

The
LORD'S DAY
Not a Sabbath Day

A Discussion
Of Sunday Worship
From a Historical Standpoint

By
MARION RIDDLE

Published By
THE BEDROCK PRESS
4511½ Esmeralda Street
Los Angeles 32, California

Copyright 1947
By Marion Riddle
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED
IN U.S.A.

IN MEMORIAM

Of my dear mother, who departed this life,
November 13, 1944, this volume is
prayerfully dedicated.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I Introduction	13
II The Sabbath for Jews Only	18
III The Sabbath Not Practical	26
IV Jesus and the Sabbath	30
V Paul and the Sabbath	40
VI Inferiority of the Law	49
VII The Lord's Day in Apostolic Times	62
VIII The Lord's Day in Post-Apostolic Times	76
IX Conclusion	90

PREFACE

This book is written to supply a much needed and a correct statement as to why Christians worship on the first day of the week instead of the seventh. It is appalling how many Christians there are who are wholly unacquainted with the facts. The apostle Peter said, "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asks you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." Yet how few there are who could do it when it comes to the day of worship. It is the firm conviction of the author that every Christian should know all the available facts, as they have come down to us from the past history, concerning the origin of our Lord's Day. He has made a very careful investigation and study over a long period of years of the essential facts, hence he has gathered much information which is ordinarily not known to the great masses. Every effort has been made to check carefully all the available sources of information and when there has been a doubt to dig deeper before proceeding. The approach to this subject has been purely from the historical standpoint. To show the historical origin of worship on the first day of the week among the Christians and how closely connected it is with the very heart of Christianity. Also to show how it would be impossible in this present day to keep the sabbath as it is taught in the Old Testament. No attempt has been made to take up the study of the development of Sunday down through the centuries of the Christian era, or the subject of Sunday laws, or the reasons why men ought to have one day's rest in seven or any other of the kindred subjects.

Grateful acknowledgment is hereby given to Dr. Bruce Brown, Minister, Vermont Square Christian Church of Los Angeles, California, for having read the manuscript and for having given helpful criticism, and to W. R. Walker, Minister, Indianola Church of Christ, Columbus, Ohio, for his words of encouragement and generous offer to do what he could in the help of distribution. This volume now goes forth to the general public with the hope that it will deepen and enrichen the knowledge and appreciation of those primitive Christians, to whom, for their faithfulness, loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice we are indebted so much.

The LORD'S DAY Not a Sabbath Day

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps there is no subject in all Christendom upon which there is more confusion or which is less understood than the Lord's Day and the sabbath day. Confusion exists in the minds of both friend and foe alike. As one example, most everyone knows that certain groups claim that Christians are under obligation to keep Saturday as a sabbath; arguing that the sabbath law has never been changed and that about the middle of the second century the leaders of some of the churches began to apostasize and to worship on the first day of the week, a day which they had borrowed from the pagan religions then existent in the Roman Empire. They claim also that later Constantine the Roman Emperor together with the officials of the church made a law requiring the churches to worship on the first day of the week and forbidding them to worship on the seventh day.

It may surprise some who shall read this book to find herein the statement that the sabbath day was never changed, for vast numbers of Christians both among the masses of the people and among the church leaders have simply taken for granted that our Lord changed the day from the seventh to the first and that therefore, all things which applied to the seventh day in like manner apply to the first day. If we admit that Christians are under obligations to keep a sabbath at all, then it is correct to say that they should observe Saturday, for that is the sabbath of the Old Testament and is the only weekly sabbath taught in the Bible. But the purpose of this volume is to show that they are in error who say we are bound to keep a sabbath. The sabbath day of

the Old Testament was superseded by another institution far greater than it ever was.

To some it may seem of but little importance whether or not we observe any day and in what manner we observe it. But it is far more important than at first it might seem, for to understand the principles of the Lord's Day and its origin is to understand the very essence of Christianity itself. Just how this is true will be shown in further discussion later in this book. No doubt or question is being raised as to the sincerity of those people who say that we are under obligation to keep Saturday, but it has been repeatedly shown all through the centuries that a man being sincere doesn't make him right. The facts are that sincere people when wrong, have often done great harm. Saul of Tarsus was not any less sincere when he was trying to exterminate Christianity by force than was Paul the Apostle, when he was preaching Christ and seeking to build up churches. But if he had gone on in the way he started there in Jerusalem at first, it is not likely that any of us would have heard of him and the world would have been far poorer for his having lived and died as one of the world's greatest religious persecutors than it is with his having lived and died as the world's greatest exponent of Christ and His Kingdom.

It has been claimed by the advocates of the seventh day that Protestants must of necessity keep the seventh day in order to be consistent for the position of Protestants has always been that "The Bible and the Bible alone shall be the rule of faith and practice" and that there is no command in the Bible and no authority for Sunday worship save the authority coming from the Roman Catholic Church. Quite often they quote the statements of high churchmen of various faiths that there is no authority for Sunday worship unless we wish to ac-

cept the ecclesiastical or church authority which Protestants deny.

So far as the claims of the Catholic Church are concerned there may be some Catholics that will tell you that the church originated Sunday worship; however, if that were correct, surely the Catholic Encyclopedia, a collection of several volumes prepared by the officials of the Church and having the Church's approval, which is to be found in every public library, would have something to say about it. However, this encyclopedia does not make that claim, but rather states that Sunday, according to the Jewish method of reckoning, was the first day of the week; but for Christians it began to take the place of the Jewish sabbath in apostolic times as the day set apart for worship of God. *Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume XIV: ARTICLE SUNDAY.*

As for the statements of those high churchmen, those are purely their personal statements and as such carry no authority over any man or woman unless he or she shall elect to allow them that authority. None of us

is bound to accept the opinions or interpretations of the Bible as given by any individual or any ecclesiastical body unless such opinions or interpretations can be harmonized with the known facts.

Christendom, as a whole, has confused the sabbath day with the Lord's Day over a period of many centuries. The two days are not the same any more than the Jewish Passover is the same as the Lord's Supper. There is a resemblance between the two, just as there is a resemblance between the Lord's Supper and the Passover. However, the identity is not there, and we have irrefutable evidence that in the beginning of the church under the leadership of the inspired apostles the Christians did not think of the two days as the same. It has been very unfortunate that the two days have been confused for it has resulted in much misunderstanding

as to what was the original purpose of either. Men have sincerely believed that it would be sinful to do any work at all on the first day of the week so much as even to cut a stick of wood, while at the same time they have neglected the chief reason for the existence of the Lord's Day. The first day of the week is the Lord's Day and it never was a sabbath day when correctly understood. The seventh day of the week is the sabbath day and there is no historical record where it was ever called the Lord's Day.

In our own language and here in America, we speak of the first day of the week as the sun's day or Sun-day for a reason which will be discussed later in this work, however, there are nations and languages that know nothing of the term Sun-day but only the Lord's Day. This is the Christian term for the day and it can be found in the New Testament. Rev. 1:10. In the ordinary sense of the word, there is no such thing as a sabbath for Christians taught in the Bible. It is true there is the mention of the sabbath repeatedly in our gospels and also in Acts, but that day was the seventh day of the week or Jewish sabbath which is not binding on Christians. There is also a sabbath for Christians mentioned in one of the epistles, but that is in an entirely different sense of the word and the writer had in mind something entirely different from a day of the week. It is also a fact worthy of notice that the fourth commandment, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," is the only one of the ten commandments not repeated in the New Testament.

If it were a mere matter of which day is correct, a point on which some have laid the entire stress, then it would scarcely be worth while to write this book or to read it for that matter. But when anyone comes to a correct understanding of the Scriptures, he can readily see that there is an issue far greater than that. Hence

it will bear repeating, that to understand the Lord's Day and its origin and purpose, is to understand the very essence of Christianity itself. In the following chapters it will be shown why the sabbath is not practical. Why we observe the first day of the week and the proper manner of its observance. Also what the Lord's Day means to Christians.

CHAPTER II

THE SABBATH FOR JEWS ONLY

The sabbath day or seventh day of the week was an institution of the Jews and there is no recorded history where any other people ever observed it. An effort has been made to show that the sabbath day was observed in Old Babylon, but so far what evidence has been discovered is too far fetched to establish any connection between Old Babylon and the Jewish sabbath. This sabbath of the Jews was part of the law of the Old Testament and was given to Israel as a nation, and not to any other people as the following Scriptures will show:

"For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" Deut. 4:7, 8.

"For when the Gentiles, *which have not the law*, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, *having not the law*, are a law unto themselves." Rom. 2:14.

In this law we have something a bit peculiar and a bit different from anything which we find elsewhere in the world. It was a combination of the civil, the religious, the moral, and the ceremonial all combined together in one single code of laws. Here in America we have grown so accustomed to both civil and religious liberty, that we are apt to lose sight of the fact that the law of the Old Testament made no provision for either civil or religious liberty and there was no place in this law for tolerance of other religions. It was not made to fit a democracy or a monarchy but a theocracy and it would be impossible to have the law of the Old Testament and still have a separation of church and state. There

was no provision in this law for the individual to decide a matter for himself for it left nothing to the judgment of the individual, but rather provided a specific statute for every little detail of life from the cutting of a man's coat to the trimming of a woman's bonnet. Indeed the Israelites of that ancient time had no choice in the matter. It was mandatory that they accept this law whether or no, and there is a tradition that Jehovah lifted up Mt. Sinai before them and said, "Either accept my law or else I will crush you beneath this mountain." When the kings of Israel and Judah led the people away from the keeping of this law which included the sabbath day, they incurred the wrath of Jehovah in no uncertain manner. Time and again, we read that the wrath of Jehovah "waxed hot" against Israel and time and again the prophets of Israel rose to call on the nation to return to Jehovah. The Old Testament is filled with such passages as these:

"Return thou backsliding Israel, saith Jehovah, for I will not look in anger upon you." Jer. 3:12.

"Return, O backsliding children, saith Jehovah, for I am a husband unto you." Jer. 3:14.

"When Israel was a child I loved him and out of Egypt have I called my son." Hosea 11:1.

The entire law of the Old Testament was adapted to purely local conditions, as one can see by the fact that the feasts that they were commanded to observe were made to suit a climate and seasons which are peculiar to Palestine. We all know that the Jews to this very day gather for worship in their synagogues throughout the world. But the law of the Old Testament made no provision for synagogue worship. That grew out of the necessity of the times. When the Jews were carried captive into Babylon by King Nebuchadnezzar and the temple in Jerusalem was laid waste, it was no longer possible for them to gather in the temple according to the law, so they began to do the only thing that was

practical for them under the situation and circumstances. They in this manner established what since has become a world wide custom, namely that of synagogue worship. Indeed it is said that the early church organization was patterned largely after the synagogue. All this shows that the law was designed for Palestine only and that it worked out pretty well as long as the people could remain undisturbed, but it was too inflexible to be adapted to lands and conditions outside of Palestine.

However, we are interested primarily in that part of the law which deals with the sabbath. So the question naturally arises, when did this sabbath day begin among the Jews? It is not possible to answer that question with positive certainty, for we have no record of the sabbath until we come to that point in the journey of the children of Israel where they received the manna from heaven. Was it a part of their lives while they were held in bondage in Egypt? It hardly seems likely. We know that when they were almost ready to depart from Egypt, they were given the Passover, which commemorates the "passing over" of the death angel and the deliverance from Egypt. This feast is to Israel what the Fourth of July is to America. So it is certain that neither Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, nor his brethren nor any of the other patriarchs knew anything whatsoever of the Passover. It would seem from the record as given in the 16th chapter of Exodus that the sabbath was something new in the lives of those people. The record tells us that they had been gathering each one his portion of the manna each day until they came to the sixth day when they gathered each one two portions. This seemed to have surprised them for the record tells us that the rulers of the congregation came to tell Moses what had happened and that Moses had to do some explaining by telling them that what had happened was the fulfilling of what Jehovah had spoken and that the morrow

was to be a day of solemn rest and a sabbath unto Jehovah. It is recorded also that some of the people went out to look for manna on the seventh day and there was none there to be found. So apparently, the whole procedure was something new. Had they been familiar with the sabbath at that time, as the people were later on, they would have known not to look for the manna on the seventh day and would not have been surprised when a double portion fell on the sixth.

The basic law regarding the sabbath observance, is of course, the fourth commandment which is found in Exodus and which reads as follows:

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore, Jehovah blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Exodus 20:8-11.

It will be seen at once that this fourth commandment made provision for two different things. First it forbade them to labor on the seventh day and secondly it made it mandatory that they labor the other six days. So it was as much a violation of the fourth commandment to be idle during the six days preceding the sabbath as it was to work on the sabbath. To do one was just as much a part of the commandment as the other. At least it would seem so from the language, and this was the construction placed on the commandment by the ancient Hebrews. Of course, it is true that their having put a construction of that kind on this commandment did not necessarily prove that this was God's intent and purpose in giving the commandment, but those Hebrews of the ancient time had a better right to know what the commandment meant than anyone else for they were nearer

to it than anyone else, just as the disciples of Jesus who were alive when Jesus was crucified had a better chance to know that he was resurrected than anyone else, for they were the only ones who were present and could know.

We note also that the father and mother were not allowed to keep the sabbath themselves and yet allow their sons and daughters to do as they liked about the matter. Neither were they permitted to employ workers and make them work on the sabbath day while they themselves rested or worshipped Jehovah, for the commandment provided that the son and daughter, the manservant and the maidservant and also the stranger who might be lodging with them in the home, that they all should be compelled to keep the sabbath. Also it was imperative that the ox and the ass should be allowed to rest on the sabbath day. And not only did the law provide for a sabbath DAY but also for a sabbath YEAR. That is that every seventh year was to be a year of rest for the land and they had to raise sufficient crops on the sixth year so that the land could lay out and take a rest on the seventh. The penalty for breaking this sabbath law by working was death and we are told in Numbers 15:32-36 of a man who was put to death by stoning for gathering sticks on the sabbath day. Then there were a number of solemn feasts that the law provided for the Israelites to observe in which they were forbidden to do any "servile work." These were sometimes called sabbaths. Lev. 23:15—22—24, 25. Numbers 29:1—6. Deut. 31:10—13. Ex. 23:10—12, 31:12—18 and Numbers 15:32—36. In addition to all this, they multiplied seven by seven thus making forty-nine years and the following or fiftieth year had to be a year of Jubilee. Lev. 25:12—18. It cannot be said that one of these is more important than another. They all came from the same source to the same people and all provided for the same thing

except that one provided for a longer period of time than another. If anything could be said as to the relative importance of these various parts of the law, it would be that those solemn feasts have exerted a greater influence on the lives of the Hebrew people than the weekly sabbath, for there are comparatively few Jews today living in America who close their businesses on the regular weekly sabbath, while almost all of them close for those special feasts and solemn assemblies such as Yom Kippur, the Passover, the Pentecost, etc. There is nothing in the New Testament that even remotely resembles such a system as has just been described as being a part of the law of the Old.

Some have believed that we are under obligation to keep the sabbath day because of two verses in the second chapter of Genesis. These two verses read as follows:

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."
Genesis 2:2, 3.

It is quite evident that the term "sanctified" as used here, means to set apart for sacred purposes, though the same term is used elsewhere in the Scriptures to mean something else. But are we to understand from this passage that God set the seventh day apart for sacred purposes for all people throughout all time? We think not. It has been said by men who have traveled among all peoples and tribes and nations of the earth, that nowhere in any tribe regardless of how ignorant the people may be, has anyone ever found a people who didn't have some knowledge of a Supreme Being, that is of one over and above themselves. The idea is sometimes very crude, but none the less the idea is there. The book of Genesis tells us about a great flood that came upon mankind wherein the waters covered, so far

as is known, the whole earth. And we find among the other nations of antiquity some knowledge of this great cataclysm wherein all mankind was destroyed. But we do not find any evidence of any nation of antiquity observing a sabbath day other than the Jews. Surely if that day had been sanctified to all mankind, then there would have been some evidence of other nations somewhere on the face of the earth having some knowledge of it. It is no more strange to say that God sanctified that day to the Jews alone than to say that God gave the law to the Jews alone and that they received a revelation many centuries before that revelation came to any other people. That the Scriptures confirm this conclusion is shown by the following:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Exodus 16:28, 29.

In addition, it is very clear that this book of Genesis, even the first and second chapters, was written from a Hebrew standpoint.

There has been much comment and controversy centered around this first and second chapters, of Genesis. Some have said that it was a fable, others that it was a scientific account, still others that it had been pieced together from two or three other writings. It is the opinion of this writer that all these theories are incorrect. It is a general summary of the creation of things with no attempt to put those things in the order they occurred and it was written from a Hebrew standpoint. There was a definite reason for all this. Someone has said that the three parables as given in the 15th chapter of Luke called, "The Parable of the Lost Coin," "The Lost Sheep," and the "Prodigal Son," have all been misnamed. They ought to be called "The Parables of God."

The idea was not to impress on the minds of the people anything about the lost sheep, the lost coin, or the lost boy, but to impress on the minds of men the fact that God loves a sinner. Not what was lost, but the one who did the losing. In the same way, the idea of the writer of this book of Genesis was to impress on the minds of men not the thing created but the Creator. When this book was written, the nations of the world roundabout the Hebrews, had a multiplicity of gods. One god of the sun, another of the sea, another of the harvest, another of the moon, etc. The writing of this book was to impress on the minds of men and especially the Jews that there was one universal God and that this God had created all the things which they could see in the world and not only that, but had created themselves as well. There are many evidences that this is true. The creation of the sun was not spoken of until the third day. It is absurd to believe that the writer of this book as well as the other people of that day, didn't know that the sun gives all the light and that without the sun there could be neither day nor night. Certainly they understood that. This shows that it was a general summary of the things created without any attempt to place them in the order of their occurrence. Then we notice the many repetitions in these chapters which was a common Hebrew way of speaking and writing in that day. Again we note that the evening and the morning were one day. The Jews counted the day to begin with the going down of the sun. All of this goes to show that the seventh day of the week was sanctified and set apart for the Jews only and not for the entire world.

CHAPTER III

THE SABBATH NOT PRACTICAL

It is not practical to keep the sabbath today as it was taught in the Bible for the reason that it was adapted, like the other parts of the law, to purely local conditions. As one evidence of this, the Israelites were forbidden to kindle a fire on the sabbath day. Exodus 35:3. This might not work out so bad in a climate like that of southern California and the regions further south and especially a hardy people like the Israelites of that far off time must have been. But how shall we work that out among the people living in the northern part of the United States and in Canada during the winter months? Again it was provided that the sabbath day should be from evening to evening. But in the Scandinavian countries of northern Europe, in that region known as "the land of the midnight sun," the day is, and the night likewise, six months long. How is it possible to adapt this provision of the sabbath to those countries? Nor is it possible to keep the sabbath in America and still retain our present industrial system. Nor could we, as has already been said, keep the law of the Old Testament and still retain a separation of church and state or have religious freedom. I attend church on Sunday and I could go on Saturday if I so desired. The facts are that I have attended Adventist services on Saturday and I know that large numbers of them are like myself, dependent on street cars and buses. Maybe they do keep the sabbath day, but how about the street car conductors and motormen, are they to be allowed to keep the sabbath day? If I keep the sabbath and attend church, I cause someone else to break the sabbath.

When Thomas A. Edison died, it was first planned to shut off all the electric power in America for one full minute in his honor. They said that the great electrical "wizard" who had made all this great electrical power possible deserved that in his honor it should be still for a minute at the time of his death. However, the idea was soon abandoned because protests came in from hospitals and doctors that they might be engaged in a hazardous operation at the time the power was shut off and that it might prove fatal in many cases. If our life in America is so complicated, that we cannot shut off the power in America for one full minute throughout the nation without great hazard, then how can it be possible to stop our whole industrial machine perfectly dead for twenty-four hours each week? If the sabbath law of the Old Testament was so strict that it provided for the ox and the ass to keep the sabbath day and also provided for the land to be allowed to keep the sabbath, then is it reasonable to suppose that God would sanction the operation of great industrial machines seven days in the week?

Another factor that enters into the situation when we come to the application of the fourth commandment, is that it provided that they must work six days as well as rest on the seventh. This is one of the reasons assigned by the Jews as to why so many of them do not try to keep the weekly sabbath here in America. It is scarcely thinkable that the big department stores in our great cities many of which are owned and controlled by Jews, could keep open on the first day of the week even if it were possible for them to be closed on Saturday. It may be a case of "when in Rome do as Rome does" but none the less, they cannot ignore public sentiment and common custom, but they must in a large measure adapt themselves to the customs and ideas of the people among whom they live and operate a business. An-

other factor which further complicates the situation, is that part of the fourth commandment that provides for the man-servant and the maid-servant to keep the sabbath. The great department stores in our cities are compelled to keep watchmen and other employees at work, even though the store is closed and the great mass of their employees are allowed to be off. Of course, provision can be made for those workers who must work on the sabbath to be off and to keep some other day of the week as a sabbath day, but the moment we agree to a provision of that kind, we abandon the idea of sabbath keeping as a universal proposition, and we also violate the fourth commandment because that commandment made no such provision as this.

Aside from the industrial side of life, there is also the social and family side of life. When this fourth commandment was given on Mt. Sinai, the father was lord and master in the home and his word was respected and obeyed. But in America our home life has in a large measure gone to pieces. It certainly has gone to pieces, as compared with the home of a few generations ago. We are told that even today, the Jews have a stronger home life and the father and mother have more influence over the sons and daughters than any other people, but where in America, outside of among the Jews if even among them, can we find a home where the sons and daughters have sufficient respect for the parents or the fathers and mothers have sufficient influence over the children, so as to make possible the enforcing of that part of the commandment that the sons and daughters must keep the sabbath? So we see that while the keeping of the sabbath was practical for Israel some thirty-five centuries ago, a little nation not much if any larger than Los Angeles and maybe two or three other adjoining counties, when the great bulk of the people were engaged in agriculture and pastoral

pursuits, it is not practical for America with its highly complicated and diversified industrial life which has been a very important factor in the disintegration of the American home.

Certainly it is possible to modernize the sabbath and bring it up to date so that it will fit fairly well into American life, but why try to connect such a sabbath as that with the fourth commandment in the Old Testament? And why insist that it be on Saturday? If we must modernize the day and make something out of it which is entirely different from the sabbath day of the Old Testament which is the only sabbath for which we have any authority in the Bible, then why not allow the people to keep any day of the week they wish as a sabbath day? The thing we need to realize is the difference between the law and the gospel. The law consisted of specific rules while the gospel was based on general principles and each individual was given not only the privilege but also the responsibility to apply those general principles as he or she thinks best so long as the application is kept within the boundaries of common sense and common decency. Had Jesus and the apostles set up a system of specific rules as did Moses, Christianity would have passed out of existence many centuries ago, for no set of rules could be made to apply to all people under all circumstances.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS AND THE SABBATH

It has been pointed out that Jesus kept the sabbath. That is entirely correct. He did keep the sabbath which was Saturday and the gospels tell us that it was his custom to go into the synagogue on the sabbath day. But that cannot be cited as evidence that the sabbath is binding on Christians today. Jesus also kept the Passover and along with millions of others of his day, he went annually to Jerusalem to celebrate that great feast. Then it is recorded in our gospels that just before his crucifixion, he gave his disciples orders to make preparation for them to keep the feast. That is the Passover. Jesus also was circumcised and circumcision was older than Mt. Sinai.

That Jesus went about in a general way and lived very much like the other people of his day, is very clear from the gospel records. He reclined at meat along with others and while reclining, he allowed the women to anoint his feet and to wash them with tears. It is also recorded that the women kissed his feet and wiped them with the hair of their heads. This all seems like a strange custom for our Lord but it is well that we remember that it was not out of keeping with customs of his day. It is not recorded that Jesus ever offered any sacrifices himself, but he did instruct others to offer sacrifices according to the command of Moses. Luke 5:14. Jesus, so far as his human side was concerned, was born and lived among the Jews, according to the law of the Old Testament. He didn't begin his earthly ministry until he was about thirty years of age, but shall all young men desirous of entering the ministry, wait until they are thirty years of age before starting?

Jesus claimed that God sent him into the world and that he was with the Father before the world was made. John also tells us that, "all things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made," and the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews confirms this by saying that, "through him also he made the worlds." If all these claims be true and so far as is known practically all Christians admit they are true, then Jesus must have known, while he walked the earth in the flesh, of the vast realm of nature which men would be able to develop in the centuries that were ahead of him, such as all the electrical machinery, the radio, the moving picture, and even the atom bomb, yet there is not one single word recorded anywhere that Jesus ever mentioned these things. He must have known of the reapers and binders and threshers that it would be possible for men to develop in order to harvest the vast wheat crop of America, yet he lived among men who used an ox to tramp out the grain from the heads of the wheat and maybe they beat it out with a flail themselves, but he never said a word about improving these methods. The twelve hour day was current everywhere in the lands where Jesus lived and men got a wage of a little better than fifteen cents per day for their work. He even built one of his parables around the twelve hour day and this seemingly inconceivable, little wage, but he didn't say one word against a situation of that kind in any direct manner. Matthew 20:1—16. The Roman Empire was filled with slaves while Jesus was on earth, yet he never spoke one word against human slavery by any direct reference. Then too there were both master and slave in the early church together and the apostles gave command to the slaves to obey their masters.

Just as there is a reason why he obeyed the law of Moses while he was on earth, so also there is a reason why he didn't say anything about the industrial or slave

system under which men were living. First of all, Jesus did not come to institute a system of social or industrial reform as a political or economic movement. He came to build something in the hearts and lives of men and to first of all get men into right relationship with God. He knew that by planting that something in the hearts of men, there would come a system of development which would in the end accomplish far more than could be accomplished by going out to preach social reform. That, we know, is exactly what did take place. Where Christianity has gone, men have been made free, women have been lifted up and we have learned to respect the rights of each other, economically, socially, and religiously, to a far greater degree than was done while Jesus was on earth in the flesh and blood. Then undoubtedly Jesus knew that men if left alone would in time discover for themselves all the great marvels in the realm of nature that they have discovered. Paul tells us that in the "fulness of time" God sent forth his son into the world. Well Jesus knew that in the "fulness of time" men would discover the things they have discovered for themselves, so we were left alone to work out all these problems in our own way.

In regard to the keeping of the sabbath, there was also a reason for that. The Kingdom of God had not yet come in its completeness. Both John and Jesus had said, "The Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," but as yet it had not fully come and Jesus himself did not preach the full gospel. He preached the gospel in promise, but it was left for the apostles after the setting up of the kingdom to preach the gospel in actual fact. Paul declared to the church at Corinth that he had delivered unto them first of all that GOSPEL which he had also received. The King James translation is just a bit weak on this point. What Paul really said

was that he had delivered unto them among the CHIEF THINGS, that gospel which also he had received:

"That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried and that he arose on the third day according to the scriptures." 1 Cor. 15:3, 4.

Yet Jesus never went around teaching that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. He couldn't for it had not yet taken place. Neither did he lead a group of people to meet on the first day of the week to celebrate the resurrection of Christ from the dead. He couldn't for his resurrection had not yet taken place.

It has been argued that Jesus in his teaching as well as in his practice indorsed the sabbath day and that because of this we are under obligation to keep the sabbath for all future time. There is something said about the sabbath in a number of different places in the gospels but in every case it refers to the Jewish sabbath. No one claims that Jesus didn't observe Saturday as a sabbath. But what we do claim is that his observing the day doesn't bind it on Christians. As has already been said, the kingdom had not yet been set up and Jesus observed the law of the Old Testament. In the great mass of cases, the question concerning the sabbath centers in a controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees as to the proper way to observe the sabbath. In many of the cases the language is so simple that it would be superfluous to comment, but there are a few statements from the lips of Jesus concerning the sabbath which need to be taken up and to receive a brief comment. One of the statements cited by those who argue in favor of sabbath keeping is:

"Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day." Matthew 24:20.

If we examine our Scriptures with the view to finding out when any words were used or on what occasion any words were used, it will help us very much. We

always need to keep in mind, in reading any portion of the Scriptures, when it was written or spoken, by whom it was written or spoken, to whom it was written or spoken, and for what purpose it was written or spoken. Then too we should try to determine, not what construction we can put on any portion of the Scriptures, but try if we can to determine what the writer or the one speaking had in mind. We ought to read the Scriptures in exactly the same way that we read a letter; for instance when we receive a letter from one of the soldier boys stationed in some foreign country, we don't try in a case of that kind to see what construction we can put on the letter, but we try if we can to determine just what was in the mind and heart of the young man who was writing it. So far as this statement being a command to keep the sabbath holy, we might as well to say in the same passage that Jesus was instructing his disciples to keep the winter time holy. This would be an absurd construction to put on the words of Jesus but no more absurd than to say he instructed his disciples by means of this statement to keep the sabbath holy. We need to know, in this case, the purpose that Jesus had in making this statement and the occasion on which he made it. Jewish history comes to our rescue in this particular instance. Jesus had said immediately preceding this statement:

"Then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains: Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house: Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days." Matthew 24:16—19.

Luke helps us here by adding in the following words, a thought that Matthew does not give:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them

which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto." Luke 21:20, 21.

It is perfectly evident that Jesus is talking to his disciples about a great catastrophe which is to come soon. We learn from Jewish history that this great catastrophe came in the year 70 A.D. when the Romans under the leadership of Titus laid siege to the city. We are also told that the Christians understood Jesus' teaching to apply on that occasion and sought refuge by fleeing from Jerusalem. *Margolis and Marx, "A History of the Jewish People."*

We all remember in the spring and early summer of 1940 when Hitler's armies were invading Holland, Belgium, and France, the stories that came to us in our newspapers of the pitiful plight of the refugees fleeing before the invading German armies. How the roads were blocked by the refugees so that the allied armies coming to help them could hardly reach the scene. Doubtless the situation in Palestine and around Jerusalem was just as bad, when the Roman armies came to lay siege to the city, for let us remember that invading armies are often without mercy. It would seem at this particular time that the Roman armies were determined to force the Jews to submit or to literally wipe them from the earth and that the Jews with equal determination were bent on getting their independence from Rome. This made the situation more terrible. So with this thought in mind, let us try to picture the plight of the expectant mother or the woman with babe in arms trying to get away in a situation of this kind. Add to that the fact that she has to go during the winter months when it may be cold and rainy and in addition to all this having to flee on the sabbath day, a day which was held sacred to the Jews and upon which no one was allowed to travel or to so much as cook what he or she would eat, and we get a pretty clear picture of what Jesus meant

when he said, "Pray you that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day," and when he speaks of that time of trouble such as never has been before and will never be again. Thus we see that this passage cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as a command to keep the sabbath holy.

It has been pointed out that Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount:

"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. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, 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." Matthew 5:18, 19.

It is therefore, argued from this statement that Jesus is herein commanding the keeping of the sabbath day. That to keep the sabbath holy is one of the commandments, so Jesus is saying that it is unlawful to break the sabbath. We are therefore under obligation to observe Saturday as a sabbath day because of this statement. That might seem on first thought to be a valid argument, but we must remember in reading our Scriptures that we are not to place a construction on them that makes them contradict the known historical facts. From the history that is available to us, as will be shown later, we know that the apostles whom Jesus commissioned and sent into the world to teach after his ascension, did not teach men to keep the sabbath holy and that the church under the leadership of inspired men, met on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread and that they called this day the Lord's Day. We must, therefore, come to the conclusion, that since those men who were with their Lord during his earthly ministry and to whom he gave the commission to go into all the world and teach and preach the gospel, did not understand these words of Jesus to mean what has been aforementioned, that we

are not to understand it that way. If Jesus had in mind, when he made the statement on the mount that we are under obligation to keep the sabbath day sacred, then it must have been that either the apostles whom he commissioned and sent into the world, didn't know what their Lord wanted them to do, to preach and to teach, or else they willfully disobeyed. In either one of those cases, it is impossible to conceive of the church making the progress that it did make and having the influence on the lives of men that we know it had.

There is another statement from the lips of Jesus recorded in Mark's gospel which is sometimes cited as evidence that we are bound to observe the sabbath. This statement is as follows:

"The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath." Mark 2:27.

But there is no warrant for putting a construction on this statement so as to make it mean that the sabbath was given to ALL men for ALL time. To do so is to make it say something contrary to the known facts. This is another case of a controversy between Jesus and the religious leaders of his day over the proper observance of the Jewish sabbath, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the Kingdom of God which had not yet been set up and which didn't come until after the resurrection of Jesus. Jesus was here speaking to the Pharisees who were the great sabbatarians of their day. But, as is well known to all Bible students, they had done more than just keep the law, they had placed all kinds of extreme interpretations and constructions on the law. As the disciples of Jesus walked along the path, they would reach and take the heads of wheat and rub them out in their hands in order to eat the grain. To the minds of the Pharisees, this constituted threshing wheat on the sabbath day. A thing strictly forbidden by the law of Moses. Jesus answers them by citing an instance

in the life of David, their ideal king, when he went into the house of God and ate the showbread unlawfully, because he was hungry.

The case of David like the one we have under consideration here was a case of human physical need against ritual law. This showbread was placed on the table in the tabernacle and each sabbath it was renewed with fresh bread and the law allowed the priests to eat the bread that had just been removed from the table, but no one else save the priests could lawfully eat of this bread. David came into the tabernacle and asked that he might have the bread that had just been taken off the table since there was no other bread available. There was nothing wrong with what David did except that it was a violation of the ritualism of the Mosaic system. We may safely conclude from these words of Jesus that men were not to go hungry and to suffer affliction just to keep a certain ceremonial law from being violated. Likewise, that the sabbath had been given for man's benefit. That is for man's refreshment and rest, but the religious leaders of that day had placed so many restrictions on it that it was more of a burden to keep the sabbath day than to do a day's work.

On the same occasion and in this same connection Jesus said,

"The Son of Man is lord also of the sabbath." Mark 2:28. Not only lord of the other things belonging to the life of man, but lord also of the sabbath. Here he is speaking concerning himself and his authority. He is greater than the sabbath day and thus has authority over the sabbath to change it or adjust it or set it aside according to his will or as the need may be. This statement spikes the theory that the command to keep the sabbath is a moral law. If it were a moral law or part of a moral law it must of necessity be a part of a moral constitution having its seat in God and man must adjust him-

self to the law. Man cannot set aside the law against murder or adultery or any of the other moral laws just to suit his convenience. But the sabbath law is purely an enacted law or a ceremonial law and in this case Jesus had authority to set it aside as he pleased, for it is a case in which the law must be adjusted to man and not man adjusted to the law.

It has already been pointed out that Jesus was circumcised and that circumcision was older than Mt. Sinai, it being a part of the Abrahamic covenant which came more than four hundred years prior to the fourth commandment. Not only that but the Jews understood this rite of circumcision to be more important than the keeping of the sabbath. The rite of circumcision had been confirmed in the law as God had given it to Moses. It provided that every boy baby must be circumcised on the eighth day and it also provided for the keeping of the seventh day as a sabbath. There were times when those two provisions conflicted with each other and when they did, the rite of circumcision took precedence over the keeping of the sabbath day as the following passage from John's gospel will show us.

"Moses hath given you circumcision (not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers); and on the sabbath day ye circumcise a man. If a man receiveth circumcision on the sabbath that the law of Moses may not be broken; are ye angry with me, because I made a man every whit whole on the sabbath?" John 7:22, 23. Also see Jewish Encyclopedia Vol. 4: Article CIRCUMCISION: Page 95.

CHAPTER V

PAUL AND THE SABBATH

It is not impossible that Paul did keep the sabbath day. He was a Jew and he may have retained that old Jewish custom to the last. We cannot be absolutely certain about that, but it would seem on the basis of what we learn from Acts 21:17-25 that this is correct. We learn from the record that when Paul came to Lystra and Derbe that he met up with a young disciple named Timothy and that he took Timothy and circumcised him. Acts 16:1-3. However, we find the same Paul writing to the churches in Galatia that if they receive circumcision, Christ will profit them nothing. Gal. 5:2. And again Paul himself tells that when he went up to Jerusalem on a certain occasion taking Titus with him, that on account of certain ones whom he called "false brethren," pressure was put on him to have Titus circumcised, but he gave place in the way of subjection not for one hour. Gal. 2:1-5. This is not a contradiction in Paul's life or teaching either. But there was a reason for this.

When Paul came to Lystra or Derbe where he found Timothy, he recognized in this young man some qualities that made him very useful to Paul in carrying the gospel message to the Jews. Paul saw that with the help of Timothy, he could carry on a work among the Jews that it would not be possible to carry on alone. We may not know very much about this young man Timothy, but we do know that he had been born of a Jewess and that his father was a Greek, and undoubtedly he had been under the influence of both his mother and grandmother who were very faithful, for Paul himself tells us when writing to the church at Philippi that he has no man likeminded. Phil. 2:20. So it would seem that among

all of Paul's helpers Timothy is the only one who was not self seeking. But there was one thing that Timothy lacked when Paul met him. He had never been circumcised, even though he had been brought up in a Jewish home. Paul knew that unless Timothy was circumcised the Jews would not listen to him preach, so as a matter of expediency, he took him and circumcised him. It wouldn't do any harm to be circumcised, but when it came to a matter of a test of faith and binding it on people so that in order to become Christians they must first become proselytes to the Jewish faith, then Paul would not accept that for a single moment.

Men were not bound to keep the law of the Old Testament in order to become Christians. We have a situation somewhat like this in regard to the keeping of the sabbath day. Just as Paul taking Timothy and circumcising him, does not bind the rite of circumcision on Christians, so his entering into the synagogue and preaching to the Jews on the sabbath day does not bind that on Christians either. No one who had any correct knowledge of the proper division of the Word ever claimed that Paul taught sabbath keeping for Christians. The record also tells us that Paul was hastening if it were possible that he might be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Acts 20:16. He said also:

"My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved." Rom. 10:1.

"For the hope of Israel, I'm bound with this chain." Acts 28:20.

"I could wish myself anathema from Christ for my burden's sake." Rom. 9:3.

So while Paul is often spoken of as the "apostle to the Gentiles," it is a noteworthy fact that he always went into the Jewish synagogue and preached to the Jews first.

It might seem at first, to those who have not given a careful study to the Scriptures, that Paul's going into the

synagogue of the Jews on the sabbath day was evidence that he believed that Christians should keep the sabbath day sacred. However, when we come to examine the record that tells us of Paul's experience in the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath day, that idea is seen to be more apparent than real. The first recorded instance of Paul's going into the synagogue is found in Acts 13:14—43. But before this the record tells us that Paul, at that time called Saul, together with Barnabas had been sent out by the Holy Spirit from the church at Antioch in Syria and how they had crossed the island of Cyprus and eventually had come to Antioch in Pisidia. There they went into the synagogue on the sabbath day and sat down.

The synagogue service of that day was in many respects not far different from the services in our churches today. They read from the law and the prophets which were the only Scriptures the Jews had and when they had finished reading, an opportunity was extended to the visiting brethren to say something in the way of a word of exhortation to the people. It may have been that the rulers of the synagogue had previously talked with Paul and Barnabas so as to learn that they were on a preaching tour in order that the invitation to speak might not come as a surprise and that they would be prepared to respond.

It is well that we keep in mind that the Jews of that day looked on what we call the Old Testament as a book of final authority. Convince a Jew that the prophets had said a thing should be and he was ready to accept it. It is well also that we keep in mind that they were never weary of hearing someone recount how God had dealt with their great leaders in time that had past. This gave Paul exactly the opportunity he wanted and for which purpose he had entered the synagogue. We notice that in this speech he had nothing whatsoever

to say about the sabbath day or to tell anyone that it should be observed or anything of the kind. He had entered the synagogue for an entirely different purpose and he had an entirely different message for those people. Hence he begins his speech with the time when their fathers were in bondage in the land of Egypt. A way of beginning which was calculated to please the people and get their attention. He recounts how that God had led them out of Egypt with a "high hand," but we notice also that Paul hastens in this speech to come to David. This may have been partly because the Jews looked on David as their ideal king, but more than any other one thing, because David was the son of Jesse and the Jews were looking forward to the coming of a deliverer who should come of the stock of Jesse. Isaiah 11:1-5. Paul then proceeds to point out to them that this deliverer had already come in the person of one named Jesus. Of how that the Jews living in Jerusalem, more especially the leaders, had failed to understand this Jesus and by failing to understand Jesus had failed to understand both the law and the prophets. And though they were unable to find any cause for death in Jesus had sought to have Pilate put him to death. But that God had raised him from the dead and that he had appeared among those who went up from Galilee to Jerusalem with him and that they were witnesses of these things. Paul then calls to their attention exactly the same prophecy as Peter had used on the day of Pentecost,

"Thou wilt not permit thy Holy One to see corruption." Psalms 16:10.

Exactly like Peter, Paul then proceeds to argue that David in writing this psalm couldn't have been talking about himself for he had fallen asleep among the fathers and had seen corruption, so the psalmist must of necessity have been talking concerning someone else. And that

Jesus was the only one who could fit into that prophecy for he was the only one that had not seen corruption in the flesh.

Now Paul comes to the climax of his speech. He has already shown how Jesus came into the world in fulfillment of prophecy, but that would have been worth but very little had it been alone. He now proceeds to tell them just what all this means to them. He now tells them that through Jesus forgiveness of sins is being proclaimed and that through him everyone, who believes, both Jew and Gentile, can receive justification such as could not be done under the law of Moses. Paul is here saying that it is not necessary for men to obey the law of Moses in order to become Christian.

On another occasion, we find Paul in the city of Philippi. It would appear that there were not very many Jews in that city for they did not have a synagogue. But Paul, together with his companions, found a place down by the river-side which had some indications to them of being a place of prayer. So on the sabbath they went to this place and found a group of either Jews or Jewish proselytes or perhaps some of both assembled for worship. Acts 16:13. The record doesn't give us any details concerning Paul's speech at this place but it does say that he, having sat down, spoke to the women who were assembled there. We can very easily imagine what Paul's message on this occasion was for we know what Paul always had to say on such occasions as this. He always brought, in its essential nature, just one message. That is that God had sent Jesus into the world to redeem mankind from sin. We can get an idea also from the results of this speech, for the record tells us that there was a certain woman there named Lydia and that she believed what Paul and his companions said and was baptized. So Paul must have

said something about baptism or else she would not have known that there was need for her to be baptized.

Once more we find Paul in the city of Thessalonica and in the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath day. I'm glad that Luke in recording this mentions the fact that Paul didn't go into the synagogue just now and then but that he made it his rule to go into the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath. Acts 17:2. Here, as at Antioch in Pisidia, it is very clear from the record that he proceeded along the same line as he had in Antioch, thus showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the promised deliverer for he fitted exactly into the picture that Moses and the prophets had drawn.

Last of all in our records concerning Paul and the sabbath, we find him at Corinth, where he had met up with Priscilla and Aquilla who were of the same trade as was Paul—tentmakers. Here the record tells us that he went into the Jewish synagogue every sabbath and persuaded Jews and Greeks. Acts 18:4. Is it logical to suppose that Paul went into the synagogue on the sabbath to persuade men that it was necessary for them to keep the sabbath? These men and their fathers had kept the sabbath for untold generations. He must have been seeking to persuade them to believe something else. The fact that there were Greeks there need not bother us in the least, for we remember that John in his gospel in writing about the last Passover before Jesus suffered, tells us that there were certain Greeks who had gone up to worship in Jerusalem at this feast. John 12:20. Evidently in both cases, Greeks who had been circumcised and converted to the Jewish faith. But even if that were not the case, it still wouldn't have anything to do with the sabbath day for the message of Paul was essentially the same thing to all people whether Jew or Gentile. So we see that while in all probability, Paul and many other Jewish Christians were circumcised and

kept the sabbath day along with all the other parts of the law of the Old Testament, they didn't bind either of these on Christians.

Of course, there were those who did seek to bind all these things on Christians but Paul was among the most active in opposing them. Paul went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, not to preach the law or the keeping of a sabbath day, but to find an audience of interested listeners and it was ever the hope of his heart that he might persuade some of them to believe that which was so important to him, namely, that Jesus was the one whom Moses and the prophets had said should come. If he could do that, there was nothing else that he needed to do. However, when he went over to Athens to preach to the Greeks, although in the main, he brought them exactly the same message that he had brought to the Jews, he approached them from an entirely different standpoint because they had an entirely different background. It has been charged that Paul became heady and high minded when he went to Athens and that he afterwards was very sorry for his speech in that city. Well, there is not one word of evidence to support such a foolish contention. Paul went into the synagogue, to the market place, to Mars Hill, to any place where he could get an audience and he met men on their own ground, but we notice that he always came to one point in all his speeches. That is that God had sent Jesus into the world to be the savior of men and that it was through HIM the promise of life had come to both Jew and Gentile and that He "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

There is only once in all the epistles of Paul where we find any mention of the sabbath day. In writing to the Colossian Christians he says:

"Therefore, let no one judge you in regard to meat or drink or in respect to a new moon, or a feast, or a sabbath

day, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:16, 17.

For the benefit of those who have no knowledge of the Greek, it might be well to say that though Paul used the term for sabbath in the plural number, that he was using the common mode of expression. In the gospels, we find it repeatedly spoken of in the plural number even though the sense makes it very clear that the singular is meant. The following passages in the gospels can be cited as examples: Matt. 12:1, 11, 12; Mark 1:21, 2:23; Luke 4:31, 6:2. There are many other places and also Josephus speaks of the seventh day being called the sabbath, in which case the word sabbath is used in the plural number. Paul said, "therefore," that is for this reason. Evidently he had in mind the fact that Christ in his death on the cross had blotted out the "handwriting of ordinances" and he placed the law of circumcision, the eating of meats clean and unclean, the annual, the monthly, and the weekly feast days, and sabbath days, all in the same category. They all belonged to the ritualistic laws of the Old Testament, so were not binding on Christians. Paul here used a figure of speech saying that these things were to the gospel of Christ what the shadow of a man is compared to his body. We might express the same thing by comparing the law to moonlight. We know that the moon has no light within itself, but all the light that we can see is a reflected or borrowed light from some other brighter object. Paul here instructs the Christians that if anyone would judge them or cast any doubts on the validity of their Christianity because they have not been circumcised, or don't observe the Passover, the other festivals of the Jews, or the sabbath day, just don't let him do it. No individual has any right to bind ANY of these things on anyone else or to pass judgment on the one who doesn't observe them. Of course, if anyone wishes to

be circumcised or to keep the Passover, or to observe the seventh day as a sabbath, it will do no harm so long as it is not made an act of necessity in order to become Christian, but when these things become a test of faith and we seek to bind them on others as acts of necessity then we come under the heading of those whom Paul was addressing in the Galatian epistle where he said, "If ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing."

CHAPTER VI

INFERIORITY OF THE LAW

To some the knowledge that God has given men a law that was not perfect but had its weaknesses may come as a surprise, yet that is just exactly what the writers of the New Testament have told us. They agreed that the law was good, and yet, without detracting a single thing from the law, they were a unit in pointing out that it was not perfect. The law was spoken of as a "shadow" of things to come, which implies that there must have been a substance for it is not possible to have a shadow without there being a substance. Some think that in the vision of John on the isle of Patmos where he spoke of the woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet (Rev. 12:1) that he had in mind the gospel as the sun and the law as the moon. That would be exactly the thought of the other writers of the New Testament, for let us remember, that the man who would say that there was a disagreement among the writers of the New Testament on these great subjects has not a single place for the sole of his foot. They were a unit in comparing the gospel to the light of the sun and the law to the light of the moon, if not in those words certainly in that thought. Hence they spoke of the law as being a "shadow" of the gospel. Heb. 8:5. Jesus himself told the religious leaders of his day when they asked him concerning divorce, that it (divorce) had come because of the hardness of men's hearts. Men were not at that time ready to receive anything any better, nor was God ready to give them that which was to be so much better than the law. Paul very expressly declared: "Do we then make the law of none effect through faith?"

God forbid: nay we establish the law." Rom. 3:31. However, we are not to understand that they established the law as being binding on Christians. But the fact that Jesus had come and that the door of salvation had been opened to the Gentiles through faith, proved the genuineness of the law. When the apostles and elders were gathered at the Jerusalem conference, Peter called the law a "yoke that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." Acts 15:10.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews says:

"For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: * * * In that he saith a NEW covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Hebrews 8:7—13.

It is certainly clear from this portion of our Scriptures that there were two covenants and that the first had been made with the Israelites when they were led out of Egyptian slavery. Of course, we are to understand that this was made with Moses as mediator at Mt. Sinai and that it was not a faultless covenant. Also that it had waxed old and was ready to vanish away. That this NEW covenant was not merely new from the standpoint of time, but was entirely different from the old in that the laws instead of being written on tables of stone as had been the case in the old covenant were to be written in the minds and hearts of men.

Paul in slightly different language bears out this same thought. The Hebrew epistle tells us that the NEW covenant was to be made with the house of Israel. Paul now tells us that God had made a covenant with Abraham saying:

"In thee shall all the nations be blessed." Gal. 3:8. But that four hundred and thirty years after, the law

was added because of transgression, and that it continued in force until the seed to whom the promise (the promise to Abraham) had been made had come. Gal. 3:16—19.

The Hebrews of the ancient times took particular pride in the fact that they were descendants of Abraham. The critics of Jesus told him.

"We be Abraham's seed and were never in bondage to any man." John 8:33.

And even today we are told that many of them like to think that they have the blood of Abraham coursing in their veins, all of which is right and is a fact of which they should be justly proud. Indeed they have every just reason to look upon their great men of the past with no little admiration. Hence they often thought of the seed of Abraham in a natural sense, but Paul tells us this promise of God to Abraham was to be understood in a different sense of the word. He says:

"For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus.

For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." Gal. 3:26—29.

Paul then goes on to tell us that "in the fulness of time," that is when in the providence of God and according to his plan, all things were ready for it, that Jesus had come into the world that he might redeem mankind from sin and that they might become sons of Abraham and sons of God by adoption. Quite evidently he has in mind here ALL who have been immersed in water as an act of obedience on confession of faith in Christ for he tells us that in this sense of the word there is no respect of persons with God. It is not necessary to be circumcised or to observe any part of the law of the Old Testament as such for they have already received by this act of obedience all that could have been

promised to them by anyone under conditions of obedience to the law. He very expressly states that there is no difference so far as nationality, sex, or condition of servitude is concerned, but all must comply with the same conditions and all be received in exactly the same way. In this manner is fulfilled that promise of a NEW covenant with the house of Israel as promised by the prophet Jeremiah and reiterated by the writer of the Hebrew epistle, as well as the promise to Abraham that all nations should be blessed through his seed. This had been God's purpose all the way along, but the law had come about as a concession to the weaknesses of men and until such time as God was ready to establish this new system which was so much greater than the law of Moses.

Jesus himself said,

"Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets. I came not to destroy but to fulfill." Matthew 5:17.

He said also:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said thou shalt not commit adultery, but I say unto you if any man shall look upon a woman to lust after her, he hath committed adultery already with her in his heart." Matthew 5:27.

Thus not abrogating the seventh commandment, but lifting it up and putting it on a much higher plain than Moses had put it. See also Matthew 5:21, 22 and 31-39. He claimed to be greater than the prophets, greater than the temple, and greater than Solomon, to have authority over the sabbath day and just before his ascension, he told the apostles that "ALL authority hath been given unto me, both in heaven and on the earth." Matthew 12:6, 41, 42. Luke 6:5, and Matthew 28:18.

Paul very specifically declared, that the law was our PEDAGOGUE to lead us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. The King James version reads "schoolmaster" but that is not a correct translation. In our modern English we speak of the teacher as being a pedagogue,

but this word comes from two Greek words "boy" and "leader" in meaning. Thus the word really means a "boyleader." In the ancient times, the pedagogue was usually a slave in his master's house, one of his duties being to see that the master's sons were taken to school. Paul here finds an analogy to this in the law which didn't teach us anything but led us to the one who did teach us. And just as the slave was an inferior to the teacher, so the law is inferior to the gospel for Paul here tells us that now since faith has come there is no longer any need for the law. Gal. 3:24, 25. He also declared that if there had been a law that could make alive, that righteousness would have been of the law. Gal. 3:21. He tells us further that:

"Christ is the end of the law to everyone that believeth."

Romans 10:4.

Moses had taught that the blessings of God came through obedience to and keeping of the ten commandments and the rest of the law as it is written in the Old Testament. But Paul here tells us that the Jews who are still keeping this law and expecting to find life thereby are ignorant of God's righteousness and seeking to establish their own, for since Christ's death and resurrection it is not necessary to keep the law and that keeping the law can never bring life. That must come, not through the law, but through faith in Jesus Christ.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did. Hebrews 7:19. The apostles used almost every figure of speech to impress on the minds of men, the exalted position to which believers had been lifted under the new dispensation. Thus the Christians were called, "The Israel of God," Gal. 6:16. "A chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," 1 Peter 2:9. John declared that we have been made "kings and priests to God," Rev. 1:6. The epistle

to the Hebrews is filled up with the contrast between the law and the exalted position in Christ Jesus to which men have been lifted by his resurrection from the dead. The writer of this epistle says as follows:

"But ye are NOT come unto the mount that might be touched and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet and the voice of words, which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: (for they could not endure that which was commanded, and if so much as a beast should touch the mountain, it shall be stoned or thrust through with a dart; and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake;) But ye ARE come to mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the firstborn (FIRSTBORNS), which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Hebrews 12:18—24.

This is only one example of the contrast between the people under the law and the people in the new position to which they had been raised by Christ's resurrection from the dead. We have often heard the saying, "There is no rest for the wicked" and that may be true, but this same writer to the Hebrews was very emphatic in saying that there remains a rest, or as some translations would read, "a sabbath rest" and others "the keeping of a sabbath for the people of God." He was contrasting the life to come for the faithful ones who had died in Christ Jesus with the sabbath day which they had known under the law of Moses. So he said:

"There remaineth, therefore, the keeping of a sabbath for the people of God." Hebrews 4:9.

There is a similarity between the two and yet the one is so much greater than the other. The sabbath of the Old Testament was temporary, that is for one day at a time, while the sabbath of which this epistle speaks is

for all eternity. The first sabbath was for the body mainly with some rest for the spirit in a limited degree but this second sabbath is for the spirit in its completeness. John in writing Revelation brings out the same thought when he says:

"Write, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea saith the spirit, they shall rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14:13.

"But," says one, "is there not a moral and a ceremonial law and are we to understand that Jesus Christ did away with the moral law or that he was the end of the moral law?" It would hardly be correct to say that there is both a ceremonial and a moral law. To thus divide the law is to make a distinction that the Scriptures themselves do not make. Nor can we say correctly that there is a distinction between the law of God and the law of Moses. It was all the law of God in the sense of authorship, while it was all the law of Moses in the sense that he acted as mediator between God and man and gave man the law that he had received from God. Thus both terms are used to designate one and the same thing. The ten commandments were the basis of the whole law in very much the same manner as our American Constitution is the basis of all our American civil law. It is correct to say that there was included under one code both moral and ceremonial laws and not only that but, as has already been said, laws that were both civil and religious. So it would be as nearly correct to speak of the "civil law" and the "religious law" as it would be to speak of the "moral" and "ceremonial law." All of these were combined together in one code with the ten commandments as the basis of them all. So when the writers of the New Testament spoke of "the law" they had in mind the whole thing. That is easy to see from the following:

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid.

Howbeit, I had not known sin, except through the law: for I had not known coveting except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" Romans 7:7.

Certainly the basis of all law against covetousness as found in the Old Testament anywhere is in this tenth and last commandment. Paul has just finished saying to the Christians at Rome that they, as well as all other Christians, were made dead to the law through the body of Christ. Using the marriage covenant as an illustration, he brings out a point familiar to all civilized people, as a comparison. That is that a woman (or a man) is no longer bound to the husband or wife when he or she is dead. In like manner, we by the death of Christ have been made free from or dead to the whole law of the Old Testament including the ten commandments. And just as the woman whose husband has died can be joined to another man entirely independent of him, so we can be joined to Christ entirely independent of the law of the Old Testament.

Again Paul, in writing to the Christians at Corinth, tells us:

"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on 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 more glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." 2 Corinthians 3:7—11.

Quite evidently Paul was speaking of the ten commandments here, for that is the only part of the law ever written on tables of stone. He speaks here of the inferiority of the law to the gospel in three different ways. The law is a ministration of death, it is a ministration of condemnation, and it was designed to pass away,

none of which could be said about the gospel. He calls it a ministration of death not because it ever killed anyone, but because it could not make alive. No amount of obedience to the ten commandments alone could ever bring spiritual life to anyone. The best that could be had under the law, it was like paying the interest on a debt. If we keep the interest on a debt paid up and pay nothing on the principal, we can in this manner set the payments forward from year to year, but we can never make the debt any less. Likewise the keeping of the law and the offering of the sacrifices and the doing of all the things provided in that law could only put the sins of the people forward from one year to another, it could never take them away. He calls it a ministration of condemnation for exactly the same reason that he calls it a ministration of death. That is that those who kept the law and the commandments without the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, would always be under condemnation and could never without that sacrifice become free from that condemnation. We look into the heavens on a dark clear night and we see some very bright stars. Perhaps we can't help but be attracted by the brightness of these stars, but on the morrow, with the rising of the sun, we see the stars not at all. Not because the stars are not there, but because there has come a far brighter light so that the light of the most brilliant star has been dimmed until it becomes invisible. In like manner, Paul tells us here, that the law even if it were a ministration of death, had come with glory. To such an extent that the Israelites could not look upon the face of Moses, but now that covenant had passed away and a new covenant had come with a glory that so far exceeded the glory of the first covenant it had made that glory completely invisible.

We may, therefore, conclude, on the basis of Paul's statement, that the ten commandments as a part of the

law of Moses had an end with the death of Christ on the cross. Of course, there are certain moral principles that did not pass away. These moral principles were in effect long before Mt. Sinai and must continue as long as time shall last, at least. To lie, to kill, to steal, and to commit adultery were ever wrong throughout all past ages and will continue to be throughout all ages to come. Many of these were held by other nations other than Israel, even though these nations had never had a revelation from God. They had simply grown out of human experience. But not so of the keeping of the sabbath day. Although it was one of the ten commandments, it was not a moral principle but a ceremonial or enacted law. The fact that a law is provided for in the ten commandments does not of necessity make it a moral law. The commandments "thou shalt have no other gods before me" and "thou shalt not make unto thee any graven images" could scarcely be called moral laws. When Jesus drove the moneychangers from the temple, he said that they had made the house of God a den of thieves and robbers, yet undoubtedly they were very strict in the observance of these two commandments. Also the ten commandments in some form or other have been repeated in the New Testament with the exception of that fourth commandment, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." That one was never repeated and there is nothing in the way of an equivalent of that commandment given in the New Testament. It is not possible to believe that this came about through mere accident. There must have been a definite reason for leaving this one commandment out. We should also remember that many of the commandments repeated in the New Testament were placed on a much higher plane than they were as given under the law of Moses. Under this Mosaic system the situation was very much like it is under our civil law. One had to actually commit the

overt act in order to make him or her guilty under the law, but Jesus spoke of the condition of the heart and he said that if one had it in his heart to do the thing, so far as the question of his or her guilt was concerned, they might as well to go ahead and do it. Not only that, but Moses had said, "Thou shalt not kill," but John said, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer."

In the following passages taken from the Old and New Testaments and arranged in parallel columns, a comparison is made showing how nine of these ten commandments are repeated in some form in the New Testament. Of course, there are many other passages that could be cited. The facts are that the thoughts embodied in nine of these ten commandments are repeated in different words so often that it is scarcely possible to read a single chapter from the New Testament without finding one or more of these expressed in some form.

OLD TESTAMENT

First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Exodus 20:3.

Second Commandment: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven images, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth." Exodus 20:4.

NEW TESTAMENT

"For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) But to us there is but ONE God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." 1 Cor. 8:5, 6.

"Little children, keep yourselves from idols." 1st John 5:21.

OLD TESTAMENT

Third Commandment: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Exodus 20:7.

Fourth Commandment: "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." Exodus 20:8.

Fifth Commandment: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Exodus 20:12.

Sixth Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill." Exodus 20:13.

Seventh Commandment: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Exodus 20:14.

NEW TESTAMENT

"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation."

James 5:12.

NO PARALLEL

"Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and thy mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Ephesians 6:1—4.

"He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Whomsoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3:14, 15.

"But fornication, and all uncleanness, nor covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;" Ephesians 5:3.

OLD TESTAMENT

Eighth Commandment: "Thou shalt not steal." Exodus 20:15.

Ninth Commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Exodus 20:16.

Tenth Commandment: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." Exodus 20:17.

NEW TESTAMENT

"Let him that stole steal no more but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Ephesians 4:28.

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Colossians 3:9.

"For this, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Romans 13:9.

CHAPTER VII

THE LORD'S DAY IN APOSTOLIC TIMES

We now come to the Lord's Day, which is the Christian term for the day ordinarily called "Sunday" or the first day of the week. It is not a sabbath as has already been said. It is a well-known fact that the two have often been confused in the minds of Christians and they have assumed that the sabbath day was changed from the seventh day of the week to the first. But facts remain facts in spite of all that. The statement that our Lord's Day is a product of any ecclesiastical body, I care not who makes the statement, is an absolute falsehood. The apostle said:

"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost:

In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God should shine unto them."
2 Corinthians 4:3, 4.

Even so, if the facts concerning our Lord's Day are hid to anyone, it is not because the facts are not there, but because they for some reason best known to themselves, have not sought out the facts which are available to anyone who will take the pains to do a little searching.

In the preceding chapter it was pointed out that the gospel was far superior to the law. It naturally follows that since the sabbath was a part of the law and the Lord's Day is a part of the gospel dispensation, that the Lord's Day must of necessity be far superior to the sabbath. In the first place, the sabbath was temporary and passing, the Lord's Day is as eternal as Christianity itself. The sabbath was a day primarily of rest. In time there had been a development, so that men went to the synagogue for worship on the sabbath day, but

the original command had been that it was to be only a day of rest and a cessation from toil in memory of the fact that the Creator had rested from His toil on the seventh day. The Lord's Day was never a day of rest until it became perverted and made into a sabbath by those who had not originally understood its purpose. Many of the first Christians were slaves or at best, servants in the homes of people who were better off than they so far as this world's goods were concerned. Hence they had no power to refrain from labor on that day had they desired to do so. But the Lord's Day is and should be a day of spiritual activity except for those who must rest from physical necessity. The sabbath day was a local institution restricted to one nation and one people. The Lord's Day was and is a world wide institution for all peoples and languages and tongues. Men were commanded to keep the sabbath holy and it was a capital crime to not do so. But there was certainly nothing in the way of a civil law requiring Christians to observe the first day of the week. It had come about from entirely different reasons.

Sometimes the statement is made and question asked, "If there is no command in the New Testament to keep Saturday, then where is there any command to keep Sunday?" There is no such command and that is exactly what lifts the Lord's Day up and places it on a higher plain than the Jewish sabbath. That same principle applies to the entire law and gospel. In the Old Testament, the law was a series of definite commands which left nothing to the judgment of the individual, he was given a specific command embracing every little detail of life. The sabbath was in the same manner and the commands were nearly all negative. Just as long as we talk or think about the Lord's Day as a matter of law and try to bring out its legal aspect, just that long, we fail to see the cardinal principles of Christianity.

The sabbath came about because of external conditions. Men were given orders from without to obey the law and to keep the sabbath day. But the Lord's Day came about because of conditions that were within. Take a child and mark out every little detail of life in a certain well ordered routine and you might have perfect obedience, or let a teacher go in front of the child and do everything for that child and he may get a superior grade of work in the beginning, but what about the development of the child? How much better it would be for the development of the child if it were given certain principles and left to work out some things for itself. How often do we get the question, "Would it be any thing wrong, if I stayed away from the church just one Sunday?" And how many times do we hear people say, "I think that I've done my part in attending the morning services." And don't we see cases now and then of those who manage to get to the church just in time to be counted? Well as long as we are thinking in terms of this kind, we are going to have Christians like Paul said of those in Corinth, "some among you that are weak and sickly and not a few sleep." Hence the Lord's Day represented spiritual development among the primitive Christians.

We are used to thinking of and calling May 30th "Memorial Day" and it is a memorial of some things which we like to keep as a sacred event and alive in our memories. But it would do no violence to the meaning of the first day of the week if it were called "Memorial Day." It began in the lives of Christians to commemorate the resurrection of their Lord. These disciples of our Lord had walked and talked with him in the flesh and blood and they had believed and hoped that it was He who was to redeem Israel. But all of a sudden, their hopes were all darkened. As we sometimes say, "the bottom completely fell out" of all their

plans and hopes. They had seen that one in whom they had set their hopes, taken away and tried as a criminal then taken out and crucified between two thieves and they knew that he was dead. Could anything be blacker or more disheartening in the lives of those people? They had gone away from that cross and that tomb with a feeling that all was lost. But on the first day of the week following that event, their blackness was suddenly turned into sunshine.

Nobody was any more surprised than these disciples themselves, for while all along, Jesus had told them that he would be raised again, they had never understood what he had meant and it is well that we keep in mind that it was his enemies and not the friends of Jesus who remembered these statements. In the sorrow with which they were overcast, his disciples had completely forgotten all those promises. Can we imagine the surprise and the eagerness with which they ran from one to another with the words, "Christ is risen" when they found that empty tomb and had learned that Jesus was alive? In the Eastern Orthodox Church, the communicants have a custom on the Easter day of greeting each other with the salutation, "Christ is risen," to which the other replies, "In truth he is risen." Though there is no history, known to this writer, which tells us so, it is very clear that this manner of greeting had its origin among those early disciples when they first learned of their Lord's resurrection.

But this is not all, seven weeks from the date of this resurrection day, they were assembled on the first day of the week in Jerusalem in obedience to their Lord's command, when the Holy Spirit came from on high and they all "spake with tongues as the spirit gave them utterance." It was on this day that the first gospel sermon was preached and the church was born on that day. From that time on, they became NEW men and women.

They had left that cross and that tomb a cowering band of defeatists. They went forth from this time on to make their power felt in the world and in due time to conquer the mightiest empire the world has ever known. One of the great leaders of higher criticism of a generation or more ago, though he denied the resurrection of the Lord, said that whatever we might think of these disciples, that they had experienced something that was just as real in their lives as the resurrection itself could have been. Also one of the professors in Chicago University has said, "Christianity began when the disciples of Jesus had some kind of experience that made the resurrection seem like a reality to them." So we see that while men may deny the actual resurrection, they cannot deny that those first Christians actually experienced something. Those Christians were able to make their power felt to such an extent, that even their enemies said on one occasion:

"They that have turned the world upside down have come here also." Acts 17:6.

Is it to be wondered that those people should want to keep in memory their Lord's resurrection, when it had meant so much in their lives and hearts? Thus we see that the Lord's Day represented in their lives not only a much higher plane of living, but also a completely new life.

The Lord's Day represented faithfulness also among those Christians. It is well that we keep in mind, that they had an entirely different situation from what most of us have. For many generations with us, the great majority of influences have tended to favor Christianity. We are protected by laws and not only by laws but by a strong public sentiment in our worship programs. There may be much indifference to Christianity today and it may be difficult to interest others in what we believe, but there is scarcely anyone who would voice ob-

jections to our believing or worshipping as we choose. However, those first Christians encountered the most open and violent opposition. Ofttimes it meant that they must give up anything and everything that we would hold dear in life, if they became Christians. We may not understand the viewpoint of those who opposed Christianity in that day, but nevertheless, those people felt under obligation to destroy this new religion by force if necessary. There was no law to which the Christians could appeal for protection in most cases. Hence they were arrested and thrown into dungeons, nailed to crosses, fed to lions, their clothing saturated with oil and set on fire on dark windy nights, they were stoned to death, and almost every other conceivable form of cruel and unusual punishment was thought of to try to compel those Christians to abandon their faith in Christ Jesus.

We are all familiar with the word "martyr" and we know that it means one who gives up his life for a principle, but do we know how that word came to have that meaning? It originally meant a witness, so when Jesus said to the apostles, "Ye shall be my witnesses" in the original he said, "ye shall be my martyrs" and in reality, they became martyrs though in an entirely different sense of the word from what they expected. So many of the Christians were killed because they gave testimony to the saving power of the gospel of Christ, that the word took on a new meaning. It came to mean not only a witness but one who gives up his life for a principle. So this word in our English language stands as a monument to the faithfulness of those Christians of the first century. They had been promised:

"Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life." Revelation 2:10.

Hence they kept that faith in spite of all the bitter persecution that they experienced. In that day, the

day we call Sunday was just an ordinary business day. It corresponded among the Jews to our Monday. It was not only the first day, but also the first work day of the week. In the Roman Empire outside of Palestine, it was no more than any other day. But the Christians in spite of all the opposition never lost sight of one thing. The Lord just before his crucifixion, had instituted what we commonly know as the Lord's Supper or the communion and had told them to keep that in memory of him. We know also that Paul told the Christians at Corinth:

"For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death until he come." 1 Cor. 11:26.

The thing which they never lost sight of for a moment in spite of all this active opposition was to meet on that first day of the week for the breaking of bread to proclaim the Lord's death and resurrection. We do not claim that they never missed a single Lord's Day, of course, nobody has any information to that effect, but we do know that they never lost sight of this institution and it most likely would be safe to say that there was never a single first day of the week in all that time when some of the Christians did not meet to proclaim this great fact that had meant so much to them. That these people could have gone on under the conditions which they faced, with a practice that was entirely new in the world in which they lived and by this faithfulness and sheer persistence have given the world a custom which has probably meant more to the world than any other one thing in Christianity, and not only that, but also have given to the Gentile world the week of seven days, seems inconceivable. Yet that is exactly what took place. Is it reasonable to suppose that they had nothing more than just their own ideas, in view of what was actually accomplished? Gamaliel very wisely instructed the Jews of that day in regard to Christianity:

"If it be from God, ye are not able to overthrow it."

Acts 5:39.

This Lord's Day as a day in which the Christians met to remember the One who had been crucified and resurrected steadily spread and grew so that in the course of a century or two, it had come to be a worldwide practice and this in spite of the fact that the Christians oftentimes had to meet in places like the catacombs of Rome or behind closed and locked doors or in other secret places. This fact shows that it was more than just mere human effort. To say that the Lord's Day is purely human is to say that the Lord's Supper is purely human for the day is a product of the communion and not the communion a product of the day.

Of course, we are not to understand that every professed Christian was always faithful to his calling in Christ Jesus. There were those in that day, just as there are those in our own day, who did disgraceful deeds and thus brought Christianity into disrepute in the eyes of the world. There were those who loved the world in which they lived better than they loved their Lord. There were those of whom as Paul said:

"I now tell you even weeping, there are those among you who are ENEMIES of the cross of Christ." Phil. 3:18.

However, the vast majority of the Christians were among the faithful ones and it was they who helped to stamp indelibly on the world the power of the gospel.

Perhaps the question will naturally arise in the minds of some who shall read this volume, how do we know all these things are true? The answer is that it would be perfectly fair to say that we don't KNOW they are true, just as we don't KNOW that our Christianity is true. If we knew all these things, there would be no room for faith. However, we do know that the Lord's Day or Sunday as a day of religious worship had its beginning somewhere or else there would be no day of

that kind now. And it is not overstating the fact to say that we have evidence which proves beyond all shadow of doubt, both in the Bible and out of it, that our Lord's Day was in existence as a day of worship among the Christians during apostolic times and less than twenty-five years after the resurrection of our Lord, hence it is safe to conclude that it began right immediately after our Lord's resurrection. First of all, will be presented the evidence obtained directly from the Scriptures themselves, which will be corroborated by the post apostolic writers in the early part of the second century. Our first Scripture to be taken into consideration reads as follows:

"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:6, 7.

It is apparent that Paul and his companions arrived at Troas on Sunday afternoon or evening and that they waited over there seven days in order that they might be with the disciples when they had assembled for the communion service. If this conclusion be correct, it shows how important the assembling of the saints together for this purpose was in the minds of the Christians, not only the masses of the people, but also the apostles. There is one thing that is certain in connection with this occurrence. Those Christians, did meet on the first day of the week and the purpose of this meeting was for the breaking of bread or the communion service. There can be little doubt but what this meeting was on a Saturday night. Otherwise they would have observed the communion on the second day of the week instead of the first. The record is very clear that they broke bread early on Sunday morning. It is equally clear that

Paul travelled on Sunday morning. There may have been a reason for that. We are told a little further on that:

"Paul was hastening that he might be, if possible, in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost." Acts 20:16.

Not because he felt that Christians were bound to keep the law of the Old Testament, but because at this Pentecost feast, there would be thousands of Jews from all parts of the world in Jerusalem and it would be a wonderful opportunity to preach the gospel to them. For, let us remember that, it was ever a hope of his heart that he might be able to make them see that Jesus was the one whom their prophets had said should come. Hence it may be that he went the only time that he could get a boat and get passage in time to arrive for that great feast.

But we must also remember, that this Lord's Day was not a legal day. To the Christians of that day, it was a glorious privilege to meet on the first day of the week to commemorate the resurrection of the One who had brought so much hope into their lives. So they spent the entire night in the house of God, when perhaps many of them had to go to work on the day following. What a contrast that is between the old system and the new. Under the old system they had kept the sabbath day out of necessity and constraint, when their hearts were not in the matter at all. Thus we read they said:

"When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn or the sabbath that we may set forth wheat?" Amos 8:5.

To the Christians this first day of the week was a day to be observed with joy and gladness of heart even though perhaps many of them did have to be at their daily tasks on that day, and it was not a day to be kept out of necessity and constraint when their hearts were not in it and they kept wishing that the day was over in order that they might get back to business. It is true that the mention of this one meeting does not prove

that they met on EVERY first day of the week. If we had only one instance of the mention of this, then it would be worth but little, but we have a saying, "Where there is so much smoke there is bound to be some fire" and this is only one link in a chain of evidence.

Our next Scripture comes from the pen of Paul himself and reads as follows:

"And concerning the collection which is for the saints; as I directed the congregations of Galatia, so also do you. Every first day of the week, let each of you lay something by itself, depositing as he may be prospered, so that when I come collections may not then be made." 1 Cor. 16:1, 2; Emphatic Diaglott.

These Scriptures tell us four distinct things. First of all that Paul had given a positive command to the churches. Secondly that it was the custom of the churches both in Galatia and at Corinth in that early day to assemble on every first day of the week. Thirdly that the individuals who made up the congregations were to lay something by in store according as God had prospered them in a material way. There was no certain amount which could be measured in terms of dollars and cents, but each one was to bring in proportion as he had, thus leaving the individual himself to be the judge and to also have the responsibility. And last of all, the preparation was to be made for the collections to go to the poor saints in order that there should be no collecting when Paul came. Paul expected to pass through and among the churches on his way to Jerusalem and to receive the offering which had been prepared for the needy saints.

To place an interpretation on this which would make it say that these Christians were to lay by in store, each in his or her home or other place of abode, is to do violence to the meaning of that latter portion. In a case of that kind, it would be necessary to have a gen-

eral collection in order to get it all together, which is just exactly what Paul said he didn't want. Moreover, if the first day of the week meant absolutely nothing in the churches, there would have been no point to Paul's directive. If it was important enough that he gave a directive for it to be done on the first day of the week, it is obvious that there must have been some reason for selecting that day. Otherwise he would have been assuming the role of a petty dictator, trying to arbitrarily compel a great number of people to do some little detail in a certain manner when it would have been no value to him or to anyone else for them to do it that way. The only logical construction is that they were to bring to the church when it assembled for worship on the first day of the week, an offering which was to be placed in a separate fund and earmarked for the poor saints.

We now know, from the information which has been available since the beginning of the century that there was a systematic plan not only for the collection of these funds but also for the delivery of same. Paul writes to the Roman Christians:

"When I have sealed to them this fruit, then I will go on by you into Spain." Romans 15:28.

This used to puzzle Bible students to a considerable degree until the discovery of so much papyri in Egypt near the beginning of the present century. Evidently the money was gotten together and placed in some kind of container and sealed, most likely it would have been counted and sealed in the presence of Paul. Then it was his job together with those who were chosen to go with him, to deliver this container to someone properly designated by the church at the other end of the line, who would look after its distribution. Thus when Paul "sealed" the offering, he delivered the sealed package containing the money which he had received from one of the churches to the person or persons, whom the

tribution. As further evidence that Paul had in mind church elsewhere had designated to look after its dis- the entire congregation sitting as a unit, he speaks of those who shall be chosen to carry this money and says that if he shall be chosen, that these others shall go with him. It was only the congregation acting as a unit, and no one individual acting as a separate entity, that could make a decision of that kind.

Next we have the statement of John who said:

"I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Rev. 1:10.

Some have believed that maybe John meant Saturday, but if we examine a Greek newspaper dated for Sunday, we will see that they use the same term to designate the first day of the week that John used. It is true that Isaiah spoke of "my holy day" when he had reference to Saturday and also that Paul spoke of the "day of the Lord" but evidently those three were all separate and distinct from each other. The language would indicate that John had in mind the first day of the week and that he was trying to locate himself with reference to the time in which he had received that vision. If an inspired apostle confused the terms and wrote thus when he meant Saturday, then he did something that no uninspired writer did for several centuries afterward. McClintock and Strong tells us that the line of demarcation among the ecclesiastical writers was very sharply drawn and that for five centuries after John, not one of them ever used the term which John used to designate the seventh day of the week and not one of them used the term which was ordinarily used for Saturday when they were talking about the first day of the week. *McClintock and Strong, Cyclopedia of Biblical, Ecclesiastical, and Theological Literature. Article LORD'S DAY.* Thus there is no evidence, whatsoever, that John had in mind Saturday when he made that statement and a preponderance of evidence that he did have in mind

the first day of the week which is called the Lord's Day.

If anyone should object to this on the grounds that it is only three times in our New Testament that we find a reference to the Lord's Day, he should remember that no one questions the use of the term "Christian" as being applied to the followers of Christ during the apostolic age, yet we find only three references to that term in the New Testament.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LORD'S DAY IN POST-APOSTOLIC TIMES

In the period immediately following the apostolic age, we have some very important testimony concerning our Lord's Day and its purpose which has been preserved for us. There is one writing which can scarcely be called post-apostolic. It would be more nearly correct to say or to speak of this writing as a connecting link between the period in which the greater part of our New Testament was written and the writings of the second century. This is called the "Didache," a Greek word meaning "teaching" and translated in our King James version "doctrine." The complete title of this manuscript when translated into English is the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." This document was found in a monastery in Constantinople in the year 1873; however, it had long been known that such a manuscript had existed, but it was not known to be extant before this time. It is not possible to determine the exact dates of any of these writings. The Encyclopedia Britannica says that it was written not later than 120 A.D. and it may have been written as early as 90 A.D. Even the ordinary reader can see from the style of writing and from the nature of the subjects discussed that this manuscript was written somewhere near the apostolic age. It is not to be understood that it was actually written by one of the "Twelve" and no one knows who wrote it or from what place it was written, but it most likely was written by some Christian near the close of the apostolic age who was giving in his own words the teaching as he had learned it from the apostles.

An examination of this writing brings out very readily an abundance of evidence that it was written during the

first century. Paul had said in writing to the Christians at Ephesus:

"He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." Ephesians 4:11.

It is quite evident that this manuscript was written while those apostles and prophets were still living. At least some of them were living. Some have believed, it is true, that the writer might have in mind men living in the second century called "apostles," but there is no historical evidence known to us at present of any class of men who lived in the second century called "apostles." We do have evidence that some of the great leaders of the church, such men as Polycarp, were called "apostolic men," that is men who were LIKE the apostles. These men, may it be said to their everlasting credit, poured out their lives in an attempt to build up the Kingdom of God in much the same manner as did the apostles, hence they were LIKE the apostles but they were not apostles. The apostles belonged to the first century.

Then too the baptismal service spoken of in this manuscript is very simple and the Lord's Supper is given in just the reverse order from what we ordinarily have in the churches today. It would appear that both orders, that is the bread first and the cup afterwards and also the cup first and the bread afterward, is given in the New Testament. We know also that in the times of the New Testament, there were two classes of officials in the churches. The two classes as given in our New Testament are bishops and deacons. The bishops and elders were one and the same thing. However, there was very soon a development so that in the early part of the second century a change had been made. By the early part of the second century this officialdom had changed for then the bishops had developed into a special class and there was only one bishop to a con-

gregation. Following the bishops came the elders or presbyters and following the presbyters came the deacons.

Evidently at the time this manuscript was written, the aforementioned development had not taken place and there were only two classes of officials in the church, which is the same as there was in the church as given in the New Testament. Moreover, the local congregation was the unit and these officials were chosen by the congregation. It cannot be ascertained definitely as to the method of choosing these officials, but it may be that they were elected by the congregation voting by means of the outstretched arm. The Greek word used in both the New Testament and also in this *Didache* would seem to indicate that this was the method of voting. All these furnish us with practically certain evidence that this work which we call "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" was written toward the end of the first century. Probably in 80 or 90 A.D.

From this manuscript the following is quoted:

"Every Lord's Day, having assembled, break bread and after having given thanks, confess your faults that your offering may be pure." *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; Chapter XIV.*

This manuscript, like all the other ancient writings on the subject of Christianity including the Bible, has come in for its share of criticism. The passage which has been translated "Every Lord's Day" if it were literally translated would read, "Every Lord's Day of the Lord." So the critics have seized on this and tried to discredit this writing on account of the awkwardness of the expression. Today there is a tendency in writing Greek to make the order of the sentence very much like that of our English, but there are still many expressions very different from our English order and one is just as likely to find the order of the Greek entirely different from our English as he is to find it like our English.

A very common Greek expression which has come down to us from the ancient times, is "How for me are you?" Also in common everyday Greek is "Out I go out," "Not I know nothing," or "The of the wife of me sister." Then it is perfectly good Greek to say, "Has the store of him, the Andrew yet?" Our New Testament is filled with examples of an order of Greek similar to those already given. Our well-known Lord's Prayer, if it were translated literally into English would read, "Father of us, the in the Heavens." So if the awkwardness of speech as compared to our English order brings a writing into disrepute, then we must of necessity discredit our Bible.

When we come to the writings of which we can be certain they originated in the second century, we have first of all the letters of Pliny the Younger, Roman provincial governor of Bythnia, to Trajan the emperor of Rome. Pliny tells us that it was the custom of the Christians to meet on a "stated day" very early in the morning, at which meeting they sang a hymn in concert to Christ as a god, after which they would adjourn and then reassemble for a "meal" which they ate in common without disorder. Pliny does not tell us on what day of the week it was. Perhaps some of us will ask the question, "If he had in mind the first day of the week, why didn't he say 'the first day of the week'?" Well, that will be very easy to understand when we know all the facts.

First of all, those Roman rulers were pagan and understood nothing of Christianity. Pliny himself, says that he could make nothing out of it but "depraved and excessive superstition." Then we need to remember that he was writing purely for the benefit of the emperor and not for our benefit or for the benefit of the Christians of his day. So had he written to Trajan that it was the custom of those Christians to meet on the Lord's Day

or the first day of the week it would have meant absolutely nothing to the emperor and he would have been talking to him in terms of which he neither knew nor cared a single thing. It is not likely that either Pliny or Trajan knew anything about dividing the time into weeks, nor was there any way that he could have expressed that term "first day of the week" in either Greek or Latin. Nor did either Pliny or Trajan care anything about the time when those Christians met. For his purpose in writing and for Trajan's purpose in reading, it was good enough to say "stated day" and it meant as much as anything else that he could have said. In exactly the same way, he understood nothing of the communion or its import, so when he had described to him by those Christians whom he had taken into custody for examination, the passing of the communion emblems, it seemed to him that the best word he could use to designate that part of the service would be "meal." If we had nothing only the writings of Pliny, it would be of little real value as evidence, but with all the other writings that we have this provides a very important link in the chain of evidence coming to us not from the friends of Christianity but from its enemies.

If those Christians were under the guidance of pagan rulers and leaders as has been very foolishly charged by those who were at a loss for some means to explain away the Lord's Day, I wonder why a pagan ruler should seek to stop them or to do them harm. For again we have the testimony of Pliny himself, that he tested the ones who were accused of being Christian by requiring of them to repeat after him an invocation to the gods and to offer adoration, with wine and frankincense to the image of the emperor and finally to curse Christ. If they would do that, he ordered them immediately discharged. But others he interrogated in regard to being Christians

and repeated the interrogation a second and a third time with the threat of capital punishment. Then if they still persisted that they were Christians, he ordered them immediately executed.

Of course, like everything else that has been in the past, we do not know that Pliny had in mind the first day of the week, but there is no room for reasonable doubt that he was talking about the Christians meeting on the first day of the week for a communion service and the charge that those Christians were under the guidance of pagan leaders falls down as being a perfectly groundless charge. *Letters of Pliny; Volume II, Chapter 96.*

The next witness we have from history is Ignatius. Of course, we do not know exactly what year any of these testimonies were written, hence we cannot tell exactly which one should come first. It is quite certain that Ignatius, like Pliny the Younger, was writing in the early part of the second century, perhaps about the year 108 A.D. According to Eusebius, Ignatius was third bishop of Antioch in Syria, and he suffered martyrdom at Rome in the tenth year of the Emperor Trajan. In the collection of letters written by Ignatius, there is one addressed to Polycarp whom we are told was a disciple of the Apostle John, having known John in the flesh. Thus we know that Ignatius was living at the same time as Polycarp and it is most likely that he too knew that beloved apostle. It is known also that there was a theory current in the Roman Empire to the effect that Jesus never actually came in the flesh but simply made some kind of spiritual manifestation into the world. It is believed that this was what John had in mind when he wrote:

"Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God." 1 John 4:3.

In the epistles of Ignatius, this theory is likewise very bitterly denounced, which is further evidence that Ignatius lived not far from the time of the apostle John. Concerning the personal life of Ignatius, like Paul, there is very little known. We often wish that we might have known more about the home life and the family of those great leaders in that early church, but they were content to let the world know as much as they could make known about our Lord and perfectly willing that they as individuals might be forgotten. In this collection of epistles Ignatius tells us about the voyage starting from Antioch in Syria and how he was under the control of ten Roman soldiers, and how the soldiers treated him. Also in the epistle to the Romans he pleads with them to not interfere in his behalf for he wanted to die a martyr for his Lord. All of these things are very important factors and they help to make these epistles of Ignatius very valuable as evidence. Perhaps they stand among the most valuable we have in the way of written testimony outside the Bible itself. For let us remember they were written at a very early period in the history of the church.

In the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, he is writing to Christians who have been converted out of Judaism and in this epistle he says as follows:

"If, therefore, those formerly in ancient customs, having turned about and come unto a newness of hope, no longer keeping the sabbath, but according to the Lord's Day living, on which also our life has arisen through Him and His death, which some deny, through which mystery we received the faith and on account of which we stand firm that we might be found disciples of Christ Jesus, our only teacher." *Ignatius to the Magnesians: Chapter IX.*

The author of this volume is well aware of the fact that there has been much controversy centered around this portion of the writings of Ignatius. However, there

is no reason why it should be. It is a very simple statement if we only let it be simple. Quite evidently, he is talking about the first day of the week and calling it the Lord's Day. There are some who have inserted the word life in this phrase and have made it read something else, thus making Ignatius talk about something else besides a day of the week. Regardless of how we translate that portion in which he mentions the Lord's Day, it is not possible by any stretch of the imagination to translate the preceding phrase anything except, "no longer keeping the sabbath," and it is quite evident that he is setting up one in contrast with the other. So it is quite obvious that he is setting up the first day of the week in contrast with the seventh which he here calls the sabbath day. As a further proof that he was talking about the first day of the week, he says that the Lord has risen on that day and with Him also has risen our lives. We get practically the same thought from Paul's epistle to the Colossians which reads as follows:

"When Christ who is our life shall appear, ye also shall appear with Him in glory." Colossians 3:4.

So there is no room at all for those who would say that Ignatius in this particular instance was not talking about the first day of the week. The evidence is too plain, there is nothing else about which he could have been talking.

Next we have a writing known as the "Epistle of Barnabas." Of all our writings, this is probably the most difficult to determine when it was written. However, it was first discovered in the back of a very old manuscript of the Bible which is now in the British Museum and for which the British paid the Soviet Government in Moscow a sum equal to \$500,000 in American money. The fact that it was placed alongside of the Scriptures by the early Christians shows that they held it in very high esteem in that early day. It was probably

written during the time of the emperor Hadrian who reigned from 117 to 138. This epistle says:

"Wherefore, we celebrate the eighth day with gladness, on which Jesus arose from the dead, and having been made manifest, ascended into heaven." *Epistle of Barnabas C. 15.*

The next witness we have from the post-apostolic period is Justin who is commonly known as Justin Martyr. Justin was born probably about 114 A.D. and was put to death for his faith, we are told in 165 A.D. It is very clear that he had at first studied and learned Greek philosophy, but later he learned of Christianity of which he became thoroughly convinced that it was true. He thus became one of the most able defenders of the faith of the times in which he lived. The apologies of Justin are the oldest that have come down to us and they are characterized by Christian fervor. Regarding the day of worship, Justin says as follows:

"And on the day called the DAY OF THE SUN, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits, then when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of those good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying 'Amen'; And there is a distribution to each and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons." *Apology of Justin Martyr, 1:67.*

There are those who have argued that because Justin mentions water in connection with the communion service here, that we may conclude that Christians were beginning to fall away and were taking up the practices of pagans. There is no evidence whatsoever, to support such a theory as this. If we examine the writings of Justin with a little care, we find that he tells us that

the water was mixed with the wine. Evidently the Christians of that day were using fermented wine which was diluted with water to weaken it and in this manner make it practically non-alcoholic. Critics have also pointed out that Justin used the term "day of the sun" in writing this apology. Of course, that is true, but there was a reason for that. The opening paragraphs of this apology tell us that he was addressing the Roman Emperor on behalf of the Christians and pleading that they should not be unjustly persecuted. Hence he talked to the emperor in terms that he would understand. He didn't say the first day of the week, for that term would have been meaningless to the Caesar. Nor did he say Lord's Day for that would have meant nothing to a pagan emperor. However, the practice of worship of the sun was a very common thing in the empire and it is certain that the emperor would understand what day was meant, so he told the emperor that the Christians met on that day which men ordinarily called the day of the sun. Now when John was writing Revelation, he was writing to Christians, so he uses the term that they would understand. He calls it the Lord's Day.

But now we come to the strongest evidence we have. That of monumental evidence which comes to us in the form of the Greek calendar. Someone has very truthfully said, that there has never been in all history, a day set apart to commemorate any event that the event itself didn't occur. One eminent Jewish writer has said, "had there been no Moses, there would have been no Judaism." We can say also here in America, that had there been no Declaration of Independence, there would have been no Fourth of July. In exactly the same way, this Greek calendar furnishes undeniable testimony that the Lord's Day had its origin in apostolic times. It is well that we examine a few facts concerning the Greek

calendar and its relation to our Lord's Day as well as how it bears out our position.

It has not been possible to establish definitely how or where the week had its origin, but we do know that the Jews were among the pioneers in that method of dividing time. Since Christianity began among the Jews and the first Christians were all Jews, it is natural that they should have had their time divided into weeks of seven days. However, the Jews of Paul's day had no name for the days of the week except for the two we call Friday and Saturday. They spoke of the days of the week as:

"FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH, PREPARATION DAY, AND SABBATH DAY."

Neither the Greeks nor the Romans of that period knew anything about dividing their time into weeks. The Greeks had their months divided into three periods of ten days each, while the Romans divided their months into two periods called Ides. Thus Julius Caesar was told to be on the lookout for the Ides of March. The term sabbath among the Jews had originally referred to the seventh day of the week, but there had been a development so that in time it came to mean not only the seventh day, but also the entire week or the period from one sabbath to another. So when the New Testament writers wanted to say something about the week, they took the Jewish word and spelled it with Greek letters for there was no word in the Greek language to correspond to our English word "week." There was in the Roman Empire a religious cult called Mithraism, whose adherents worshipped the sun on the day that corresponded to our first day of the week. This cult had a cycle of seven days on each of which they worshipped a different god. Our English week or the days thereof, corresponds exactly to the days and the gods of that ancient pagan cult. Thus the sun's day because on that

day they worshipped the sun. Then the moon's day, etc., until Saturday which was Saturn's day. But this was not a civil division of the empire, so we can say that neither the Greeks nor the Romans of that period had their time divided into weeks.

The Jewish Christians took that Jewish calendar and called the first day of the week, the Lord's Day. We have the testimony that has come down to us that it was in honor of the fact that their Lord had been raised from the dead on that day. Other than that, they made no change in the Jewish calendar. When they went among the Greeks carrying the gospel message, they carried also a new calendar. It is not meant by this a sheet of paper like we are apt to think about when we think of a new calendar, but a new way of dividing time. As the Greeks accepted Christianity and came into the church, they accepted also the Christian-Jewish calendar. This became the calendar accepted by the Greeks as a nation and still remains so to this very day without alteration. As has already been said, you get a copy of the Greek Sunday newspaper, or a handbill for that matter, announcing a picnic or outing of any kind among the Greeks to be held on Sunday and printed in the Greek language, and check the name of the day and you will see that both newspaper and handbill use the same term to designate the first day of the week that John used when he wrote Revelation. The terms used by the Greeks to designate the days of the week, right here in Los Angeles, in Chicago, in New York City, and elsewhere are as follows:

"Lord's Day, Second Day, Third Day, Fourth Day, Fifth Day, Preparation Day, and Sabbath Day."

This is the only calendar the Greeks know and we have an abundance of evidence that it was in use very early in the Christian era, and the fact that John used the term that he used, shows that it was in use during

the first century. This calendar is very important evidence, for it furnishes us with irrefutable testimony that Sunday worship did not come to take the place of the sabbath day. If it had there would have been no day on the calendar called the sabbath. The fact that there is both a sabbath day and a Lord's Day on this calendar shows that the first Christians who were all Jews observed both days. These Christians and their fathers, for untold generations, had observed a sabbath day as Jews, but when Christianity came to the Gentiles, they had never observed a sabbath, so the sabbath was not bound on them. We all know that the Jews keep the Passover. Well it stands to reason that this started somewhere. If it didn't start at the time the Old Testament says it did, then somebody who can, tell me where it did start. In exactly the same manner the Greek calendar, if they didn't get that calendar from the Jewish Christians of the first century then who can tell me where they did get it? I challenge any man, I care not how much of a scholar he may be or how well recognized by the world his scholarship may be, to present anything in the way of a logical explanation of the origin of that Greek calendar, if it didn't come from the Jewish Christians of the first century. We cannot say it came from the pagans, for the Greeks themselves were pagans before the coming of Christianity. Moreover, there is no record on earth of any pagan religion that ever had a Lord's Day and a sabbath day, and a preparation day, or anyone of these three. Nor can we say it came from the unbelieving Jews for they had no Lord's Day. So that leaves us with only one source from which it could have come and that is the Jewish Christians.

In the English, the German, the Dutch, and the Scandinavian languages, we call the seventh day of the week, Saturn's Day and the first day of the week, Sunday or

the sun's day, and all the other days of the week are named from the old pagan deities of a people who lived in northern Europe whose religion had its counterpart in the Mithraism of the old Roman Empire. Thus we have another link in the chain of monumental evidence. In the Providence of God, these calendars have come down to us without alteration just as the ancient pagans used them in northern Europe and the Roman Empire. When we compare these calendars with the Greek, which also has come to us without alteration, it is easy to see that they did not have and could not have had a common origin. The Greek calendar came from the Jewish Christians of the first century. The others came from the ancient Mithraites to the peoples of northern Europe and in turn to the peoples who are using them today.

CHAPTER IX CONCLUSION

If we wished we could cite passages from writings of one ecclesiastical writer after another from the time of Justin all the way to the fourth century to show that the Lord's Day was known in the day of each writer and that it was not a sabbath day. However, that would not strengthen the case. It has already been shown that the Lord's Day originated very early in the Christian era. Certainly less than 25 years after the resurrection. It was one of the most important features of Christianity for it centered around the resurrection of our Lord. The facts are the Lord's Day is one of the most positive proofs we have of the resurrection. The fact that Christians have all through the centuries met together on this resurrection day to celebrate the resurrection, shows that the resurrection must have occurred. Then too it was very closely connected with the communion service for we don't find a single recorded instance either in the New Testament itself or in the writings of the Christian leaders of the post-apostolic age, when we can get anything definite at all as to the manner of its observance, that we don't find them celebrating the communion on that day. So it is quite correct to say that there is no authority in the New Testament for Christians meeting at all on the first day of the week except it be for a communion service. Therefore, those who would take away the Lord's Day, would take away one of the strongest proofs we have of the resurrection. And let us remember that in spite of everything that is being said nowadays to the contrary, the inspired apostles made this resurrection the central theme of all Christianity. Paul said in writing to the Christians at Corinth:

"If Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If we have hoped in Christ, in this life only, we are of all men most pitiable." 1 Cor. 15: 17-19.

They would also take away from us the privilege of meeting to remember our Lord through his broken body and shed blood on that first day of the week, when they can offer us nothing in the place of that except to go fishing or to engage in some kind of worldly amusement. The question has been asked sometimes, "Wouldn't it have been just as well, had the Christians under the leadership of the inspired apostles met on some other day, instead of the first day of the week?" It is not the purpose of this book to decide what COULD have been done. The point at issue is not what COULD have been done, but what actually WAS done. But it is well to remember that we observe Lincoln's birthday on the 12th of February, because that was the day on which Lincoln came into the world. It might be just as well to observe the 25th of May, or the 13th of June or some other date, but we have chosen the 12th of February as the most fitting date because it was the day on which he was born. In exactly the same way, the early Christians celebrated the resurrection of their Lord on the first day of the week, because it was the day on which the resurrection actually occurred. It is not being claimed that Christians are bound by law to meet on that first day of the week to remember their Lord, or if they fail in that one thing they will not be Christians. If we are thinking purely in terms of doing as little as we can do, it will make little difference whether we meet on that date or not. But to the Christians who find a delight in doing as much as they can do, it becomes not a matter of legal necessity, but a glorious privilege to meet to remember their Lord on this day.

Constantine, the Roman Emperor, had nothing whatsoever to do with the establishment of our Lord's Day. We have the testimony of Justin Martyr that it was in current practice among the Christians in his day and he was put to death about a hundred years before Constantine was born. Then we have the testimony of Ignatius who was put to death at least a half century before Justin and it was in current practice in his time. Then John the apostle gives us testimony that it was in current use in the latter part of the first century. Luke, in writing the Acts of the Apostles which it is certain was not written later than about 60 A.D., testifies to the fact that the Christians under the leadership of Paul met on the first day of the week. We do not know how long it had been after the occurrence of this meeting at Troas before Luke made his record, but it is certain that we can go back to a period not later than twenty-five years after the resurrection and it may have been even earlier than that. So it is pretty hard to see how any man could have established a day which had been in existence more than two hundred years when he came into the world. It is true that Constantine passed a law regulating work and the employment of labor on the first day of the week, which is the first instance on record of any form of Sunday law, but in doing that he didn't change any day, but he gave legal recognition to what had already become a world-wide custom.

So far as is known, no intelligent people deny that while Christianity was spreading throughout the Roman Empire, there was also a pagan cult called Mithraism whose adherents worshipped the sun on the first day of the week. Both religions worshipped on the first day of the week, but right here the relationship ends. There is not one single iota of evidence that our Christian Lord's Day came from the pagans and we have an abundance of evidence that it did not. It is not being denied that cer-

tain modernistic historians have assumed that the Lord's Day had its origin with the pagans, but this is purely an unwarranted assumption with not even a scratch of a pen of evidence in its favor. Justin tells us that the Mithraites of that day sought to imitate the Christians and he was living in the day when those things occurred, so he is better qualified to know than anyone living eighteen hundred years later.

If we go to any Greek who has any intelligent understanding of his own language, and show him Revelation 1:10 in the Greek New Testament and ask him what day he understands that to be, he'll tell us that he understands it to mean the day we call Sunday. To say that John might have used the term then current in the Roman world, in a way that it meant some other day of the week, is just like saying that maybe the other writers of the New Testament used the term which has been transliterated and rendered "baptize" in our English version of the Bible to mean "sprinkle." If we are mistaken about what John meant, then maybe we are mistaken about what the others meant, and maybe we should be sprinkling people instead of immersing them. We can rest assured that we are not mistaken about either. Likewise, we may conclude that if it had not been for the faithfulness of those Christians of the first century in meeting on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread in memory of the One who had brought to them a hope which had been beforetime unknown, it is exceedingly doubtful if we right here in America today would have our time divided into weeks. It came to us through England from the Roman Empire which in turn got it from the Christians.

So we can rest assured that our Christian Lord's Day is not a sabbath day and that it is as old as Christianity itself. That it did not come from any church council or

any other ecclesiastical body and that it had no connection with any day observed by any pagan group anywhere in the Roman Empire. It is true that in time men confused the three and have built a day that partakes in part way of all three, namely, the pagan Sunday, the Christian Lord's Day and the Jewish sabbath, but in the beginning a clear line of demarcation existed between the sabbath day and the Lord's Day, neither of which had any connection with the pagan Sunday.