The answer is given in the next verse: "For he that said, (or as the margin reads, that law which 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." Hence according to the apostle James the individual who violates the Sabbath precept, or any other of the precepts of the decalog, is guilty of transgressing the law of God. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4.

Question No. 10: "Where is there one text in the Bible which says the keeping of the seventh day Sabbath is the seal of the living God, and the seal of this dispensation?"

Answer: We do not claim that it is.

Question No. 11: "Where does Paul, who was an able minister of the New Testament, who preached the whole counsel of God, who kept back nothing that was profitable to the church of God, teach the seventh day Sabbath?"

Answer: The law of which the Sabbath was and is an integral part, Paul says is holy just and good; and that it is spiritual, and he delighted in it, see Rom. 7:12-23. And instead of abolishing it he established it, Rom. 3:31. If Paul kept back nothing that was profitable, is it not singular that he did not inform his Sabbath-keeping brethren of the fact that it was not necessary for them to keep the Sabbath? We presume he thought that such knowledge was not profitable. Paul told them that there was no profit in circumcision; but he places stress upon the commandments of God, 1 Cor. 7:19. May you and I learn to love and do the commandments of God that we may enter in through the gates into the city, Rev. 22:14.

The Questions Reversed

1st. Where is there one command of God to not take His holy name in vain prior to the time of Moses?

2nd. Where is there one command of God to any believer in Jesus Christ in this or any preceding dispensation to discontinue the observance of His

Sabbath, which He instituted at creation, which Christ says was "made for man"?

3rd. Where is there one text in the Bible which says that Jesus Christ nailed His Father's Sabbath to His cross?

4th. Christ refers to the seventh day Sabbath when He says, "The sabbath was made for man." Where is one text in the blessed Bible which says that is ceased to be the Sabbath when Christ was crucified?

5th. If the seventh day ceased to be a Sabbath when Christ was crucified, why do not Christ and the apostles inform these Sabbath-keeping brethren of the fact?

6th. Where does the Comforter, or Holy Ghost, or Spirit of truth, which is to guide the church into all truth, tell us that the Sabbath law was ever repealed? A law remains a law until repealed.

7th. Where is there one text in the Word of God stating that the ten commandments do not constitute God's holy or spiritual law, which you say is not our rule of conduct, and which you say is not man's whole duty to obey?

8th. Where is there one text in all the living oracles of God, stating that all His (God's) commandments, which are sure and steadfast, forever and ever, mean less than the ten, written on tables of stone? If all the ten are not included will you please just tell how many of them are left out, and just how and when they were repealed? Come; we want to understand the when and wherefore of it.

9th. Where is there one text in the blessed Bible that tells us that there was as much holiness, spirituality, or sanctity, attached to the sacrificial offerings as there was to the seventh day Sabbath?

10th. Where is there one text in Paul's epistles that expressly declares that we are released from

obedience to the ten commandments; that we may violate the Sabbath precept of that law with impunity? Or where is the text that says we are not under a moral obligation to keep the law of God?

11th. Where is there one jot or tittle of testimony in the second will, or testament, or law, of the spirit, or of liberty which declares we can secularize the day embraced in the fourth commandment of the decalog, during the whole of this dispensation; or that even intimates that the unchangeable God has so changed His eternal, immutable law of right and wrong, that what was once an act of sin, is now an act of righteousness?

12th. Where does Paul, who was an able minister of the New Testament, who preached the whole counsel of God, say that the ten commandments are abolished; or where does he single out the Sabbath, and condemn it as Jewish, a dead institution, a thing of the past? And finally, as Mr. Seymour is a Sunday-keeper, and as he says Paul declared the whole counsel of God, will he please tell us what Paul said about Sunday keeping, or first day observance? God blessed and sanctified the seventh day and commanded man to keep it holy. When did He bless and sanctify the first day, which you say is the Sabbath? When did God command its observance, and where does He say it is the Sabbath? Where does Christ speak well of it and what does He say about it? Come, tell us what the Holy Ghost, which is to guide the church into all truth, has said about the first day being a holy day; and you will oblige a class who are seeking to know the truth.

Conclusion

Reader, we are for the present done with the subject. How well we have succeeded in establishing the claims of the Sabbath and removing imaginary objections you are left to exercise your

own judgment. We are aware that many persons when shown that the Bible does not teach first day Sabbatism, appeal as a last resort to those whom they are pleased to denominate the apostolic fathers, for evidence in favor of the first day of the week being the Christian Sabbath. Had we time to examine this question in the light of history we would erase the very foundation from under their claims, and expose to full view the Mene, Tekel, written upon their Roman banner. But a lack of time, and the limits of the present work, forbid anything like a historical examination of the question. We have already extended our investigations far beyond what we at first designed. We may refer to history to confirm doctrines and institutions clearly revealed in the Bible. But when we appeal to history to prove the origin of the doctrine or institution not taught nor instituted by divine authority, we are not only guilty of confessing that the Bible does not sustain us, but also of transferring inspiration out of the Bible into history, which we have shown will not do. Reader, do you leave the Bible out and appeal to the apostolic fathers to prove your first day Sabbath keeping?

Who were the apostolic fathers? Did not Jesus teach His apostles to call no man father? Did He not tell them one was their father, even God? Does not God, who was the Father of the apostles, and is our Father, declare plainly that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and is He not a majority? Away with your apostolic fathers, who were simply uninspired men, and who were by men assigned a position denied them by the Son of Israel's God, and who would, in their teachings, dethrone the very God of the universe and scatter His holy institutions to the four winds of heaven! First prove your position from the Bible, and then as you read the various histories of the church, adopt

only such principles and doctrines as harmonize with the plainly revealed institutions and doctrines of the Bible. The so-called apostolic fathers are Hermas, Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaus, Tertullian, and a few others are classed under this head. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not object to or reject the writing of these ancient and venerable men, which are shown to be genuine, and which comport with Bible teachings. But many of the epistles ascribed to them have been, by the most ancient scholars, condemned as spurious. See Ruther's Church History, pp. 31, 32, 46. This is a settled fact. We cannot assent to arguments which purport to come from those early writers without good evidence of their genuineness. Otto, in discussion with Elder A. J. Eychaner, quotes from a spurious document ascribed to Clement of Alexandria, to prove that Clement was not a worshiper of Christianity, but also a believer in heathen mythology, a worshiper of the sun, which he quotes to set aside Clement's testimony, adduced by Elder Eychaner, in favor of the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke not being a forgery. Age-to-Come Herald, April 10th, 1879. Some fifteen epistles are ascribed to Ignatius, eight of which are condemned as forgeries. Epistles bearing the name of the others share the same fate. We should be very careful how we build doctrines upon statements drawn from such a doubtful source.

But not to extend our remarks further we close by reminding the reader of the fact that the writings of these ancient men furnish evidence that the Sabbath was observed by Christians down to the time when they wrote. May God help us to keep His commandments and the faith of Jesus, Rev. 14:12, that we may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city.