

# The Lord's Day

By E. C. FUQUA

ANTIQUITY unanimously concurs in referring the phrase, "*the Lord's day*" (Rev. 1: 10) to the day otherwise in the New Testament styled "*the first day of the week*"—the day we call *Sunday*. This *day* derived its peculiarity or significance from *Christianity* alone. While it was peculiarly *marked* under the Old Covenant, having a *typical* significance there, it did not bear a *name* that distinguished it from other days of the week, as did the seventh or *Sabbath day*. It was sometimes styled "*the morrow after the Sabbath*" (Levit. 23: 15), "*the eighth day*" (Neh. 8: 18), etc. It was left to the New Testament, the *Spiritual System* of religion, to give the *Day* its true setting as the typified *substance* of the undefined *shadow* of preceding dispensations. In the New Testament it takes precedence over all the days of the *week*, the *month*, and the *year*; all *seasons* resolve themselves into the *day*, and this day "*the first day of the week*."

But before pursuing our study into the New Testament it is thought best to present the *history* that marks the Lord's Day in the centuries immediately succeeding the New Testament period. Citing the *Fathers* in order, we shall first hear—

Barnabas (A. D. 120):—"We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead."  
—*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Chapter XVII.

Justin Martyr (A. D. 140):—"But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead."  
—*Ibid.*, *Apology*, Chap. LXVII.

Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 194):—"He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself."  
—*Ibid.*, Book 7, Chap. XII.

**Tertullian in Africa (A. D. 200):**—"We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradiction to those who call this day their Sabbath."—*Ibid.*, *Apology*, Chap. XVI. — "We however, just as we have received, only on the day of the Lord's resurrection, ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude, deferring even our business."—*Ibid.*, *On Prayer*, Chap. XXIII.

**Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (A. D. 250):**—"The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath and the Lord's Day."—*Ibid.*, *Epistle 58*, Sec. 4.

**The Apostolical Constitution (A. D. 250):**—"On the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's Day, meet more diligently."—*Ibid.*, *Book 2*, Sec. 7.

**Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea (A. D. 270):**—"Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day will lead us to celebrate it."—*Ibid.*, *Chap. X*.

**Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (A. D. 306):**—"But the Lord's Day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it, he rose again."—*Ibid.*, *Canon 15*.

The foregoing historical citations abundantly prove that, from the Apostles on down, "the Lord's Day" always meant *Sunday*, "the first day of the week." They moreover show a universal celebration among Christians of the Day as the day of weekly assembling around the Institution commemorating the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which was the *Lord's Supper*. (Acts 20:7.)

The latest *Encyclopedia Britannica* contains this conclusive evidence:

**Sunday, or the LORD'S DAY, in the Christian world, the first day of the week, celebrated in memory of the resurrection of Christ, as the principle day for public worship. An additional reason for the sanctity of the day may have been found in its association with Pentecost or Whitsun.** [*Foot-note:*—"From an expression in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 15), it would almost seem as if the Ascension also was believed by some to have taken place on a Sunday."] There is no evidence that in the earliest years of Christianity there was any formal observance of Sunday as a day of rest or any general cessation of work. But it seems to have from the first been set apart for worship. Thus according to Acts xx. 7, the disciples in Troas met weekly on the first day of the week for exhortation and the breaking of bread; 1 Cor. xvi. 2 implies at least some observance of the day; and the

solemn commemorative character it had very early acquired is strikingly indicated by an accidental expression of the writer of the Apocalypse ([Rev.] i. 10), who for the first time gives it that name ("the Lord's Day") by which it is almost invariably referred to by all writers of the century immediately succeeding apostolic times. [*Foot-note:*—"In the Epistle of Barnabas already referred to (c. 15) it is called "the eighth day:" "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also in which Jesus rose again from the dead."—Cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph. c. 238.*] Indications of the manner of its observance during this period are not wanting. *Teaching of the Apostles* (c. 14) contains the precept: "And on the Lord's day of the Lord come together and break bread and give thanks after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." Ignatius (*Ad Magn. c. 9*) speaks of those whom he addresses as "no longer Sabbatizing, but living in the observance of the Lord's day on which also our life sprang up again." [*Foot-note:*—"The longer recension runs: 'But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner. . . . And after the observance of the Sabbath let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days.' The writer finds a reference to the Lord's day in the titles to Ps. vi. and vii., which are 'set to eight.'"] Eusebius (*H. E. iv. 23*) has preserved a letter of Dionysius of Corinth (A. D. 175) to Soter, Bishop of Rome, in which he says: "To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle," and the same historian (*H. E. iv. 26*) mentions that Melito of Sardis (A. D. 170) had written a treatise on the Lord's day. Pliny's letter to Trojan in which he speaks of the meetings of the Christians 'on a stated day' need only be alluded to. The first writer who mentions the name of Sunday as applicable to the Lord's day is Justin Martyr; this designation of the first day of the week, which is of heathen origin (see SABBATH), had come into general use in the Roman world shortly before Justin wrote. He describes (*Apol. i. 67*) how 'on the day called Sunday' town and country Christians alike gathered together in one place for instruction and prayer and charitable offerings and the distribution of bread and wine; they thus meet together on that day, he says, because it is the first day in which God made the world, and because Jesus Christ on the same day rose from the dead."—Vol. 26, page 94.

No historian will deny that from the first till the fourth century, "the Lord's Day" was exclusively applied, as it is to-day, to *Sunday*, the first day of the week, and that this appellation was derived from

the *Apostle, John*, who so applied it in Rev. 1: 10.

In modern times, *Sabbatarians* have attempted to apply the appellation to *the Sabbath day*, but this is done to protect a *delusion* by the sacrifice of *Truth*. No authentic teacher ever so applied it. The *Lord* of Christians is *Jesus Christ*, and "*the Lord's Day*" is particularly *His*, set apart for a purpose created by the System which *He* originated. It requires little effort to learn that with the birth of the Resurrection itself was born the "*first day of the week*" as the distinctive *meeting day of Christians*. On no other day of the week did *Christ* ever meet with the disciples, after His resurrection. Beginning *on that day*, He met with them *consecutively* week by week, as we learn from John's Gospel (John 20). He met with them on the day of His resurrection (John 20: 19), "and after eight days again" He met with them in like manner (verse 26), thus proving a *consecutive* assembling with His disciples *on Sundays*. We reasonably infer that this continued throughout His sojourn on earth, for Luke says Christ was known to the disciples intimately, "appearing unto them by the space of forty days." (Acts 1: 3.) We have not the slightest evidence that He was seen by them at any time after His resurrection, except upon the first day of the week. The fact that He "*appeared*" on each occasion signifies that He was *in seclusion* at all other times: and from John's description of His *appearing* on the only occasions revealed (John 20: 19, 26) we are forced to conclude that *all* of His *appearings* were *upon the first day of the week*. This would total *six* meetings with them, by strict count; but the ancients (see *Barnabas* c. 15, for example) largely held that the "*forty days*" was an expression in *round numbers* for an *exact* period of *forty-three* days; hence their understanding that *Jesus' ascension* occurred on the first day of the week. If that be true (and we believe it is), then Christ met with His disciples exactly *seven times* after His resurrection, *ascending* on the *seventh* occasion. And in meeting with them on these *Sundays* He *blessed* them, saying, "*Peace be unto you.*"

It is vain to raise the question, Where was Jesus during the week days? for no one knows. All we

know is that He appeared to them *on Sundays*.

### "After Eight Days."

If it be argued that the phrase "after eight days" (John 20: 26) would denote the *ninth* day, we reply: The expressions, "*after three days*," and "*on the third day*," are identical expressions, for they are used to denote the time from Christ's burial to His resurrection. (Compare Matt. 16: 21; 20: 18, with Matt. 27: 63, 64; and Esther 4: 16, with Esther 5: 1.) The latter reference shows that though Esther was to fast "*three days*" before going in unto the king, she fulfilled the time by appearing "*on the third day*." Hence the expressions, "*after eight days*," and "*on the eighth day*," meant the same to a Jew. Now starting with *Sunday* as *one*, the next *Sunday* will be the "*eighth day*," or "*after eight days*," as John (20: 26) styles it. *Sunday*, therefore, was *consecutively observed* by the *Lord* after His resurrection, establishing it as "*the Lord's Day*."

### Sunday Continuously Observed From A. D. 33.

*This day* continued to be observed by all disciples throughout the Apostolic period, as is undeniably proved from Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2; Rev. 1: 10, and its observance continued as "the queen and chief of all the days" (*Ignatius, Ad Magn.* c. 9) throughout the centuries immediately following the Apostles. When *Sabbatarians*, therefore, charge that *Constantine*, a Romish emperor (A. D. 321), "changed" the Sabbath to Sunday, they deliberately *pervert the truth*. Observance of Sunday as the distinctively *Christian meeting day*, originated in joint-meetings of *Christ* and *His Apostles*. Not even once did these ever assemble as Christian worshippers on a Sabbath day, after the resurrection. Christ kept the last Sabbath of God's law *in the tomb*. It has never since been kept by any man in obedience to God's command. It was *buried with Christ* and by Him *left in the tomb* forever.

### Significance of the First Day of the Week.

As pointed out by the Fathers (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67), the *Lord's Day* is the *first day* God ever

made, and of course the first day of the *first week* of time. *Light* was created on that day, succeeding the "gloom profound" that had brooded over "the face of the deep" (Gen. 1: 1) in true *sabbatic silence* for ages past. From some activity in æons past Jehovah, with "the heavens and earth," was observing a *sabbath rest*, which was suddenly *broken* by the Spirit's *moving* "upon the face of the waters" in the incubation of *light*. How fitting, then, the *stirring in the tomb* on that glorious "first day of the week" that incubated the *Spiritual Light* that "brought life and immortality to light" among men! (2 Tim. 1: 10.) The glorious "Light of the world," breaking the darkness and silence of the tomb and creating Hope of life eternal in the human breast, cast "His beams athwart" an erstwhile hopeless world *on the first day of the week*—the first week of a *new creation*, the *Spiritual System* of "the end of the ages." Any *other day* for this Event would have spoiled the type-mold of the material creation.

The Ten Commandments—the Constitution of the Law of Moses—were spoken to Israel on the first day of the week. It was the inauguration day of the Old Covenant and the national economy of Israel, and it was necessary that this *beginning day* of the commonwealth be the first day of the week. The *beginning day* of the material world, of the Jewish economy, of the fact of the resurrection, and of the Christian economy, was "the first day of the week;" for the inauguration of the Christian Institution, the Church of Christ, occurred on the day of Pentecost, which *always* fell on Sunday. (Acts 2.) The Law, which itself was given on Sunday, designated and consecrated *Sunday* as a day of special convocation. (Levit. 23: 15, 21.) It was called "the morrow after the Sabbath." It was the *fiftieth day* from the Passover. Hence the Greeks named it "*Pentecost*."

#### Pentecost Always Fell on Sunday.

While it counted "from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering" (Levit. 23: 15), it also had to always be "on the morrow after the Sabbath" (*Ibid.*), no matter on what day of the week the preceding ceremony took place. This invariably

placed Pentecost on *Sunday*.

The Israelites were required to observe this Sunday with "a new meal-offering unto Jehovah" (v. 16), "for *first-fruits*" unto Him (v. 17). The entire ceremonies of this day were to be "*new*." It was to be a day of "holy convocation" (or *meeting*), in which "no servile work" was to be done, and it was a perpetual institution (v. 21). This ceremony *distinguished this day* in the Jewish calendar, for it was designed to forecast that Great Pentecost when the "First-fruits" of the dead, Jesus our Savior, was to be *waved* as a final and efficacious *Peace-offering* unto Jehovah for the sins of the world.

#### Sunday Not a Sabbath in Any Sense.

The Lord's Day was never appointed as a *sabbath*. Nevertheless its *convocational* nature—the *meeting* upon this day "to break bread"—demands cessation from work, at least to some extent; for people cannot *assemble* together and *work* at the same time. Christians, therefore, because of the very nature of the Lord's Day requirements, are forced to *desist* from secular labor on at least a portion of the day. Nothing is divinely said about the length of time to be devoted to the meeting "to break bread;" they can remain in convocation *the entire day*, if they so desire. This would make the day a *sabbath* to all so observing the Lord's Day convocation; but the nature of this *sabbath* would vastly differ from the *Sabbath* of the Old Covenant. That *Sabbath* was divinely exacted of no Christian, and the reason is apparent: the Lord's Day exactions make *that day*, or at least a part of it, sufficiently *sabbatical* to take the place as a *rest day* of the old *Sabbath*. In other words, Christians would have had *two rest days* together, had they been required to also keep the old *Sabbath*. *Sunday* did not "take the place" of the *Sabbath*. *That day died* with the resurrection of Christ and its "place" cannot be filled by any other day. *Sunday* has a meaning all its own, and while Christians must *cease from labor* while observing the Lord's Day requirements, the *Day* has never by divine appointment been established as a *Sabbath*. If any individual wishes to *rest the entire day*, he may

do so: God makes no demand otherwise. The rule is best expressed by Paul, thus:

"One [Christian] man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord." (Rom. 14: 5, 6.) That expresses the "*liberty*" Christians enjoy as to *sabbath* keeping. It is the "*liberty* wherewith Christ hath made us free" (Gal. 5: 1) and we are commanded to "*stand fast in*" that liberty, allowing no man to bring us under "a yoke of bondage" regarding this *day* or any other matter pertaining to Christian liberty.

There is no word from God requiring Christians to either *rest* or *labor* on the first day of the week. He only requires them to *assemble* on this day to *break bread* (Acts 20: 7), leaving them free to choose their own program for the remainder of the day. If they wish to spend the entire day in convocation, they are free to do so; if they wish to spend it in *rest*, they may do so; if they wish to enjoy recreation in the remaining portion of the day, they are not prohibited by any divine law; but this latter enjoyment, or the tendency to want to *labor* on this day, while not by any divine law *prohibited*, is rather to be regulated by the solemn significance of the *Day*, which, to the truly *devout soul*, begets a tendency to *spiritual* or *religious meditation* that eschews *secular business* of every form on this Day. Certainly, then, all efforts of *Sabbatarians* to convert the Lord's Day into a purely *secular* or common day, are hostile to Christianity. This Day *differs* from all others because of the example of the resurrected Lord and of His disciples for three hundred years following. To treat it as other days is to *show contempt* for their *example*. *Christians* do not do this. *Sabbatarians* do. Then, as if in prophetic view of the latter sin, Paul commands Christians to "*forsake not*" their *own assembling together*, as some were then doing (Heb. 10: 25), but to keep "*the day*" in mind and to exhort others to do likewise. That this "*day*" was the first day of the week is absolutely sure, from the well known fact that their "*own assembling together*" was invariably upon this Day. (John 20: 19, 26;

Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2.) *As Christians* they never once convened upon the *Sabbath day*. In cities *where there was no Church of Christ* Paul was accustomed to preaching, temporarily, in the Jewish synagogues, which were attended by the *unbelieving Jews* on the *Sabbath days* (see Acts 17: 1, 2); but in places where there *was* a Church of Christ Paul assembled with the brethren "upon the first day of the week." (Acts 20: 7.)

### Purpose of the Lord's Day Assembling.

The primary purpose of the disciples for three or four hundred years after the resurrection in meeting on Sunday, was "to break bread." This was called "the Lord's Supper." (1 Cor. 11: 20.) This was the one memorial feast of the Christian Church, observed in memory of the *death* of Christ, upon the day of His *resurrection*. His *death* procured the remission of our sins, and His *resurrection*, the hope of life eternal. His death we celebrate as a *triumph*, hence upon the *Day* of His *resurrection* from death. The *solemnity* of His *death* is thus turned into the exuberant *joy* that finds a spontaneous outburst in *praise*. Thus the service is marked by acts that denote an intelligent thanksgiving and appreciation of all that was done for us by Christ. *He*, therefore, is the *center* and *soul* of the Lord's Day celebration.

Belonging to the Lord's Day celebration of Christ's death are the *praise*, the *prayers*, and the *contribution* of financial means for various needs. (See Acts 2: 42; 1 Cor. 16: 1-4.) The praise consists of *singing* "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16). The prayers embraced all that the term means. The contribution was a *liberal, cheerful* donation into a common *treasury*. This latter service was a distinct feature of the "first day of the week" meeting. (1 Cor. 16: 2.) Christ instituted the common treasury, and Judas was treasurer (John 13: 29) until the crucifixion. Christ also instituted *singing* at the celebration of the Lord's Supper (Matt. 26: 30); and finding these things "*continued*" in the establishment of the Church on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 42), and later on mentioned in connection with the first day of the week meetings (Acts

20: 7; 1 Cor. 11: 20-30; 16: 1, 2), we are compelled to recognize them *as a part* of the Supper celebration.

### Dangerously Close to Wilful Sin.

To some, these may not seem so important; but to all who weigh well the importance attached to them by Christians for three hundred years after the resurrection, especially by *Christ Himself* and by the *Spirit-guided disciples* through the New Testament history, the importance of the entire service appears infinite. These words have infinite meaning: "Not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins," etc. (Heb. 10: 25, 26.)

This passage strongly hints that any *forsaking* of the first day of the week *assembling* is *wilful sin*. The "assembling" referred to is made certain by the words "*our own assembling together*," which thoroughly *distinguishes* it from the assemblings of the *Jews*, which were universally upon the *Sabbath day*. This makes the Lord's Day assembling a solemn duty the neglect of which is closely connected with the fearful *wilful sin*. What, then, must be the fate of *Sabbatarians* who scrupulously *determine* to habitually *forsake* the very "assembling" that Christians must call *their own*, for an assembling that was the universal custom of all *disbelieving Jews*?

The *sinfulness* of "forsaking" the Christian "assembling" is evident when we remember that upon *this day*, in *this assembling*, the "*Lord's death*" is remembered by all those *redeemed by that death*. To forget to "*remember*" such a sacrifice is to *wilfully* do so, and the thing *forgotten* is the *only Sacrifice* provided for *our sins*. Hence "there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins," when *this* is ignored; which is done when Christians *forsake* the first day of the week *assembling*. Truly, men pay a tremendous price for the "privilege" of *keeping the Sabbath*, when that observance plunges them in *wilful sin*, by *forbidding* them to observe the "*Lord's death*" upon the "*Lord's Day*"!

### "Meager References to Sunday" Studied: (Acts 20: 7)

It is usually argued by those who disregard Sunday that so little is said in the New Testament about it, it being mentioned only *three times* as "the first day of the week" (John 20: 19; Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2), and once as "the Lord's Day" (Rev. 1: 10).

That is sufficient—for all who *believe those texts*. We have already studied John's statements. Luke, in Acts 20: 7, conclusively shows that it was the *custom* of all the disciples to meet on that day *to break bread*; for he only mentions it in passing, without one word of *explanation*, which proves it to have been a custom *familiar to all his readers*, one needing no explanation. It was their custom to meet together on Sunday to break bread; and whether Paul's presence under extraordinary circumstances caused *this particular* Supper to be eaten at an odd hour, or not, in no wise militates against the custom of the disciples to meet together *on that day* for that *especial purpose*. Luke says *their purpose* in coming together *on that day* was "*to break bread*." They *did* what they *purposed* to do, unless *defeated* in that purpose. It is the *purpose* of those Spirit-guided disciples that determines what *our purpose* should be to correspond with *their custom*; for their *purpose* was their *custom*—and should be *ours*. But, whatever, by force of extraordinary circumstances on *this* occasion, *they did*, the fact remains that they came together *on this day* for their customary purpose of *breaking bread* or eating the Lord's Supper. That sufficiently declares and establishes what *our custom* should be. We need nothing more.

Incidentally, we believe that the "bread" "broken" by the Apostle on this occasion after midnight (verse 11), was a meal for refreshment, and not the Lord's Supper for the eating of which they came together on the first *day* of the week. Certainly Paul would need refreshment at such a time, and since *he alone* did the *eating* at this hour ("and when *he* was gone up, and broken the bread, and had eaten, and had talked with them a long while, even till break of day, so *he* departed"), we feel certain that the Sup-

per had been attended to *at the time* for which they came together, and that that Service had been prolonged by Paul's discourse.

### 1 Corinthians 16: 1, 2:

In the directions given to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2) there is another wholly sufficient custom indicated. No explanation is given by Paul as to *why* he named "the first day of the week" for this contribution; which shows that his readers well knew what *this day* meant—what was the universal custom of the churches of Christ. It was their *regular custom* to meet together on *this day*, and it was a recognized part of their duty to *contribute* of their means on this day in obedience to the "will of God." This is plain from 2 Cor. 8: 1-6. When commending the Macedonian churches for being so ready to help him in raising a special fund for the Judean saints (the contribution particularly emphasized in 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2), Paul says: "And this [liberality] not as we had hoped, but first they gave their own selves to the Lord, and to us [in raising this fund] through the will of God." (2 Cor. 8: 5.) They were accustomed to regular and systematic giving on the first day of the week, in keeping with "the will of the Lord," these funds being applied to local needs; and when they perceived that Paul's mission was urgent, and just, they, ever mindful of the will of the Lord, immediately *diverted their means to this channel*, or as Paul styles it, they gave themselves "to us through the will of God." What they gave to God *regularly* they now, through His will, give to *this particular cause*. That this was done *on* the first day of the week is certain, unless it can be shown that the Apostles had a different rule for Macedonia to the one laid down for the Corinthians and the Galatians. The latter were commanded to make their offerings on the first day of the week. (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.) And Paul told the Corinthians, who had the first day of the week *order* direct from him, that he *gloried* to the Macedonians, that Corinth had obeyed his order and had been "prepared for a year past" with means collected according to this order. (See 2 Cor. 9: 2.) Macedonia could not, therefore, have

been *ignorant* of the *order* given to Corinth. This is all the more certain when we note that the 2 Corinthian epistle *was written in Macedonia*. Therefore we reason that the *order* for the first day of the week donation was *universal* throughout the Gentile churches. No one can rationally deny this.

So the "little" that is said about "the first day of the week" in the Christian Scriptures, amounts to the incontrovertible fact that it is a Christian institution and the *forsaking* of its observance borders dangerously close to the *wilful sin!*

It is not in any sense the "Christian Sabbath," because *Christianity has no Sabbath*. We have seen that, beginning on the day of Christ's resurrection, His disciples invariably assembled upon *Sunday*, and never upon *Saturday*, which was the Sabbath day. The Sabbath *died* with Christ and *slept on in death* while the *resurrected* Christ held joyful convocation with His disciples upon *another day*. This *new day* is the *Christian day*; not a *Sabbath*, but a day for Christians to *assemble to remember Christ's death* in His own instituted *Memorial*, the Lord's Supper.

### Sunday Observance Not a Papal Enactment.

Sabbatarians attempt to excite Protestant prejudice against Sunday observance, by telling them that Constantine the Great (A. D. 321), a Roman emperor (who, in political form only, espoused the Christian religion and for the first time in its history endowed it "with that instrument of worldly power" that has made it ever since a recognized force in all civilized governments), "*changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday*," by his famous Edict.

No more *studied misrepresentation of the truth* has ever been taught than this idea of Sunday observance *originating* with Constantine. *It originated with CHRIST*. And by His Apostles and disciples it was *perpetuated for three hundred years* before Constantine's Edict. Who does not *know* this? Rome has enough crimes against God, of her own, without being *falsely charged*. Had Constantine actually *made* such a change in the Divine law, he would be worthy of eternal contempt; but of *this* he died *innocent*. The actual *crime* committed in this

matter lies at the door of *Sabbatarianism!* These have *actually done* the very thing they have *charged against the Pope*; namely, the *changing of the law*. They have *changed* the law of Christ by substituting the abrogated seventh-day *Sabbath* for the authoritative *first day of the week*, the day consecrated by Christ's *presence* and *blessing* consecutively given during the forty days from His resurrection to His ascension. And they have done this in the face of the indisputable fact that Christ's disciples, following His example, assembled exclusively upon the first day of the week. A people who can *thus reverse* an *inspired precedent* (equivalent to a *Divine Law*), are not the people to sit in judgment over the Popes for committing the *same sin*; "for thou that judgest dost practise the same things." (Rom. 2: 1.) If it is a "mark of the beast" in the Popes to change the law of God, as Sabbatarians correctly teach, it is no less than a "mark of the beast" in Sabbatarians to do the same thing. Only "the beast" could move a people to openly *refuse* to assemble "upon the first day of the week to break bread," when it is *known* that Christ's disciples, under inspired guidance, *did thus assemble*. In their zeal to honor the *abrogated law of Moses* Sabbatarians *dishonor the living law of Christ*. They reject God's *Son* and rever God's *servant*, making the latter their *Lord*, and the Lord Himself a Teacher of *secondary importance*—to be followed *only as He followed Moses!* Such is Sabbatarianism. We challenge a denial.

To prevent just such a move on the part of professing Christians, God had His Son transfigured before Peter, James, and John; and there appeared to them, talking with Christ, *Moses*, the Lawgiver, and *Elijah*, the national Reformer; and a Voice warned the spectators concerning *Christ*: "This is my beloved *Son*, in whom I am well pleased; *hear ye Him*." (Matt. 17: 5.) Sabbatarians *disobey* that *Voice*. They *turn from Christ* to Moses and Elijah. "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by *the law*; ye are fallen away from *grace*." (Gal. 5: 4.) The Gospel cannot reach Sabbatarians—*until they leave the Old Law*, for "Christ is the *end of the Law* unto righteousness to every one that *believeth*." (Rom. 10: 4.)

### Another Change of Divine Law.

Speaking of *changing* Divine law, the Sabbatarians and the Catholics are not the only cults that do that. All Protestant denominations, that assemble on Sunday merely for worship and entertainment, *without once observing the Lord's Supper*, deliberately reject the authority of Apostolic teaching and example. The disciples in New Testament times assembled on Sunday "*to break bread*." Where Sunday is "*kept*" *without* the Supper observance, it is *changed* into a mere *Sabbath*, for which there is not a semblance of Divine authority. Sunday is *not* a Sabbath; it is a day in the seven appointed for remembering the Lord's death by eating the Lord's Supper. When professing Christians refuse to *thus* observe the day, employing it for *another purpose*, they *change the law* as certainly as do the Sabbatarians in despising the Day altogether. Why do either? Why not observe the Day just like the disciples did? What is wrong with their example? Who is holding people back from imitating the New Testament example? Ah! "The mark of the beast" appears prominent.

It is nothing but a "commandment of men" that calls professing Christians together upon the Lord's Day, then sends them home *without the Lord's Supper*. Whether *Adventists* or *Methodists*, *Armenian* or *Calvinist*, the sin is the same; all deliberately reject the known practice of the Spirit-guided disciples. People cannot serve Christ in *obeying men*. (Gal. 1: 10; Matt. 4: 10; 2 John 9.)

I recently read a "missionary report" in a Seventh-Day Adventist paper, in which the writer very enthusiastically said: "When we began work in this community most of the religious people were meeting on the first day of the week; but the Lord be praised! we got many of them to see their sin, and now they meet only on the Sabbath day." That is a plain admission that the work of the Adventists in that community was *changing the law of Christ*. That is *their mission* everywhere: they are sent out for the prime purpose of teaching men to *turn away* from *Christian doctrine* and example, to the "*doctrine and commandments of men*" called "Seventh-Day Adventists;" and every proselyte made by them



is "two-fold more a son of hell than" themselves. (Matt. 23: 15.) Christ named that ratio because of the truth that "evil men and imposters shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." (2 Tim. 3: 13.) The *Papacy* is but a development of that immutable principle. Error "will eat as doth a *gangrene*" (a *cancer*) (2 Tim. 2: 17), and that is why a *convert* to a false doctrine is more in league with "*hell*" than was his *teacher*; though "if the blind guide the blind, *both* shall fall into a pit." (Matt. 15: 14.) Therefore: "*Take heed what ye hear.*" (Mark 4: 24; Luke 8: 18.)

By E. C. FUQUA

3111 Grover Street, Fort Worth, Texas

Religion Analysis Service, Inc.

P. O. Box B, Traffic Station  
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota