

THE LORD'S DAY

or, THE SABBATH

"Not under law but under grace"

A REPLY TO
SEVENTH DAY
ADVENTISTS

BY

NORMAN C. DECK

MISSIONARY, BRITISH SOLOMON ISLANDS



PICKERING & INGLIS

14 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
229 BOTHWELL STREET, GLASGOW, C.2

Preface

IT is well known that although the great majority of Christians observe Sunday, the first day of the week, as a day to be specially set apart for the worship of God and as a day of rest, yet a body of people called Seventh Day Adventists, have gone back to the seventh day, Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, for their day of rest and worship. These people are very zealous in insisting that they are the only people who are obeying God in the matter, and are continually judging and finding fault with other Christians for not observing the seventh-day Sabbath; and this in spite of the clear warning given by the Apostle Paul in Colossians 2. 16, which says: "Let no man therefore judge you...in respect of...a sabbath day."

If Seventh Day Adventists would only keep their peculiar views to themselves, not much notice would be taken, to their own Master they stand or fall (Rom. 14. 4-6). But they are most persistent in seeking out uninstructed Christians amongst the Churches, and in flooding the land with pamphlets and booklets attacking the practice of the Churches, with a view to making proselytes. The writer of this booklet is a missionary into whose immediate field they have lately entered, and it became very necessary to go carefully into the seventh-day question and other erroneous Seventh Day Adventist doctrines, in order to safeguard native converts already won. Seventh Day Adventists do not observe comity of missions, so they do not hesitate to enter any mission field; and it is alas, common experience that they seek to proselytise converts already won by existing missions. This is said in all charity, for among this body one comes across true earnest believers in our Lord, whose lives are better than their doctrines, and who honestly think that they are doing God a service in urging the seventh day on other Christians.

It is thought that this booklet may prove of value to other missionaries, and any others, who like the writer, have to face Seventh Day Adventists propaganda in their fields of work, and those who have limited time or occasion for going thoroughly into the matter. For it must be remembered that Seventh Day Adventists are trained controversialists on the Sabbath question from their point of view. It is their *forte*. They have at their fingers' ends prepared replies to the usual objections brought forward by Christians against observance of the seventh day of the week. So much so that the average Christian who has not given the matter special study, will surely get the worst of an argument with a Seventh Day Adventist in the matter. Indeed it is far better for such a person to resolutely refuse to argue the question unless he is fully prepared. It is with the object of providing him with such a preparation that this booklet is written.

The writer is very much indebted to D. M. Canright's "Seventh Day Adventism Renounced," published by Revell, U.S.A. This book is invaluable, and should be studied by those desiring fuller information. Mr. Canright was a prominent minister and writer of that faith for twenty-eight years, but came out from among them after becoming convinced that their teachings were not Scriptural. On the other side, Seventh Day Adventists literature has been studied with care, in order that their arguments may be fairly met without misrepresentation. Amongst their writings may be mentioned Conradi and Andrews' "History of the Sabbath" (revised edition) C. B. Haynes' "Christain Sabbath," M. C. Wilcox' "The Lord's Day," G. I. Butler's "The Change of the Sabbath." What has been here written has been written without animus in any form, bearing constantly in mind the exhortation of the Apostle Paul in Romans 14. 4-6, 10. It may be wondered why so much notice has been taken of these Seventh Day Adventist writings, why quote them so much? Some of their arguments seem very futile, yet it is just these very arguments which have to be met on the field among

converts. Also this examination of their arguments may possibly open the eyes of some of them to the weakness of their position, though we doubt if this is really possible, so entrenched are they in their beliefs. It is most difficult for anyone who has publicly taken up a strong dogmatic position to ever recede from it, such is human nature. Our quotations of Scripture unless otherwise indicated are from the English Revised Version.

Contents

	PAGE
CHAPTER I	
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST CLAIMS,	8
CHAPTER II	
THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS' MAIN PLANK, ..	11
CHAPTER III	
THE CONTEXT PROVES THE DECALOGUE TO BE JEWISH,	18
CHAPTER IV	
THE DECALOGUE SET ASIDE WITH THE OLD COVENANT,	24
CHAPTER V	
A SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS' DEMURRER,	29
CHAPTER VI	
THE TWO-LAW THEORY,	38
CHAPTER VII	
A CHANGE IN THE LAW,	52
CHAPTER VIII	
OUR LORD AND THE SABBATH,.. .. .	64
CHAPTER IX	
THE APOSTLE PAUL ON THE SABBATH,	74
CHAPTER X	
THE SABBATH AS A TYPE,	91
CHAPTER XI	
THE CHANGE AFTER CALVARY,	100
CHAPTER XII	
THE BIRTHDAY OF THE CHURCH,	107

CONTENTS

7

	PAGE
CHAPTER XIII	
THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS	122
CHAPTER XIV	
THE CHRISTIAN DAY OF WORSHIP IN THE SUB- APOSTOLIC CHURCH,	126
CHAPTER XV	
THE CHRISTIAN AND THE LORD'S DAY,	146
A FINAL SUMMING UP,	155

CHAPTER I

Seventh Day Adventist Claims

SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS claim that they have a special last message to the world before the coming of Christ. In their booklet "The Christian Sabbath," by Carlyle B. Haynes, we read: "As in the days of Elijah, so to-day, God's people have forsaken the commandments of God in the acceptance of the false and counterfeit Sunday institution, and therefore God is sending them to-day a message to bring them back to their allegiance to the commandments, calling for a reform on the question of the Sabbath, revealing that the seventh day is the Sabbath and that it should be kept by His people. This message is the fulfilment of the prophecy of the coming of Elijah," page 116; "It is God's final message," page 128; "Like every other special message of the Gospel, the salvation of all who hear it will be found in obeying it," page 116; "In this wonderful message there is salvation from the destruction which is soon to come upon the world, and in it there is abundant entrance into the Kingdom of God. 'Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city' (Rev. 22. 14), p. 128; "those who accept the last message of God to the earth, and bring their lives, through the grace of Christ, into harmony with His commandments, will enter into the city of God," page 128.

Such are their very astounding claims! And yet they make them in all seriousness, and with a zeal without knowledge, as it seems to us, are seeking to press them upon Christians in general. Notice, in passing, the inaccurate reference to Revelation 22. 14, above; they cannot but be aware of the correction the Revised Version makes, to which agree all modern critical texts. The original Greek reads, "wash their robes," not "do his commandments." Is this candid? Why build upon

a textual reading which is known to be defective? Then notice the unscriptural doctrine of salvation by works, that is to say, by Sabbath keeping. The Apostle Paul says, "By grace are ye saved through faith...not of works" (Eph. 2. 8).

Seventh Day Adventists even go as far as connecting the observance of the first day of the week with the "mark of the beast" of Revelation 14. 9-11. Thus Mrs. White their prophetess says, "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark"* This is exceedingly grave, for Revelation 14. 9-11, prophesies that "if any man worship the Beast and receive his mark...the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God...and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone...for ever and ever." One Seventh Day Adventist told the writer that it was this very Scripture which scared him into keeping the Sabbath.

In this controversy it sometimes happens that the very opposers of Seventh Day Adventists teaching put a weapon right into the hands of that party. This they do by contending that the seventh day Sabbath has been changed by Christ or by the Apostles into the first day of the week. For when they are challenged by Seventh Day Adventists to produce any text from Scripture authorising this change, it is soon found that no such Scripture can be found. Seventh Day Adventists have often offered a large reward to anyone who can find one verse of Scripture authorising this change, or commanding people to keep the first day of the week holy; and they are quite safe. Of course it would be equally safe to offer a similar reward for a text commanding the Church to observe the seventh day, but this in passing. We understand that among Seventh Day Adventists sisters partake of the Lord's Supper; yet there is not a single instance of this in the New Testament, nor is there any command to do so. On the other hand, while there is no command to observe the Lord's Day, the first day of the week, yet we certainly have an instance of such observance in Acts 20. 7. So actually there is more authority for the observance of

* "The Great Controversy," vol. 4., p. 281, quoted by Canright.

the first day than for a Seventh Day Adventist sister to partake of the Lord's Supper. The truth is that the Jewish Sabbath has never been changed; but in fulfilment of Hosea 2. 11, it has been, during the present dispensation, "made to cease," together with the other Jewish feast days and new moons:

"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies" (Hos. 2. 11).

This is in consequence of Israel having become, for the time being, "lo-ammi," *i.e.* not God's people, as prophesied in Hosea 1. 9; but more of this anon.

Again, when people refer to the first day of the week as the "Christian Sabbath," and appeal to the fourth commandment as authority for its due observance, they play directly into the hands of the Seventh Day Adventist. As we shall prove later, the correct name for the Christian day of worship is the "Lord's Day." In the New Testament the first day of the week is never called a "sabbath" (nor indeed is it in the writings of the sub-apostolical church), but carefully differentiated from it. Nor is the Sabbath ever called "the Lord's Day." On the contrary the inspired writers of the New Testament always identify the Sabbath with the seventh day and with no other.

So, if in this inquiry into what we believe is Seventh Day Adventist error, we discover that we ourselves have to adjust our views on the Sabbath question in the interests of the truth, so much the better; for we are persuaded that among Christians generally who observe the first day, there is much ignorance and looseness of thought on the matter.

CHAPTER II

The Seventh Day Adventists' Main Plank

THE main plank of the Seventh Day Adventist platform for the universal observance of the Sabbath (the seventh day) is undoubtedly that the keeping of this day is commanded in the Decalogue. In C. B. Haynes' book referred to above it is argued that Jerusalem is the centre of the earth, the Temple the centre of Jerusalem, the Law the centre of the Temple, and the Sabbath the centre of the Law, "It is the centre of centres!" There you have it. One would have thought the Shekinah Glory the centre of the Temple. But, be that as it may, one thing is clear, the fourth commandment is of paramount importance to Seventh Day Adventists, the whole weight of their argument rests here. Suppose, for instance, a Seventh Day Adventist is asked, why, if he keeps the weekly sabbath, does he not keep the yearly sabbath of Leviticus 25. 1-24? Does not the sabbath principle inhere in both? Are they not both called a "sabbath unto Jehovah?" (See Lev. 23. 3; 25, 2). He will reply that the yearly sabbath is not part of the Decalogue like the weekly sabbath, but is contained in the "ceremonial law," which was only for the Jews, and so passed away at Calvary. Thus in effect Seventh Day Adventists claim that the Decalogue, unlike the other laws of the Pentateuch, is binding as a code of laws upon mankind in general for all time, and is not for the Jews only.

If indeed the fourth commandment, as it is worded in the Decalogue, is binding as a moral commandment on mankind, then undoubtedly Christians ought to keep the seventh-day sabbath. But in attempting to press the fourth commandment on Christians Seventh Day Adventists make two assumptions; first, that the Decalogue as a code is binding upon mankind; second, that the

fourth commandment is like the other nine moral in its nature. These two assumptions must be carefully tested; this we shall now proceed to do.

We must first inquire whether it is true that the Decalogue, as a code of laws, was intended as a moral standard for mankind in general? If care is taken to examine its exact wording and its context it will become perfectly plain, that it was not so intended.

First let us notice to whom it was addressed. Read Exodus 20. 1-17 and Deuteronomy 5. 4-22.

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have none other gods before Me. Thou shalt not make...Remember the sabbath day...Thou shalt not covet...anything that is thy neighbour's."

"The Lord spake with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before Me. Thou shalt not make...Observe the sabbath day...Neither shalt thou covet...anything that is thy neighbour's."

It is to be observed that the word "saying" introduces the code in both quotations. Immediately following the version in Deuteronomy we find the words:

"These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them upon two tables of stone, and gave them unto me."

It is quite clear from these quotations that the Decalogue as a code commences with the words, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," so that it is addressed to Israel of whom alone this was true. It is also clear from the passage in Deuteronomy that these same words were written upon the two tables of stone by God Himself.

Now it is a remarkable thing that Seventh Day Adventists, when ostensibly quoting the Decalogue as a whole,

usually mutilate it by the omission of these very words, which constitute its signature as it were. Usually their version of the Decalogue starts abruptly: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." On the face of it such a wording is incomplete. Who is the "Me" referred to? Obviously "the Lord (Jehovah) thy God." Seventh Day Adventists often inveigh against the Church of Rome, accusing them, in the words of Daniel 7. 25, that they "think to change the times and the law," and instance their deletion of the second commandment against graven images; but are they not themselves guilty of a similar treatment of the Decalogue in this defective quotation of theirs? They are even bold enough to say, "There is nothing in the first commandment which reveals who it is that gives the law. It declares that 'Thou shalt have no other gods before Me;' but it does not tell who it is that speaks."* And again, "If the ten commandments were without the fourth the law of God would contain no signature."† So, also, Mrs. White, their Prophetess, who says, "Aside from this precept (the sabbath) there is nothing in the Decalogue to show by whose authority the law was given."‡ We can scarcely believe our eyes! Such statements are utterly misleading. Whether we take the words "I am the Lord thy God...house of bondage" as part of the first commandment, or as a preface, they are a necessary and integral part of the Decalogue, and if quoted, specifically and very definitely do what Seventh Day Adventists deny. As in so many Eastern documents the signature opens the code. Compare for instance Ezra 7. 12; also many of the Epistles in the New Testament. In Seventh Day Adventist public tent meetings they often hang up a wall-sheet with the Decalogue printed in full, but with the foregoing omission. This is surely significant; a full quotation would give their case away at once, for it would be immediately apparent to the public that the Decalogue is addressed to people who had come out of the land of Egypt, namely the Jews, but

* C. B. Haynes, "The Christian Sabbath," p. 32.

† "Idem," p. 32.

‡ "Great Controversy," p. 284.

that is precisely what Seventh Day Adventists would wish to keep out of sight. What an illustration of the tendency so common to all, to distort or even to suppress facts, when there is a preconceived or pet theory to uphold. May we all ever pray for grace and humility that we may squarely face and accept the truth whatever it may be, for we are all liable to bias.

Secondly, it also seems significant that Seventh Day Adventists, when quoting the fourth commandment, generally avoid the version found in Deuteronomy 5. 12-15. And why? Let us quote verse 15 and our question will answer itself:

"And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the sabbath day."

These words are not found in the Exodus version; but whether they were included in what was written on the tables of stone or not, they are here incorporated by inspiration of God in the fourth commandment, and were binding upon the Children of Israel, giving a Divine reason why the Sabbath was given to Israel at the giving of the manna, namely, because they had been brought out from Egypt by Jehovah's mighty hand and stretched out arm. Just as the Children of Israel were to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, so also they were to remember that God had brought them out in this mighty fashion, and that the former depended on the latter; both are commanded.

Do not the above words clearly limit the fourth commandment to those who were in bondage in Egypt and came out thence, that is Israel? It is manifestly quite impossible for a Christian to obey the fourth commandment as here given, for the simple reason that neither he nor his ancestors were ever there under Pharaoh. Consequently there can be no "therefore the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the Sabbath day holy" in his case.

The commandment, however, is always applicable to the Jew, for he was there in the person of his ancestors

with whom in God's sight he is identified. It is clear that the word "thou" in the Decalogue here is to be taken in a national sense, it is "thou," the nation. We must remember that these words in Deuteronomy 5. 15 were addressed to a generation who had not served in bondage in Egypt; all those who had actually served under Pharaoh were now dead with the exception of Caleb, Joshua, and Moses. Thus the words "thou," "thy," "thee," in the Decalogue mean the nation Israel, though this necessarily includes the individual. Clearly then the Decalogue is only addressed to the nation Israel and cannot apply to other nations or individuals of them.

In the third place, there are other parts of the Decalogue yet which limit it to the Jewish nation. Let us examine the words, "nor the stranger that is within thy gates," in the fourth commandment. The word "stranger" (Heb., *ger*) here is a Jewish local expression, meaning a man of foreign extraction who was a sojourner in the land, as distinguished from an alien or foreigner (Heb. *zar*, or *nekar*), a mere visitor or traveller. This "stranger" then is a naturalized Gentile living amongst the Jews. Such a "stranger" appears to have been eligible to all civil positions except that of a king (Deut. 17. 15); but if he was a bondman or slave he had to be circumcised (Exod. 12. 44); but if independent it was optional; but if he was not circumcised he could not partake of the Passover (Exod. 12. 48); but if circumcised no distinction existed as regards legal rights (Lev. 19. 34). The word "gates" is also a Jewish technical expression and not of universal application. The "gates" of Jewish cities held a very important place in the public economy. The term sometimes represents the city itself (Gen. 22. 17); they were especially places of public resort (Gen. 19. 1; 23. 10, etc.), (2) places of public deliberation, administration of justice, of audience of kings, rulers, and ambassadors (Deut. 16. 18; Josh. 20. 4; 1 Sam. 4. 18), places for public markets (2 Kings 7. 1). Plainly then we have in the fourth commandment a purely Jewish national law, which in the precise form in which it is expressed, could not apply to the Church at the present time.

Fourthly, "That thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." These words from the fifth commandment plainly limit the Decalogue to the Jew; for no one, not even a Seventh Day Adventist, will question the fact that "the Land" here can only refer to the "promised land," Canaan. No land is promised down here to the Christian. He is, while upon the earth, a "stranger and a pilgrim" (1 Peter 2. 11), an "ambassador for Christ" (2 Cor. 5. 20), his "citizenship (A.V., conversation) is in Heaven" (Phil. 3. 20). He is not looking so much for longevity of life down here as is promised in this commandment to the Jew as for the Coming of his Lord, or to "depart and be with Christ which is far better" (Phil. 1. 23). It is ever to be borne in mind that the blessings promised to Israel under the Law were temporal and earthly (Deut. 28). On the other hand the blessings promised to the Christian are spiritual and Heavenly (Rom. 8. 18, 19).

It ought to be quite plain by now that the Decalogue though it contains principles which apply to all ages, as a code of laws, is purely Jewish and local in its jurisdiction. The use of the Decalogue by the Protestant Churches has been, rightly or wrongly, as a collection of principles, not as a precise literal code. In this respect the principle of a weekly rest day reappears in the Lord's Day of the Church of God. We are inclined to think that this use of the Decalogue has laid the Churches open to attack at the hands of sabbatarians. For if we go to the fourth commandment as authority for the enforcement of the Lord's Day we are simply inviting such an attack.

Just here it would seem appropriate to notice one possible rejoinder to the fact that the Decalogue is a purely Jewish code and is not therefore directly applicable to mankind in general. It is this, Seventh Day Adventists teach that Israel, as a nation, is cast off for ever by God, but that Gentiles upon believing on Christ become instead the "true Israel," and they make the claim that they constitute this "true Israel," and therefore keep the Decalogue. Now there is no doubt that Israel may be taken as an illustration of the Church, and an Israelite

as an illustration of the believer who has been delivered spiritually from bondservice to a greater Pharaoh, and who has spiritually come out of an Egypt, spiritually has been promised a Canaan, *i.e.*, a life of blessing and victory over every besetting sin; to such the spiritual principles embodied in the Decalogue are applicable; as such he keeps the spiritual principle of a weekly day of rest and worship when he observes the Lord's Day, the first day of the week. But the Seventh Day Adventists will have none of this; they say—No, it is a literal code which we have to obey, which specifies the seventh day and no other. But we reply that they cannot have it both ways; if they are under the Decalogue as a literal code, then they must consistently be the descendants of that literal Israel who came out of literal Egypt to whom the code is addressed. But this of course is not so, the great majority of them are not Jews, hence they cannot be under the code in question.

CHAPTER III

The Context Proves the Decalogue to be Jewish

THAT the Decalogue is a purely Jewish code in its direct application is also plain when the context is examined, that is to say, the circumstances which led up to and were the occasion of the code. This we shall now proceed to do.

If the reader will take the trouble to read carefully straight through chapters 19-24 of the Book of Exodus, it will immediately be apparent that the Decalogue is inseparably connected with the Mosaic or Sinaitic covenant. This covenant is referred to in the New Testament as the "Old Covenant," or the "First Covenant," in contrast with the "New Covenant," or the "Second Covenant" (see 2 Cor. 3. 6, 14 R.V.; Heb. 8. 7, 8). This Old Covenant was a covenant of works, and was proposed by God to the Children of Israel in the following terms:

"Now therefore if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Exod. 19. 5, 6).

Upon these words being communicated by Moses to the Children of Israel, this covenant was forthwith accepted by them in the following words:

"And all the people answered together, and said, all that the Lord hath spoken we will do" (Exod. 19. 8).

Thus Israel unanimously agreed to obey His voice; He, in return, to bless them. Now what did the words "obey My voice" entail? This God must now make plain. Evidently God wished the Children of Israel to hear His own voice, so that there could be no possibility in the future to question the fact that it was He, not

merely Moses, who was responsible for the Law. Accordingly after three days, God Himself "spake unto them" (Exod. 19. 25). All the attendant circumstances were of such a nature as to impress the people with God's awful holiness and majesty, that He was a God who must be obeyed. The actual words we find in Exodus 20. 2-17, and Deuteronomy 5. 6-21. This latter passage continues: "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and He added no more. And He wrote them upon two tables of stone, and gave them unto me."

What was the effect of this terrible manifestation? First, they knew then for certain "that God doth talk with men, and that He liveth" (Deut. 5. 24). Second, they were struck with terror, and "removed and stood afar off" (Exod. 20. 18).

"Now therefore why should we die? for this great fire will consume us: if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, then we shall die. For who is there of all flesh, that hath heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as we have, and lived? Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee; and we will hear and do it" (Deut. 5. 25-27).

All this is extremely significant. Law never brings sinful man nigh to God; on the contrary it increases his separation. Notice how the Children of Israel wanted Moses to act as a mediator between them and a holy God. It is Grace that brings nigh, not Law; and yet Seventh Day Adventists would put us under law. This was now the *second time* that Israel promised obedience. They did not yet know the desperate evil in their hearts, nor their utter inability to obey God. But God knew, for He said to Moses:

"Oh that there was such a heart in them, that they should fear Me, and keep all My commandments always" (Deut. 5. 29).

Such then was the giving of the Decalogue, the terms of the "Old Covenant;" it was pure law, with no provision,

as yet, for priesthood and sacrifice in case of failure. But this covenant of works God was to test man's ability to obey Him in his own strength, using the Children of Israel, as it were, as a sample of humanity.

God next called Moses up into the "thick darkness where God was" (Exod. 20. 21) and said:

"But as for thee, stand thou here by Me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments (Heb., *mitsvah*) and the statutes (Heb., *chog*) and the judgments (Heb., *mishpat*) which thou shalt teach unto them" (Deut. 5. 31).

And so from Exodus 20. 22, to 23. 33, we find the principles of the Decalogue expanded and applied by God to the civil and religious life of Israel in the form of "judgments" (Exod. 21. 1).

The next step is found in Exodus 24. 3:

"And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words that the Lord hath spoken will we do."

This was Israel's *third* acceptance of the covenant. Even then God was not willing to close the covenant. It had to be put in writing, for there were future generations to consider. So Moses "wrote all the words of the Lord" (evidently all the "ten words" and the "judgments") in the book "of the covenant" (Exod. 24. 4-7). This done, preparations were now made for ratifying the covenant with blood. To represent God's side of the agreement Moses built an altar; for the peoples', twelve pillars (representing the twelve tribes). Sacrifices were now made; and half of the blood was sprinkled upon the altar for God's side. Before sprinkling the blood for the people's side, a last opportunity was given to the people for re-consideration; for we read that Moses "took the book of the covenant, and read it in the audience of the people" (Exod. 24. 7). Upon which the people replied, "All that the Lord hath spoken will we do, and be obedient." This was Israel's *fourth* acceptance, adding the words "and be obedient;" such was their blind self-confidence.

Then we read:

"And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it upon the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words" (Exod. 24. 8).

Thus was the covenant ratified, closed up, and sealed. What covenant? Obviously the covenant "concerning all these words," namely the Decalogue and its expansion. In Hebrews 9. 18-20, we learn that the "book of the covenant" was also sprinkled with blood, this is important, as will be seen later.

"Wherefore even the first covenant that hath not been dedicated without blood. For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded you" (Heb. 9. 18-20).

It is plain now how inseparably the Decalogue, or the "ten words," as they are more correctly translated, is connected with the old Covenant, a Covenant which was made with Israel at Mount Sinai in the wilderness. The "ten words" were the very heart of that agreement, the terms and code of that mutual contract. In fact the Decalogue is so closely connected with the Old Covenant that by the figure of speech, metonymy, it is actually called that covenant. Thus we read that God

"Wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten words" (Exod. 34. 28, R.V., *margin*).

"And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform even the ten words; and He wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. 4. 13, R.V., *margin*).

"When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you" (Deut. 9. 9.)

Thus we have the "words of the covenant, the ten words," these were written in the "book of the covenant" (Exod. 24. 7), which was sprinkled with the "blood of the covenant" (Exod. 24. 8) they were engraved upon

the "tables of the covenant" (Deut. 9. 9) which in turn were placed within the Ark "of the covenant" (Deut. 10. 5-8). Could we possibly have anything clearer than this?

Now this intimate connection of the Decalogue with the Old Covenant is a cause of much perplexity to Seventh Day Adventists, for they fully admit, as they must do, that the "Old Covenant" has been abolished; and the natural inference is that the code of that covenant must go with it. Mr. D. M. Canright, at one time one of their most prominent ministers, but who came out from among them after an experience of twenty-eight years, says, "They dread to meet it," that is, the question of the two covenants. He says, "They have tried various ways to explain it away, but they are not satisfactory, even to themselves, I have been there and know." The late Elder Uriah Smith, one of the ablest men they ever had, says, "If the ten commandments constitute the old covenant, then they are for ever gone," "this therefore becomes a test question."* In his attempt to dissociate the Decalogue from the Old Covenant he argues that "before Moses was called up to receive this law of the ten commandments which God had written, the first covenant had been made, closed up, finished, and ratified by the shedding of blood."† This is quite true, and evidently the tables of stone were not sprinkled with blood. But unfortunately for his argument the ten commandments, spoken audibly to the people, had been written by Moses in the "book of the covenant," and this, as we have discovered from the passage in the Book of Hebrews, had been sprinkled with blood at the ratification of the covenant. Indeed the two tables themselves are called by Moses the "tables of the covenant" (Deut. 9. 9). Who are we to believe? Uriah Smith or Moses? So Uriah Smith's attempt to dissociate the Decalogue from the Old Covenant completely fails, his own test question goes against him, for, to use his own figure of speech, the ten commandments do constitute the old

* "The Two Covenants" (Australian Edition, 1926) p. 4.

† "Idem," p. 9.

covenant, Moses himself says so, thus: "And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even the ten words" (Deut. 4. 13, R.V., *margin*). Let us then for once agree with Elder Smith; the ten commandments are "for ever gone."

And Moses is not the only one to identify the ten commandments in this way with the Old Covenant, Solomon also did so. For when the Ark was brought into the most holy place of Solomon's newly finished temple, we read:

"There was nothing in the Ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the Children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings 8. 9).

Then Solomon says:

"And there have I set a place for the Ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which He made with our fathers, when He brought them out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings 8. 21).

Here we learn that the sole contents of the Ark at this time were the two tables; but these were identified by Solomon with the covenant made at Horeb or Sinai. Who then shall we say is the wiser, Elder Smith, or Solomon? Then the ten commandments do constitute the Old Covenant, and according to Elder Smith's teaching, are "for ever gone."

CHAPTER IV

The Decalogue Set Aside with the Old Covenant

Now all students of the Bible, Seventh Day Adventists included, admit that as far as the present Church dispensation is concerned the "Old Covenant" has been set aside in favour of the "New Covenant." It surely follows as a necessary consequence that the Decalogue, which we have proved to be an integral part of that covenant, must have been set aside with it as its code. This does not imply however, that the moral principles embodied in it have been set aside as moral requirements, and do not apply and can be ignored by Christians, the spiritual children of Abraham, under the New "Covenant" of Grace. On the contrary, these same moral principles, with the sole exception of the Sabbath precept, reappear in the Epistles in the New Testament as exhortations, or in other words, as "teachings of Grace." For we must bear in mind that grace teaches:

"For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world" (Titus 2. 11, 12).

Notice carefully how grace first brings salvation to all men, and then instructs; this is in direct contrast to the Law which was covenant of works. But more of this later on.

Now just as the passing away of the Old Covenant in favour of the New, is the express teaching of Hebrews, chapters 8 and 9, so also the passing away of the Decalogue as the code of the Old Covenant is the express teaching of the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 3. 3-16. In this chapter we have a series of contrasts drawn between the Old and New Covenants, showing that the New

Covenant in all respects transcends the Old. The following table will make this evident to the eye; please compare carefully with the original in the Revised Version, and verify.

The Old Covenant.
"Ye are not under Law"
(v. 14, R.V.).

The New Covenant.
"But under Grace" (Rom. 6. 14).
(v. 6. R.V.).

Written upon "tables of stone," *i.e.*, lifeless tables (v. 3).

Written upon "tables that are hearts of flesh," *i.e.*, living tables (v. 3).

The Old Covenant was "of the letter," *i.e.*, a written code, which "killeth" (v. 6).

The New Covenant is "of the Spirit," a power which giveth "life." Paul was a minister of this covenant (v. 6).

This "ministration of death," a written code (lit. letters) * "engraven on stones," "came (was introduced) with glory" (v. 7).

This "ministration of the Spirit" (life) rather (on the other hand), "shall be with (shall subsist in) glory" (v. 8).

Which code is also a "ministration of condemnation" (vv. 8, 9).

Which Spirit is a "ministration of righteousness" (vv. 8, 9).

That "which passeth away (annulled) was (introduced) with glory" (v. 11).

"That which remaineth (abides) is (subsists) in glory" (v. 11).

J. N. Darby in his most excellent translation of the New Testament has the following foot note on verse 7: "It is not said that the ministry (of death) was glorious, but that the system was introduced with glory (*egenethe en doxe*). It is in contrast with subsisting in glory (*estai en doxe*) in verse 8." The same contrast appears in verse 11, where Mr. Darby translates, "was introduced

* Lit., "ministration of death, having been engraven in letters on stones."

with glory" and "subsists in glory" respectively. This correspondence identifies the two pairs of statements with one another, making it plain that "the ministration of death engraven in letters on stones" is that which is annulled or being done away, while the "ministration of the Spirit" is that which abides.

Now the foregoing correspondence is recognised by some Seventh Day Adventist teachers, for it is patent to any one who will carefully examine the passage; but they attempt to evade the obvious deduction in many ways. One of the latest consists in saying that the words "that which is annulled" ("passeth away," R.V.) refer purely and simply to the word ministration. That is to say, the law was not annulled, but the ministration was that which was annulled. The Greek however, renders this contention of theirs impossible; for it would involve a glaring false concord in grammar. The participle adjective (to *katargoumenon*) translated "that which passeth away (annulled)" is neuter in gender and cannot possibly agree with the word *diakonia*, translated "ministration," for the simple reason that *diakonia* is feminine. But "that which passeth away" can and does agree with the matter contained in the expression "ministration of death," for such phrases are regarded as being neuter in gender. Now this "ministration of death" is immediately defined as being that which is "engraven in letters on stones," that is, the Decalogue. Hence it is clear that in some sense the Decalogue is passing away; this sense being obviously as the code of the Old Covenant, a covenant of works. That the Decalogue, though theoretically ordained unto life (Rom. 7. 10) actually ministered condemnation and death owing to indwelling sin in the heart cannot be denied. Such was its main object and work, for it is the crystallisation of that law of which the Apostle Paul says:

"For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them" (Gal. 3. 10).

"Wherefore (A.V.) then (serveth) the law? It was

added because of (with a view to) transgressions, till the Seed should come" (Gal. 3. 19).

"For I (Paul) through the law died unto the law" (Gal. 3. 19).

"And I was alive apart from the law once, but when the commandment (the 10th) came, sin revived, and I died; and the commandment, which was unto life, this I found to be unto death" (Rom. 7. 9, 10).

On the contrary the work of the Spirit is to give life, and in a believer saved by grace, to produce righteousness of life. For we read:

"The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8. 2).

"If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5. 25).

It is to be remarked that in verse 11 the R.V. has "passeth away," it is not "has passed away;" how are we to understand this present participle? In this way as far as Israel the nation is concerned, neither the Old Covenant nor the Decalogue has passed away. The New Covenant of Jeremiah 31. 31-34 and Ezekiel 36. 24-28 has not yet been made with the nation Israel. But as each individual Jew accepts Christ as his Saviour, he then and there becomes a member of the Church of God, and passes from under the Old Covenant into a new position "in Christ," who has become for him "the Mediator of the New Covenant" (Heb. 9. 15). In his case, then, we can say that "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," has passed away. During the present dispensation God is not dealing with Israel as a nation as He did previously; He Himself says that during this age they are "lo-ammi," *i.e.*, "not My people" (Hos. 1. 9); but the time is coming when God will take up Israel as a nation once more, according to the many prophecies found in the Old Testament; God will make with them as a nation a "New Covenant" as promised in Jeremiah 31. 31-34 and Ezekiel 36. 24-28; and He will say: "I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people, and they shall say, Thou art my God" (Hos. 2. 23).

Let us briefly review what we have learned. We have found that the Decalogue, though containing principles which are universally applicable, in its preface and specific details, is Jewish, and cannot possibly apply to any one but a literal Jew. Also the context shows that it is, as a code, inseparably connected with the "Old Covenant," which covenant was between God and Israel only. Now however, that the "Old Covenant" has passed away, the Apostle Paul teaches that the Decalogue, the code and heart of it, has also passed away as far as the Church is concerned. But this does not mean that the principles underlying it have so passed, by no means, for they are reaffirmed in the teachings "of Grace;" and as we shall discover, the providential principle of a weekly rest day reappears in the Christian day of worship, the Lord's Day.

CHAPTER V

A Seventh Day Adventist Demurrer

Now when the attempt is made to drive home the fact that the Decalogue is, as a code of laws, purely Jewish, and does not therefore apply to the present Church dispensation, Seventh Day Adventists generally quote Matthew 5. 17, and Romans 3. 31, as being proof to the contrary, showing the perpetuity of that code; and therefore arguments which teach the contrary must be, they say, fallacious. Indeed these two passages are two of their mainstays in the present controversy (there are not many issues of their denominational papers in which they are not quoted or referred to) so we must be pardoned if we devote somewhat large space to their examination. In our endeavour to ascertain their true teaching it will be very necessary to examine the context. Neglect of the context, a common source of error, is a very frequent failing of some Seventh Day Adventist teachers.

Let us first examine the passage in Matthew 5. 17-19, quoting in full from the Revised Version, and also from Dr. Weymouth's version in Modern Speech.*

Revised Version. "Think not that I came to destroy *the law or the prophets*: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till Heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, *till all things be accomplished*. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven."

Dr. Weymouth.* "Do not for a moment suppose that I have come to annul *the Law or the Prophets*: I have not come to annul them but to *give them their completion*. In truth I tell you that until Heaven and earth pass away,

* 4th, revised edition.

not the smallest letter, nor particle shall pass away from the Law until *all has taken place*. Whoever therefore breaks one of the smallest of these commandments and teaches others to do so, will be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven; but whoever practises them and teaches them, will be acknowledged as great in the Kingdom of Heaven."

The emphasised words in the above translations must be carefully weighed if we are to arrive at the true meaning of the passage.

Again and again Seventh Day Adventists persist in quoting these texts as applying to the Decalogue alone in order to establish its perpetuity. They usually assume that this is so without attempting any proof; but the burden of proof is upon them. Occasionally, however, reasons are given for this assumption. For instance, Milton C. Wilcox, Seventh Day Adventist teacher, in an article in the Australian "Signs of the Times" for November 8, 1926, comments on Matthew 5. 17-20 as follows: "The law of which the Master is speaking is clearly indicated in verses 21 and 27, where two precepts are quoted, 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' parts of the great primal code, the Decalogue." We would ask, why does Mr. Wilcox pass over in silence the four (as we shall show later) references to other parts of the Pentateuch which occur in this great discourse of our Lord? Is such treatment of the text fair? Is it not liable to deceive the unwary? To ask such questions is to answer them. We submit on the contrary that the word "law" in the passage refers, not to the Decalogue alone, but to the whole law of Moses contained in the Pentateuch, and this we shall proceed to prove.

It is recognised by all commentators that the Jewish Scriptures were commonly divided into "the book of Moses" or the "book of the law" (Gal. 3. 10); and "the book of the prophets" (Acts 7. 42). Occasionally an extra division was made, namely, that of the "Psalms" or poetical books; thus we read:

"And He (Jesus) said unto them, These are My words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how

that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the book of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their mind, that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke 24, 44, 45).

Notice here Luke's identification of the "Scriptures" with our Lord's divisions in the preceding verse. In agreement with this we repeatedly find the Old Testament referred to by the phrase "The Law and the Prophets," or "Moses and the Prophets," this is the case in the following passages: Matthew 7. 12; 11. 13; 22. 40; Luke 16. 16, 29, 31; John 1. 45; Acts 13. 15; 24. 14; 26, 22; Romans 3. 21. Eleven in all. Consistently then the expression "the law or the prophets" in our text must stand for the Old Testament as a whole. It follows then that the term "the law" in verse 17 refers to the Pentateuch written by Moses (see our Lord's divisions in Luke 24. 44 above) and so also does the term "the law" in verse 18, the conjunction "for" showing the closest sequence of thought.

Further, this meaning of the term "the law" is completely confirmed when we examine the context; for although the Decalogue is partly in view as is clear from the two direct references to it in verses 21 and 27, yet we find four texts referring directly to other parts of the Pentateuch as well in the same connection. Thus verse 31 refers to Deuteronomy 24. 1, verse 33, to Leviticus 19. 12 and to Deuteronomy 23. 21, verse 38, to Exodus 21. 24; Leviticus 24. 40, and Deuteronomy 19. 21, verse 43 to Leviticus 17. 18; no less than seven references in the Pentateuch other than the Decalogue. It is manifest then that the term "the law" does not refer exclusively to the Decalogue as one would gather from Mr. Wilcox's statement.

We think that Seventh Day Adventists make a second error in that they fail to give due weight to the words "fulfil" in verse 17, and "accomplished" in verse 18; for the force of the passage to a large extent turns on a due appreciation of the meaning of these words. Let us therefore turn to the lexicons. We will quote from two Greek lexicons which embody the result of the light

shed on the "*koiné*," the Greek of the New Testament, by the discovery lately of the great mass of papyri in the language of that period, namely Prof. Souter's "Pocket Lexicon" (1920) and Prof. Abbott-Smith's "Manual Greek Lexicon" (1923). The word "fulfil" in verse 17 stands for the Greek verb *pleroo*, and the word "accomplished" in verse 18 stands for the Greek verb *ginomai*.

Prof. Souter:

"*Pleroo* (a) I fill, I fill up. (b) more often, I fill up to the full, I fulfil, I give fulness (completion) to, I accomplish carry out, of prophecies or other statements, which are absolutely and completely confirmed by reality (actual occurrence) or of duties."

"*Ginomai*, I come into being, am born; I become, come about, happen."

Prof. Abbott-Smith:

"*Pleroo*. 1. To fill, make full, fill to the full. 2. Complete (a) to complete, fulfil (b) to execute, accomplish, carry out to the full (c) of sayings, prophecies, etc., to bring to pass, fulfil (Matt. 1. 22; 2. 15, 17, 23; 4. 14; 5. 17; etc.)."

"*Ginomai*. 1. Of persons, things, occurrences, to come into being, be born, arise, come on. 2. Of events, to come, to pass, take place, happen (Matt. 5. 18; etc.). 3. To be made, done, performed, observed, enacted, ordained. 4. To become, be made, come to be."

The two words *pleroo* and *ginomai* are rather close in meaning; *pleroo* being to fully carry out, do, bring to pass, accomplish, the idea of fulness or completeness predominating. In *ginomai*, however, the predominating idea is of coming about, happening, coming to pass, becoming done or accomplished. These two words very often come together in the New Testament; to take one or two instances among many, "Now this is come to pass (*ginomai*) that it might be fulfilled (*pleroo*) which was spoken by the prophet" (Matt. 21. 4) and, "But all this came to pass (*ginomai*) that the Scripture of the prophets might be fulfilled (*pleroo*)" (Matt. 26. 56).

Now please note the references in Abbott-Smith's

lexicon to Matthew 5. 17, 18, and the corresponding meanings there given, which we have emphasised, and then compare these meanings with Dr. Weymouth's translation, and notice the close agreement; next confirm the result from the extract from Prof. Souter's lexicon. The meaning of the words ought now to be clear.

Let us now try the experiment of reading the Decalogue, as a code of laws merely, into Dr. Weymouth's translation, and see if it makes sense. Did our Lord come to give the Decalogue its "completion?" or is it possible for "all" the Decalogue to "take place," or to be "accomplished" as it is in the Revised Version? Evidently not. Such questions fail to make sense.

But when by "the law" is understood the Pentateuch, with its many types, promises, prophecies, its covenants, especially the Mosaic or Old Covenant, with its special design of showing the best that man could do under a covenant of works, his failure, and therefore through its laws a knowledge of sin and need of a Saviour, its ceremonies graciously pointing on to this Saviour most of this looked forward to be accomplished and take place at Calvary. Notice particularly that it is as an essential part of the Old Covenant and in this respect that the Decalogue could be included in the whole. All the righteous demands of the law met in Christ.

But until this consummation was brought about at Calvary, the Decalogue together with all the other laws and items of the Pentateuch were still binding upon the followers of the Messiah, and this we see taught in verse 19.

Now some Seventh Day Adventists may ask, Why did the Lord say, "Till Heaven and earth pass away"? Does not this prove that the law, whatever it may mean, is perpetual and will last till then? Not necessarily. We must remember that although the greater proportion of the types and prophecies found their fulfilment at Calvary, yet some of the types and many prophecies point further on still and await their fulfilment in the future. It is still true that even the smallest detail of the law (understood in its larger sense) will not pass away

or fall to the ground unfulfilled; it will inevitably receive its fulfilment and be accomplished.

In the first place, let us take a few instances of unfulfilled prophecies in the "law." In Deuteronomy 28. 63-68 we find the present world-wide scattering of Israel foretold as a result of the disobedience described in verses 15-62 of the same chapter, please read them through. We are told that the Lord would scatter Israel—"from the one end of the earth even to the other," "among the nations thou shalt find no ease...the Lord shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing eyes, and sorrow of mind; and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee...in the morning thou shalt say, Would God that it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God that it were morning!"

This scattering we know, and Seventh Day Adventists admit, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus. What a vivid picture this prophecy has proved to be, how it pictures the past sufferings of the Jews amongst the nations. Here then is a prophecy which had its fulfilment subsequent to Calvary. Yet according to the latter half of this same prophecy Israel is to return to the land. See Deuteronomy 30. 1-10. "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse . . . and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey...with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity...and gather thee from all the peoples, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee, If any of thine outcasts be in the uttermost parts of Heaven, from thence...will He fetch thee: and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land...and thou shalt possess it...and the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart..."

The first half of this prophecy has been fulfilled to the letter, so also must the latter half be fulfilled. Seventh Day Adventists say that this latter half will never be fulfilled, for it interferes with their teaching as to the future. But the Lord Jesus says, "Not one jot or tittle"

of it (it being included in the "law") can fail to be accomplished whatever man can say.

Secondly, let us also refer to the unconditional covenant which God made with Abraham and his seed, especially that part found in Genesis 15. 18.

"In that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates."

Abraham's seed has never yet possessed the land here promised in the "law" to the extent of the geographical boundaries here indicated. But they will do so, God has given it; the promise must come true—every jot and tittle of it.

To sum up. We have seen that Christ at the commencement of His ministry said that He had come to fulfil the "law and the prophets," not to abrogate them; and He did so. Indeed after His resurrection in reference to this He said: "These are My words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms, concerning Me" (Luke 24. 44). And fulfilled they were. And the Lord opened their minds to understand how these Scripture had been fulfilled.

Now we shall consider the second Seventh Day Adventist mainstay mentioned above, viz., "Do we then make (the) law of none effect through faith? God forbid: nay we establish (the) law" (Rom. 3. 31, R.V., *margin*).

This is a very favourite text of Seventh Day Adventists by which they seek to prove that though we are saved by faith, yet the Decalogue is still binding upon us. As in the previous passage they assume that the term "law" in this passage refers specifically to that code; but we have yet to see an attempt on their part to prove that this is so. On the contrary, we shall show by an examination of the context that this is certainly not the case.

First, we must notice that, as is shown in the margin of the Revised Version, in both cases there is no article in the Greek before the word "law." This in itself ought to be enough to show that the word "law" does not refer

to any particular law such as the Decalogue, but to law in general. And why so? The context will make abundantly clear.

The Epistle to the Romans is a treatise upon salvation; salvation both from the penalty and from the power of sin. The key word is "righteousness." And this epistle shows how, through the Gospel, this righteousness is first imputed and then imparted to the sinner.

The first step is to prove man's need of this salvation. That the whole world is guilty before God. So the apostle first finds the Gentile world guilty, for they have sinned against the light they had. This light was twofold; the law of nature, as shown in creation (1. 19-23) and the law of conscience (1. 32; 2. 14, 15). He then finds the Jews still more guilty, for unto them had been committed the "oracles of God," that is a written revelation—the Law (2. 17-29; 3. 2); this the Gentiles never had, as is plain from 2. 12-14. So the apostle concludes the whole world guilty, their mouth stopped, and without excuse—"There is none righteous, no, not one" (3. 10).

Thus it came about that "by the works of (the) law shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for through (the) law cometh the knowledge of sin" (verse 20). Notice again the absence of the article. The two statements are true whether the law is that of nature, or conscience, as when referring to the Gentile; or the law of Moses, when referring to the Jew.

This leads to the marvellous remedy of the Gospel, that now is the righteousness of God revealed, available to faith, its source God's grace, it is wholly "apart from (the) law" (verse 21) "apart from the works of (the) law" (verse 28). And this is true of law of any kind, as is shown by the absence of the article in these two verses before us.

Now to guard against misunderstanding, the apostle anticipates the question, Does not such a salvation, apart from law, apart from the works of law, make law of none effect? He answers, By no means! On the contrary faith establishes law. How? First, law, for the purpose for which it exists and was given, still

abides, namely, to convict of sin. "As if the sowing of the field shows the plough to have been vainly used" (F. W. Grant). Also, "The sinner establishes (the) law in its right use by confessing his guilt and acknowledging that by it he is justly condemned. Christ, on the sinner's behalf establishes (the) law by enduring its penalty, death" (C. I. Scofield). Furthermore, while law cannot produce justification, yet justification will issue in the fulfilment of the righteous demand of the law (that is of doing God's will) in the believer, if he walks, not in the energy of the flesh (*i.e.* under law) but after the Spirit (*i.e.* under Grace) see Romans 8. 4.

By the term "the law" then, in this text is meant law in general, any law, any standard of righteousness, whether that of nature, or of conscience, or of the Law of Moses, or for that matter the requirements contained in the epistles, which are instructions of Grace (Titus 2. 11, 12). Therefore there is no hint anywhere in the context that would lead us to think that the Decalogue is solely and specifically in view as many Seventh Day Adventists assume; quite the contrary. The text therefore does not teach the perpetuity of the Decalogue as a code for mankind.

CHAPTER VI

The Two-Law Theory

It might well be thought that the foregoing considerations would rule out the Decalogue as a code for mankind in general, though, as we have said before, the moral principles embodied in it may and do have a wider application. But Seventh Day Adventists will have none of this, and in the endeavour to defend their peculiar position as to the Sabbath they have propounded their Two-Law theory.

In this theory of theirs they maintain that the Children of Israel were given two separate laws; one, the moral law, contained in the ten commandments, which they call the "Law of God;" the other, the ceremonial law, which they call the "Law of Moses." They say that the "moral law," the Decalogue, differs from the "ceremonial law," in that the former was engraven by God Himself on stones, which were placed inside the Ark. Of this "Law of God" they say that "it contains nothing that relates to the offerings or typical system."* Whereas the "Law of Moses" "related only to ordinances of a typical or shadowy nature pointing to Christ,"* and this was placed in the side of the Ark. And they have drawn up an elaborate list of (to us) artificial contrasts between the two. Of these two laws, they maintain that the "moral law," the "Law of God," the Decalogue, is still in force, never having been done away, whereas the "ceremonial law," the "Law of Moses," has been abolished at Calvary.

Now this theory, at first sight, seems plausible, because in our minds we do draw a distinction between moral and ceremonial law. But we are persuaded that a sharp distinction like this between two systems of laws, one moral, and the other ceremonial, is not made in Scripture any where. Indeed the words "moral" and "cere-

* "Bible Text Book," by O. A. Johnson, p. 88.

monial" are not found in Scripture, and Seventh Day Adventists, if they were confined to Scriptural terms, would be in the greatest quandary when arguing about their two-law theory.

That some individual commandments are intrinsically moral, and others intrinsically ceremonial no one can deny; other individual laws might be classed as civil, and others as providential. Indeed such a distinction between the nature of individual commandments is sometimes implicitly recognised in the New Testament, as we shall see later when expounding the teaching of the Lord Jesus concerning the Sabbath. It is also true, as they say, that many of the ceremonial or typical laws of the Pentateuch found their fulfilment in the work of the Lord Jesus at Calvary and so passed by way of limitation. But we maintain that the rest of the laws of the Pentateuch, as a connected system of legislation, also passed away then. Notice particularly the qualification just made, for this does not mean that many of those laws are not applicable now, they indeed are, for they are reaffirmed in the teachings of Grace. As such they apply to Christians. Further we shall show that the law of the Old or Mosaic Covenant is one law in three divisions, not two separate laws.

Let us first test the distinction Seventh Day Adventists draw between the terms the "Law of God" and the "Law of Moses." They refer us to one or two texts where they aver that such a distinction is actually made. The first is: "If they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law my servant Moses commanded them" (2 Kings 21. 8).

Here they say, is a clear distinction between the two laws. But before hastening to a conclusion, let us read the parallel passage found in 2 Chronicles 33. 8: "If only they will observe to do all that I have commanded them, even all the law and the statutes and ordinances by the hand of Moses."

Here it is plain that the word "even" rules out their distinction, by identifying the law of Moses with what was commanded by the Lord.

Their next passage is Daniel 9. 11. "Yea, all Israel have transgressed Thy law, even turning aside that they should not obey Thy voice: therefore hath the curse been poured out upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God."

Here they say "Thy (God's) law" and the "law of Moses" are distinguished. But the word "yea" refers us back to the proceeding verse, "Neither obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in His laws, which He set before us by His servants the prophets." Hence, the term "Thy law" in verse 11 is identified with the "laws which He set before us by His servants the prophets," and does not refer to the Decalogue, as they assume, but represents the will of God as revealed through Moses and the succeeding prophets.

We would that Seventh Day Adventists might only recognise the fact that "the law of God" is really the same thing exactly as "the will of God," and God's will may vary according to the subjects to whom it is addressed. Thus the will of God for Israel included many civil and ceremonial regulations which could not possibly apply to a Gentile or a Christian. Likewise God's will for the Church includes many things which could not possibly apply to Israel. So the Christian can truly re-echo the words of the Psalmist David when he said: "The Law of the Lord is perfect...The testimony of the Lord is sure...The precepts of the Lord are right,...The commandment of the Lord is pure,...The fear of the Lord is clean...The judgments of the Lord are true...By them is Thy servant warned: in keeping them is great reward."

What Christian but can say "Amen" to this eulogy of God's will?

Let us further test this Seventh Day Adventist distinction between the "Law of God" and the "Law of Moses" by turning to the 8th and 9th chapters of the Book of Nehemiah. In chapter 8, verse 1, we read how the people were gathered together at the Water-gate of Jerusalem to hear Ezra read from "the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel" (v. 1); "the law" (v. 2); "They read in the book, in the

law of God, distinctly" (v. 8); "and they found written in the law, how that the Lord had commanded by Moses" (v. 14); "and read in the book of the law of the Lord their God" (chap. 9, v. 3).

An examination of these passages is most conclusive; the same book is referred to in each case; hence the expressions "the law," the "law of Moses," "the law of God," "the law of the Lord their God," are practically interchangeable, and represent the same law from different aspects. Could one desire a more complete answer to the Seventh Day Adventist distinction?

But there is more yet. Let us turn to the words of the Lord Jesus in Mark 7. 9, 10: "And He said unto them, Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death."

According to the Seventh Day Adventist theory this should have read, "God said, Honour thy father and thy mother;" and Moses saith, "He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death." But according to the usage of the Lord Jesus, both the fifth commandment and the reference to cursing one's father or mother in Exodus 21. 17, or Leviticus 20. 9 (both the latter out of the book kept in the side of the Ark) are equally referred to Moses, and are equally God's commandments, see verse 9. Which shall we hold to, the usage of the Lord Jesus, or Seventh Day Adventist theory?

Again, let us turn to Luke 2. 22, 24, 27. Here we find the expressions "the law of Moses" (v. 22) "the law of the Lord" (v. 24), "the law" (v. 27), all referring to the law of circumcision and sacrifices. How can this be if "the law of the Lord" only refers to moral laws? Thus we see that the "law of Moses" is simply the law or will of God for Israel. It would be safe to say that "the law of God" is the fuller expression; but is one that varies somewhat in different dispensations according as His will may vary according to the individuals to which it is addressed.

In perfect consistency with this, when referring to

the more general expression "the law," we read, "the law was given by Moses, but Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1. 17). Also "Did not Moses give you the law? why go ye about to kill me? (John 7. 19)." The reference being of course to the sixth commandment. So again the Seventh Day Adventists distinction utterly breaks down.

Secondly, we must now test the Seventh Day Adventist distinction between "the moral law as contained in the ten commandments" kept inside the Ark, and the "ceremonial law, relating only to ordinances of a typical and shadowy nature," contained in a book kept in the side of the Ark.

Let us turn to Matthew 22. 36-40: "And He said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment, And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets."

Plainly these are the two greatest moral commandments; indeed our Lord says the whole law hangs on them. But most unfortunately for the Seventh Day Adventist theory they are not found in the Decalogue, but in the law written in the book kept in the side of the Ark. They are found in Deuteronomy 6. 5, and Leviticus 19. 18, respectively. Thus again the artificial distinction of the Seventh Day Adventists breaks down completely.

We would observe just here, that just as these two greatest moral commandments emphasised by our Lord formed the foundation of the Decalogue, that crystallisation of Jewish law under the old covenant, so also they form the foundation of all moral laws found in the epistles as the teachings of Grace under the new covenant.

The question has been asked by some Seventh Day Adventist teachers, "Why did God single out the Decalogue by speaking it from Mount Sinai, and engraving it with His own finger on tables of stone, and causing it to be placed by itself inside the Ark, if it was not to mark it off as a separate law?"

This question, or rather these two questions deserve a candid answer. But it will be necessary to answer them separately, when it will become clear, we think, that this special treatment of the Decalogue by God is capable of a different and more likely explanation.

We shall take the first question, "Why did God single out the Decalogue by speaking it from Mount Sinai?" and at the same time we may usefully ask, what is the significance of the awful manifestations which accompanied this audible giving of the code?

The reason why God spake audibly the Decalogue from Mount Sinai has been already answered when we went into the occasion or circumstances which led to the giving of this code, namely, it was God's answer to the people agreeing to obey His voice and keep His covenant proposed in Exodus 19. 5, 6. It was God's explanation of what this obedience entailed, and a condensed summary of the principles of the covenant afterwards to be expanded in detail. It was also proof positive that "God doth talk with men, and that He liveth." Then as to the attendant circumstances, we must remember that the Children of Israel were, in self-confidence, accepting a covenant of works; a covenant which contained that fatal word "if" in it, fatal because of the inability of the flesh. They were forsaking the position of grace expressed by the words, "I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself," and were putting themselves "under law." And God permitted it, nay He foresaw it; for in thus testing His chosen people, hedged about and separated from the surrounding nations, He was testing, by sample as it were, humanity in general. He was going to demonstrate the best that man could do by law-works or self-effort, and this under the most favourable conditions possible. He promised, if they obeyed, wonderful blessings; if they disobeyed, summary punishment. Not that in this dispensation of law was grace absent, then would none have been saved, but law characterised this period from Sinai to Calvary. Grace was always present in the priesthood and sacrificial system, which enabled a sinner to approach a Holy God.

Now while love is the ruling motive and incentive to obedience under Grace, fear is the driving force in all systems of Law. So in the manifestations at Sinai everything tended to develop a sense of God's awful majesty and holiness, a God that must be obeyed. The thunders and lightnings, the thick cloud, and trumpet exceeding loud, Mount Sinai altogether on a smoke, the charge to Moses to prevent the people from breaking through even to touch the mount on pain of death; all this served to heighten a sense of fear. Then the speaking forth of the "ten words," after which we read:

"And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the voice of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it, they trembled, and stood afar off. And they said to Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die. And Moses said unto the people, Fear not: for God is come to prove you, and that His fear may be before you, that ye sin not. And the people stood afar off."

This then is the true reason of the terrible manifestations at Mount Sinai. And it is to this that Seventh Day Adventists would direct us; to this code, which was a covenant of works! And shall we succeed where Israel so miserably failed? Is the human heart any different now than then? No indeed! That would be a counsel of despair. Ours is a better hope—"for ye are not come to a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet...and so fearful was the appearance, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake: but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem...to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in Heaven...and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel" (Heb. 12. 18-24). Thank God!

Secondly, "Why did God engrave the Decalogue with His own finger on the tables of stone, and caused it to be placed by itself inside the Ark?"

In answer, let us remind ourselves that the Decalogue is an integral part of the old covenant. Now in those days, and even at the present time amongst the Arabs, we are told, when any solemn contract or covenant was entered into, it was usual to select some object or thing as a sign or token (Heb., *oth*) or as a witness or testimony (Heb., *ed*, *edah*, *eduth*) attached to the covenant to attest it or to serve as a more or less permanent reminder of its binding nature. Let us examine a few such covenants.

(a). **Noahic Covenant**, Genesis 9. 1-27. A covenant of sovereign grace with mankind and beast, (v. 9-11). God as the Maker invests the rainbow as a token (Heb., *oth*) of the covenant (v. 13) a permanent memorial (v. 16).

(b). **Abrahamic Covenant**, Genesis 15. 1-21. A covenant of grace toward Abraham and his seed on God's part. To God's assurance that Abraham that his seed should possess the land, the latter desired some outward and visible guarantee and pledge. What is chosen for a witness? God tells Abraham to take certain animals, kill them, divide them in the midst, and place the corresponding pieces opposite one another with a passage between. This was, we are told, a common form of agreement or contract at that time, the two parties walking in procession through the passage just made, thereby signifying their agreement, thus ratifying the covenant. However in this case, as the covenant was of pure grace, that is only one-sided, only God's presence passed between the pieces. God in sovereign grace gives, Abraham has simply to accept.

(c). **Abrahamic Covenant Confirmed**, Genesis 17. 1-14. This time circumcision was adopted as the token (Heb. *oth*).

(d). **Abrahamic Covenant again Confirmed**, Genesis 22. 15-18. Confirmed by an oath, see Hebrews 6. 13-18.

(e). **Covenant between Abraham and Abimelech**, Genesis 21. 22-23. This covenant was confirmed with an oath (vv. 23, 24). The witness (Heb., *edah*) of this covenant being seven ewe lambs (v. 30), Abraham also planted a grove as a permanent memorial (v. 33).

(f). **Covenant between Jacob and Laban**, Genesis 31. 44, 45. Made with an oath (v. 33). The witness (Heb., *ed, edah*) chosen by Jacob was a pillar (vv. 45, 46, 52). That of Laban was a heap of stones (vv. 51, 52). The covenant was ratified by sacrifice.

(g). **Mosaic Covenant**, otherwise known as the "old covenant" Exodus 19. 5 to 24. 8. This covenant of works was two sided.

(1). An altar representing God's side (v. 4).

(2). Twelve pillars representing the twelve tribes of Israel (v. 4).

The covenant was ratified with blood, "the blood of the covenant" (v. 8) which was sprinkled on the altar, then on the people themselves, and also on the "book of the covenant." The covenant was also attested by a permanent witness (Heb., *eduth*) namely the two "tables of testimony" (the word "testimony" is the same word as witness) Exodus 31. 18, and 25. 16-21. The Sabbath was also appointed as a sign or token (Heb., *oth*) Exodus 31. 13-17, a sign of what? Surely of this covenant which applied to the Children of Israel alone.

So we can now understand how the Decalogue, the basis of the old covenant became inscribed by God on two tables of stone to be a permanent witness or testimony, to be kept in the "ark of testimony" (Exod. 30. 6) in the "Tabernacle of testimony" (Exod. 26. 31).

This, we submit, gives an answer to the Seventh Day Adventist question above which is both reasonable and adequate, and does not involve a contradiction of other Scriptures like their two-law theory of a "Law of God" and a "Law of Moses."

We have said above that when the Scriptures relating to the giving of the Mosaic covenant are carefully examined it is found that God gave the Children of Israel one law, in three divisions; not two laws. These three divisions are God's own, as we see in Deuteronomy 5. 31:

"But as for thee, stand thou here by Me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them."

This classification was that given by God to Moses

upon his ascent into the mount immediately after the speaking forth of the "ten words" to the people. Moses repeats this classification in Deuteronomy 6. 1, and in Deuteronomy 7. 9-11.

In the chronological order in which they are given they are:

(a). The commandments or precepts (Heb. *mitsvah*) expressing the righteous will of God for Israel (Exod. 20. 1-26, and Deut. 5. 6-21).

(b). The judgments (Heb. *mishpat*) governing the social life of Israel (Exod. 21. 1, to 24. 11).

(c). The statutes or ordinances (Heb., *choq*) governing the religious life of Israel (Exod. 24. 12, to 31. 16).

All the requirements found later in Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, are but an expansion of this law.

Now why do Seventh Day Adventists so stress this two-law theory of theirs? For this reason—it is the only way they can explain the many passages in the New Testament which speak about the law being "done away," "abolished," or "blotted out," while retaining the Decalogue at the same time. There is no alternative. For instance, they admit, as they must do, that the "law of Moses" has been abolished as regards the Church; this is quite clear from Acts 15. But then they reply that the "law of Moses" is merely the ceremonial law. If they admitted that it contained the Decalogue, then away would go their Sabbath at once. So this two-law theory is a fundamental matter with them, upon which the whole edifice of Seventh Day Adventist doctrine of the Sabbath is built. If this foundation gives way, the whole edifice must fall with it.

Now it is a remarkable fact that in the whole of the New Testament there is not even a hint about this two-law theory. All fundamental doctrines upon which the Christian Church is built are to be found fully expounded some where or other, but this theory is never explained or referred to; nay, it is conspicuous by its absence. It is incumbent upon Seventh Day Adventists to explain this absence if they can, otherwise the case goes against them by default.

Let us take for instance, that remarkable discussion before the council in Jerusalem, which is found in the fifteenth chapter of Acts.

The question at issue was one relative to the Gentile converts, whether, in addition to faith in Christ "it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses" (v. 5). If the Seventh Day Adventist theory was true what a unique opportunity this would have afforded the apostles for explaining that, as neither circumcision nor "the law of Moses" formed part of God's moral law for mankind, they were free from such obligation. If a Seventh Day Adventist had been present at that gathering how eager he would have been with such a reply! But no! such an argument is not so much as hinted at. Quite the contrary. For the Apostle Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, explains that salvation even for the Jews, not alone the Gentiles, is by grace (v. 11); and grace, having regard to its exact meaning, expressly rules out law-works of any kind, moral or ceremonial, for salvation. This is the teaching of the Apostle Paul in Romans 11. 5, 6, for he says that if the election to salvation is—"by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work."

The Pharisees "which believed" (v. 5) wanted to add the conditions of circumcision and law-works to that of faith. But the Apostle Peter replies that this gracious salvation is by faith; not faith plus circumcision and law-works.* Then, referring to the law, he goes on to say, "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?"

Seventh Day Adventists would have us believe that this yoke referred to the "ceremonial law." But if we think a little we shall see how this cannot be so. The ceremonial law, far from being a yoke, was that special part of the law which enabled the sinner to have his

* Compare Rom. 4. 16, "For this cause it (the promise of justification) is of faith, that it may be according to grace."

sin covered, and allowed him to again gain access to a Holy God. It was specially in the ceremonial law, then, that grace was exhibited; hence it could scarcely be the yoke here referred to. No, the yoke is the whole law, moral, civil, ceremonial, viewed as a legal system, obedience to which was a condition of salvation, *i.e.*, a covenant of works. As such it proved a real yoke, because of the inability of the flesh; for the law demanded perfect 100% obedience, 99% not being enough. The Apostle Paul asks why did the Children of Israel not attain unto the law of righteousness? and he gives the answer:

"Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling stone" (Rom. 9. 31, 32).

Thus the law, moral law included, though "holy and just and good," proved in practice to be a "stumbling stone," a "yoke," nay more, a ministration of condemnation and death" (2. Cor 3. 7-9).

Some Seventh Day Adventists, though not all, we are glad to say, are making just the same error as the Pharisees above, that of joining law-works to faith as a condition of salvation. Thus T. M. French, Director at one time of Homiletics in their "Emmanuel Missionary College," Berrien Springs, Mich., U.S.A., wrote as follows, "We believe in justification by faith in Christ, but on the condition of our keeping the moral law."* Again, O. A. Johnson, Instructor in Bible and History in their Union College, College View, Nebraska, writes: "One of the conditions of salvation and having our names retained in the Book of Life is to keep the Sabbath."† One of their missionaries wrote to me as follows: "We are justified by faith providing we obey the ten commandments." Who then can be saved? Does any Seventh Day Adventist ever keep the ten commandments? Not attempt to—but keep them? Does he never covet? It was this 10th commandment that condemned the Apostle Paul to death (Rom. 7. 7-10). The law demands perfect

* Quoted by C. E. Putnam in "Legalism and the Seventh Day Question."

† "Bible Text Book," p. 36.

obedience always, or it condemns, "Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them" (Gal. 3. 10). No, indeed, there can be no conditions or provisos to faith as the means of our salvation. Listen to the Apostle Paul: "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (Rom. 3. 28).

This is the exact antithesis then to this phase of Seventh Day Adventist doctrine. While not all Seventh Day Adventists go as far as the three just quoted, yet the majority of them are hazy on the matter, and have not grasped the fact that Christians "have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden (the law): so that we serve in newness of the Spirit, and not in oldness of the letter (the law)" (Rom. 7. 6).

The late Elder Butler, a leading Seventh Day Adventist teacher, when speaking of the effort of the Judaizers to force the law and circumcision upon the Gentile Churches makes the following admission: "The term 'the law' among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the *whole system*, moral, ritual, typical, and civil. This, *as a system*, these Judaizing teachers desired to maintain, circumcision was a sign of the whole"* (italics ours). This is well put. Here is another admission of the same kind, by the late Elder Uriah Smith, "That which was abolished at the Cross was the *entire system*" (italics ours). "God did not single out and abolish portions of some arrangement."† This again is quite correct, and is precisely the view we take, namely, that the whole law given by God to the Children of Israel found its consummation at Calvary, and so passed as a connected system of legislation. Does this mean then that the Mosaic law as found in the Pentateuch is of no value and interest to the Christian? Not at all. It is of the greatest value. It is a part of the whole, of which the Apostle Paul writes: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine,

* "Law in Galatians," Butler, p. 70 (quoted by D. M. Canright).

† "Synopsis of Present Truth," Uriah Smith, p. 259 (quoted by Canright).

for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3. 16, A.V.).

Though God may test man, in the different dispensations, by varying conditions, yet His principles of right and wrong do not vary, so it is most instructive to study the outworking of these principles in these dispensations. Yet unless we learn to distinguish the differences of the dispensations we shall fail to get any clear idea of God's workings. But when we do distinguish the dispensations the whole of the Old Testament becomes luminous and full of instruction.

Let us instance the deep instruction to be derived from the study of the types, in which the operations of grace are so wonderfully fore-shadowed. Yet all admit that this part of the law, as to its immediate application has passed away. But is it consistent to pick out such laws and regulations of the Jewish Law as appeal to us, and reject such as are inconvenient? If the attempt is made to dissect the law into purely moral, civil, providential, and ceremonial precepts, it will soon be found that such a classification is hardly possible. Some individual precepts will be clearly one or the other, but other individual precepts may combine more than one principle. Others again may defy such classification. No, indeed, the law cannot be consistently dissected in this manner, some of it to be retained, and some rejected. We must accept the whole of it, if it is to be accepted at all.

CHAPTER VII

A Change in the Law

AFTER Calvary there was undoubtedly a change in the law, this is admitted even by Seventh Day Adventists; for it is stated explicitly in Hebrews 7. 12: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."

This change is implied also in John 1. 17: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

The question now arises, of what nature is this change, a change from a legal dispensation to that of grace. An illustration may help us.

In legislatures of the present day, a change in the law of the country may be effected in two ways:

(a). When the change desired is not great in principle, or extensive in detail, it is more usual to pass an amendment to an already existing act.

(b). When however, the change desired involves a vital change in principle, or considerable changes in detail, it is generally thought wiser to repeal the whole Act, and pass an entirely new one in its place. In so doing some of the provisions of the first Act may be dropped entirely, but others may be carried over to be embodied in the new Act.

The former would seem to illustrate the Seventh Day Adventist two-law theory, the amendment being to delete the ceremonial law while leaving the moral law still in force unrepealed.

The latter however seems to us to better illustrate what happened in the change over from law to grace. We think that the whole law of Moses, that is, the whole law that God gave to Israel through Moses, passed away at the Cross, to be replaced by the "teachings of grace," the standard of conduct of the Church. In this change over, many of the moral laws of the Mosaic law were

re-embodied in these "teachings," being standards of right and wrong applicable for all time.

We have just suggested above that there may be a vital change in principle involved in this change over from a dispensation characterised by law to that characterised by grace. What is the nature of this change? Under law the ruling motive to obedience was fear; under grace it is love or loyalty. Under law there was a servile and maybe unwilling obedience to an irksome code: under grace there is the spontaneous out flowing obedience to the One who died for sinners. Under law means under duress, under grace means under "the expulsive power of a new affection." Thus the motive or incentive to obedience is completely changed. All this is implied in that most profound statement of the Apostle Paul in Romans 6. 14: "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under law but under grace."

The epistle to the Romans is a treatise on salvation; salvation both from the guilt and from the power of sin.

The theme of chapters one to five is justification by faith, *i.e.*, salvation from the guilt and penalty of sin. But the theme of chapters six to eight is sanctification by faith, *i.e.*, deliverance from the power and dominion of sin. The former chapters deal with imputed righteousness; the latter with imparted righteousness. Some Seventh Day Adventist writers admit the truth of this division of the subject matter; for instance Mr. L. E. Froom contributed some articles to their Journal, "The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald," issue for July 7, 1927, on this very division, admitting its truth. This admission is important as we shall see immediately. For it is in the latter division that we find our text, "Not under law, but under grace;" this position shows that "not under law" does not here mean "not under law in the sense of condemnation" as most Seventh Day Adventists contend* (though that is true enough in its place)

* They put it as follows: "Man must refrain from sinning if he would remain under grace" ("Bible Text Book," p. 70); and they illustrate this in this way: A man who keeps the law meets a policeman on his rounds with equanimity, he is "under grace;"

because the context is speaking of deliverance from the dominion, not the guilt of sin, "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under law, but under grace." "Not under law" here, means not under law as a means of attaining practical righteousness, in other words, no one will ever succeed in getting victory over sin and attaining to a righteous life by trying, in self-effort, to keep the law, spurred on by fear. Christians however are "under grace," and grace provides both a new motive, a new Master, and also a new Power, even the enabling power of the Holy Spirit to those who walk by faith in Jesus Christ.

We have in Romans 7. 14-24, a poignant example of a Christian who is putting himself under law, that is, attempting to attain in the energy of even a renewed mind to a righteous life. "Under law" leads to that cry of despair, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" "Grace" leads to the reply, "I thank God (for deliverance) through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7. 24, 25).

So a Christian will never succeed in attaining to a righteous life by law-works. It is in this sense that the law is not the rule of life of the Christian. But this does not mean that the laws and exhortations found in the epistles are not a standard of conduct for the Christian,

but as soon as he breaks the law, he feels the heavy hand of the policeman on his shoulder, and he finds himself "under law." So, "those who are under grace keep the law and the Sabbath, and a failure to do this would bring them under the law again" ("Idem, p. 101). Having broken the law the sinner is then directed to 1 John 1. 9 for clearance. He is then again "under grace," until he happens to sin again, when he again becomes "under law," and so on. What a travesty of Grace! The Apostle Paul says, "There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Are you "in Christ?" then you have passed, as regards your justification, for ever from being "under law" to being "under grace." As regards one's justification, "under law" means trying by works of law to be just before God; this is impossible, see Romans 3. 20. As regards sanctification, "under law" means trying to achieve in the energy of even a renewed mind a righteous life before God; this, too, is impossible, see Romans 7. 18-24. The use of 1 John 1. 9, is for restoration of communion not for justification.

for this they must be; they are indications of what will please the Lord Jesus, who is Himself the Rule or Supreme Incentive of the Christian's life.

Seventh Day Adventists often object that if a Christian is not under law as a rule of life, it must follow that he is free to break the law and live in a state of spiritual anarchy. Such would be antinomianism.

Dr. Scofield well observes here: "When Paul says, 'We are not under law' does he stop there? No, indeed! He hastens to add 'but under grace.' The renewed heart longs unspeakably to do the whole will of God. His agony (Rom. 7. 18-24) is that though he delights in the law, he cannot do the law. And conversely, the true ground of exaltation in deliverance from law is that what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (Rom. 8. 3), Grace does perfectly through the Spirit."

The Apostle Paul evidently had to meet precisely this very objection made by Seventh Day Adventists that being "not under" meant licence to live in it, for he continues: "What then, shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace? God forbid."

The very fact that such an inference (mistaken though it was) could be made from the preceding verse, shows that we must take the words "not under law" as being not under law as a rule or incentive of life (Christ is the Incentive). If it meant not under the condemnation of the law, as most Seventh Day Adventists argue, no such objection would have arisen. Think this through carefully. The Apostle Paul however shows that this objection, though possible, was a thoroughly mistaken one, and was due to a total misapprehension of the situation. It would be, he says, for a man, who had been freed by union with Christ, through faith, from the bondservice of the tyrant "Mr. Sin," to deliberately choose to be a slave to him again, to be under his dominion again.

The relationship of the Christian to the law is more fully gone into in the next chapter, in which becomes still more plain that the law, with special reference to

the Decalogue (see verses 7, 8, which refer to the 10th commandment) is not itself the rule of life for the Christian, but Christ is.

Let us notice particularly verses 1, 4, and 6:

"Or are ye ignorant, brethren...how that the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth?

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to Him who was raised from the dead, that we might bring forth fruit unto God.

"But now have we been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden, so that we serve in newness of the Spirit, and not in oldness of the letter."

The Apostle makes use of the marriage relation as an illustration. Just as a woman is bound to her husband as long as both are living, so man is bound to the law as long as both are living. But if one of the parties dies the other becomes free to enter into a new alliance. He says: "The woman that hath an husband is bound by the law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of her husband" (v. 2).

While her husband is alive, he is her rule "of life," she obeys his lawful behests. But after the death of her first husband, when she is "joined to another man" (v. 3) he becomes her new "rule of life." So also, when a man ceases to be under the "dominion" (v. 1) of the law by becoming, through faith, identified with Christ in His death, burial, and resurrection, he is "discharged from the law" as a rule of life, and is joined "to another" even to Christ, who is now Himself the new "rule of life." Of necessity the illustration breaks down at one point for, in point of fact, though the first husband of the woman dies, the law does not die (the A.V. of v. 6 is defective, see the R.V. quoted above) but the man does, he dies "in Christ."

Tabulating the result, we have:

The Old Husband	The New Husband
The Law	Christ
The old rule of life.	The new rule of life.

Moreover the new relationship produces "fruit unto God," instead of "the sinful passions which were through the law" (v. 5) with "fruit unto death."

The Apostle Paul's own relation to the law is found in 1 Corinthians 9. 20, 21, R.V. "And to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law (I became) as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law (I became) as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law."

This is most instructive. Notice that in each case the Apostle was vacating temporarily, as it were, his true position before God, to assume for the time being a different one, in order that he might gain the individual in that position. Notice also that he describes three distinct classes of people. Let us take them in order.

(1). **The Jew.** The Apostle Paul was at one time very proud of his position as a Jew. He was a Hebrew of Hebrews, and as touching the righteousness which is of the law, blameless (Phil. 3. 4-6). But on accepting Christ he passed over to a new position in Christ "where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all" (Col. 3. 11). He was now a member of the Church of God. After Pentecost the Word of God divides men into three classes on the earth:

"Give no occasion of stumbling either to the Jews, or to the Greeks (Gentiles) or to the Church of God" (1 Cor. 10. 32).

This then is God's classification. But Seventh Day Adventists often disregard it by saying that, in God's sight, they are the Jews, the literal Jews having been, they say, cast off for ever. The Apostle Paul evidently did not think so, as to himself he utterly repudiated his old position as a Jew, for in order to try and gain the Jew, he, on occasion, became as a Jew, that is, assumed that position. See an illustration of this in Acts 21. 26. Obviously one cannot assume what one is.

(2). **The man under law.** Who is this? Surely not the Jew, his case has just been dealt with. It is the case of a man, who like the Galatians, and we say it tenderly, like the Seventh Day Adventists, had put himself under the law as a rule of life. For notice, the Apostle was able to temporarily assume this position. But he is quick to insert a parenthesis "not being myself under the law." Notice that this assumption plainly rules out the Seventh Day Adventist idea that "under law" means under the condemnation of the law; for the Apostle would never voluntarily assume this latter position, even temporarily, to gain any one.

(3). **The man without law.** This evidently is the Gentile, to whom the written law of God had never been given, see Romans 2. 14: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, not having the law, are a law unto themselves."

The Apostle could, at times, assume this position also, in order to win the Gentile. But he again inserts a parenthesis explaining that his real position was "not without law to God, but under law to Christ," or as it is more literally rendered "not lawless toward God, but inlawed to Christ." That is to say, the pleasing of Christ was his law or rule of life. There is no exact equivalent in English for this word "*ennomos*" lit., inlawed; we have "outlawed", outside the pale of law. "Inlawed to Christ" means that Christ is the Aim, the Incentive, the Rule of life, and all the teachings of grace not being in themselves a rule, simply indicate what will please Him, and "His commandments are not grievous." The eye of faith is not so much on a set of rules, but is "looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith" (Heb. 12. 2).

So we discover that "not under law" does not mean being lawless, far from it; it is the pre-requisite to being "under grace."

We shall close this section with a passage of Scripture which in a wonderful way illustrates the difference between being "not under law, but under grace," namely John

10. 1-16. But it must be read in the Revised Version, for the whole point of verse 16 is lost in the A.V., thus:

"And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and they shall become one flock one Shepherd."

Notice here the contrast between the "fold" and the "flock" which is lost in the A.V. Now let us go back to the beginning of the chapter.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the fold of the sheep, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber" (v. 1).

Here the Lord Jesus is speaking of the fold. The sheepfold represents Israel. In the past many false shepherds, wicked kings, false prophets, Pharisees, and scribes had ruled over the fold. They had fleeced the sheep instead of feeding them, they had ruled over them with force and rigour (Ezek. 34. 1-5). But in verse 23 of this latter chapter we read:

"And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David."

How was this true shepherd to be recognised when he came? In this way: "He that entereth by the door is the shepherd of the sheep" (v. 2).

Jesus Christ, the greater David, came in by the door of fulfilled prophecy. He was the Messiah promised in the Old Testament Scriptures.

"To Him the porter openeth" (v. 3).

Who is the porter? Evidently John the Baptist, who was the last in that succession of the prophets which guarded the door of the Jewish sheepfold pending the arrival of the Shepherd. John recognised the Shepherd when He came, as we see in John 1. 29-34, "Behold the Lamb of God...this is the Son of God." And he opened the door to Him. Then we read "And the sheep hear His voice" (v. 3). The Lord's primary mission was to the "lost house of Israel" (Matt. 15. 24). At first it seemed that the whole of Israel would accept Him, for "the common people heard Him gladly" (Mark 12. 37); but, alas, it was not to be so, "He came unto His own and His own received Him not" (John 1. 11). The increasing

hostility on the part of the people, and the official rejection by the scribes and Pharisees, plainly showed that the Jewish fold as a whole would not accept Him. There was but one alternative possible, "He calleth His own sheep by name and leadeth them out" (v. 3). In thus calling them to follow Him, He was in effect thrusting them out, as is the meaning of the rather strong word in the next verse. For, as is plain from the previous chapter, to confess Christ meant being cast out of the synagogue, as was the case of the man born blind (chap. 9. 34). And the Lord was calling the sheep to such an attitude to Himself as would involve this. Once outside the fold they were under His loving care and guiding voice: "When He hath put forth all His own (sheep) He goeth before them, and the sheep follow Him: for they know His voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers" (v. 4, 5).

Upon once hearing His voice no stranger voice can attract: "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6. 66-68).

In the second half of the allegory the sheep are now outside the fold, under the loving care of the Shepherd, and their relationship to Him is now described. This relationship is twofold:

(1). He is the Door, not of the "fold," but of the "sheep" (v. 7-10); through Him these sheep, thrust out of the Jewish fold, enter into salvation, liberty, protection, and sustenance: "I am the door; by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and shall find pasture" (v. 9).

(2). He is the Good Shepherd of the sheep, as such He layeth down His life for the sheep (v. 11). Such love must beget and hold the loyalty of the sheep surrounding Him, for love begets love (v. 11-15).

But in verse 16, a new thought appears, this salvation is not to be offered only to those called out of the Jewish fold, it is to be offered to the Gentiles also: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and they shall become one flock one Shepherd" (v. 16).

Now what is the difference between a fold and a flock? In a fold we have sheep kept together by external walls; in a flock, however, we have a collection of sheep kept together by an attraction to a common centre, the Shepherd.

The Jews, during the dispensation of law, formed a fold, they were surrounded, as it were, by external regulations separating them from the surrounding nations. Again and again they were commanded "Thou shalt not" not break certain bounds, "Thou shalt" remain strictly within certain limits. If they kept bounds they were promised blessings, but if they broke bounds they were threatened with cursings. Theirs was a circumscribed unity, a unity of restraint, they were under duress. As a separated people they should have been an object lesson to the world, but in this they proved a miserable failure. Through them God was, by sample as it were, testing the best that man could do "under law," trying by self-effort to work out a righteousness of their own apart from faith (Rom. 9. 30-33). Even in the presence of their Messiah they hardened their hearts.

So a new method of dealing became necessary, the whole legal system was abandoned, and the Jewish sheep were led out. They now, together with those among the Gentiles whom the Lord will call, form a flock. What now holds them together? for now they have liberty to go "in and out;" What but a common loyalty to the Good Shepherd who layeth down His life for them who are His sheep? Theirs is a centripetal attraction. Their delight is now to do His will and to please Him. Theirs is not the irksome obedience to a set of rules, but the spontaneous loyalty to a loved Saviour. This then, in measure, is what it means to be "under grace." We can now appreciate the depth of the Apostle's statement that, "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 10. 4).

Now reverting to our major illustration of the two legislative acts, we observed that some of the provisions of the old act may be carried over into the new, yet others may be dropped. This illustrates the fact, for fact it is,

that all the commandments of the Decalogue have been carried over to be re-embodied in the "teachings of grace" in the epistles, except one, namely the Sabbath precept. This has never been re-affirmed as a precept for the Church. And why so? Because the Sabbath precept is not, we contend, like the other nine, a purely moral precept at all, but is, on the contrary, providential and ceremonial in its nature. The providential aspect is that of a weekly rest for man and beast; the ceremonial aspect is that which emphasises the seventh day of the week. Under grace the providential aspect reappears in the weekly rest of the Lord's Day, but there is a change in the other aspect.

An illustration will be apposite here. It is well known that American law is based upon British law. At the time of the separation many of the laws of the British codes were carried over into the American Constitution. But some of the laws of the two codes are now different. For instance, the national rule of the road. If an Englishman visits America, does he abstain from stealing because the British law prohibits stealing? By no means. He is no longer under British law but under American, and the latter also prohibits stealing. Suppose however he were to drive a motor car down the left hand side of the road, as in Britain, he would be liable to be fined. Why? Because the American rule of the road is to drive on the right hand side of the road, and he is now under American Law.

Just so, "under grace" a Christian will keep all the nine moral laws of the Decalogue, not because he is under that law, he is not; but because these same commandments are contained in the "teachings of grace." But just as the rule of the road in America, though similar in principle, differs in detail from the rule of the road in Britain, so the rest days of the two dispensations though similar in principle, differ in detail as to the particular day of the week. The Sabbath has not been changed, strictly speaking, into the Lord's Day; but it has been superseded by the Lord's Day during the present dispensation of Grace.

A striking instance of the reaffirmation of the moral principles of the Decalogue is found in Ephesians 6. 2, 3:

"Honour thy father and mother (which is the first commandment with promise) that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth."

This is a verbatim quotation from the Septuagint translation of Deuteronomy 5. 16 (the clause "that it may be well with thee" not appearing in the Exodus version), with the exception that the parenthetical clause "as the Lord commanded thee," and the limiting clause "which the Lord thy God giveth thee" are omitted. The word "land" of Deuteronomy 5. 16 is not changed into "earth" in the Ephesian quotation as might be surmised from the English translation, it is the same word in both cases; the Hebrew, "*erets*" of Deuteronomy 5. 16, and the Greek "*ge*" of the Septuagint version and of Ephesians 6. 3, have both meanings of "land" and "earth," the context determining which. In Deuteronomy 5. 16, the clause "which the Lord thy God giveth thee" limits the term to the "Promised Land," but the omission of this clause in Ephesians 6. 3, enlarges the term to that of the "earth." The Apostle Paul has deliberately omitted the clause in order to generalise the principle contained in the letter of the fifth commandment, which could not in that form apply to the Church at large. The quotation is then, in this form, very significant. Furthermore the quotation incidentally disproves the Seventh Day Adventist theory that the Decalogue is a separate law by itself from the rest of the Mosaic law, because the Apostle here speaks of the fifth commandment as being "the first commandment with promise." As far as the Decalogue is concerned it is the only commandment with promise; but the Decalogue is, as it were, the nucleus of the Mosaic law, a succinct summary of the principles subsequently to be enlarged.

CHAPTER VIII

Our Lord and the Sabbath

Now the contention that the Sabbath precept is not a moral one like the other nine in the Decalogue, but is providential and ceremonial in its nature, is stoutly resisted by Seventh Day Adventists. For such an admission would be quite fatal to their theories. So we shall proceed to show that this contention follows directly from the teaching of the Lord Jesus Himself, and from the teaching of the Apostle Paul.

To understand thoroughly the example and teaching of the Lord Jesus towards the Sabbath, it will first be necessary to discuss the attitude of the Jewish nation towards this day during His lifetime.

The Jewish attitude of this period was the outcome of many experiences in their previous history. Up to the time of the seventy years captivity the Jewish nation was marked by a continuous series of backslidings from God, and ensuing judgments, followed by repentance and restoration. the backslidings became worse as time went on, the people giving themselves up to idolatry and all kinds of wickedness. This period was also characterised by an increasing neglect of the daily and yearly sabbaths. Accordingly they were warned by God through the prophet Jeremiah as follows:

"Thus saith the Lord: take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem: neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day, neither do ye any work: but hallow ye the Sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers; but they hearkened not...." (Jer. 17. 21, 22).

At last God was compelled by their disobedience to punish them by sending them away into captivity, "until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years" (2 Chron. 36. 21).

After the captivity and their restoration to the land, the Jews, having learned their lesson, never relapsed into idolatry again; but they were still lax in their observance of the Sabbath. However, Nehemiah soon dealt stringently with this (Neh. 13. 15-22). Later on under the persecutions which they experienced under Alexander the Great, during the wars of the Maccabees, and the Roman aggression, they became more and more punctilious in their ritual. All these persecutions only served to accentuate their national pride and bigotry. The sect of the Pharisees arose and became, as it were, the guardians of their religion. Meticulous observance of their rites became the one desideratum which compensated for all errors. From the one extreme of laxness they swung to the opposite extreme of excessive punctiliousness. So much so, that around their ceremonial they had built up an oral or traditional law to guard their Divine religion. Yet, as we see in the Book of Malachi, with all this emphasis on the minutiae of the law, there developed an increasing insincerity in the worship of God.

Thus it came about that the Sabbath precept, as part of their ceremonial, became hedged about with numerous man-made additions. The injunction, "In it thou shalt do no manner of work," was explained by specifying no less than thirty nine different classes of work, many of them absolutely ridiculous.* Such then was the attitude of the Jews to the Sabbath when the Lord Jesus was born, lived, and died.

Then what was our Lord's attitude to the Sabbath, and how did He act among a people filled with such prejudices? First, being "made under the law," He observed the Sabbath, as far as we have any evidence, up to the day of His death. But how did He act towards the Jews and their prejudices? He knew that healing on the Sabbath would be regarded by them as a breach of the law. Did He follow the line of least resistance, and tactfully abstain from curing the sick upon that day? He might easily have done so and met their prejudices

* See Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," pp. 777-787.
E

by doing nothing, for no one would have dreamt of seeking a cure on that day. By no means. On the contrary He forced the question to the front. No less than seven miracles of healing are recorded as having been wrought by Him upon the Sabbath. (1) The demoniac, Mark 1. 21. (2) Peter's wife's mother, Luke 4. 51. (3) The paralytic, John 5. 5-18. (4) The man with the withered hand, Luke 6. 6-9. (5) The man born blind, John 9. 14-16. (6) Woman with infirmity, Luke 13. 10-16. (7) The man with dropsy, Luke 14. 1-5. In none of these miracles was any application made to Him, nor was there any urgency. They could all have been deferred. All were done of His own volition and set purpose, and in such a way as would attract and evoke the criticism of the Pharisees and priests. Let us take, for instance, the healing of the paralytic in John 5. 5-18. Not only did our Lord heal the man on the Sabbath, but He told him, "Take up thy bed, and walk" (v. 11). He might easily have told him to lie there until the morrow, and so avoid publicity. This action of our Lord seemed an open and flagrant breach of Jeremiah 17. 21, which prohibits the bearing of any burden on the Sabbath. Take again the healing of the man born blind (John 9. 14-16). The Lord spat on the ground and made clay and anointed the man's eyes, and directed him, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam," all of which He knew would be deemed desecration of the Sabbath.

Now the paralytic and also the man born blind could plead justification when accused, by pleading the command of Christ, and the Lord took upon Himself the full responsibility. What was His defence in the first case? For here seemed a plain infraction of the letter of Jeremiah 17. 21. What reply did He make? He simply referred His accusers to the fact of His Sonship to the Father, which would entitle Him to exercise a liberty of action not lawful for any others (John 5. 17-21). But we ask here, would this relationship entitle Him to disregard a moral law? God forbid! Then there must be something different in the Sabbath law.

Such was the example of our Lord before the Jews

as regards the Sabbath. We shall now proceed to His direct teaching on the question.

We read in Matthew 12. 1, how that the Lord was walking with His disciples on the Sabbath through some ripe corn-fields. The disciples, being hungry, "began to pluck the ears of corn and eat." This was in accord with what we find written in Deuteronomy 23. 25.

"When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbour's standing corn."

Hence what was done was quite lawful; but it was done on the Sabbath and therefore, in the eyes of the Pharisees, illegal. So they object: "Behold Thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath day."

Now what is our Lord's defence? It is of the utmost importance in this controversy to notice just what He says, for Seventh Day Adventists fail, we think, just here. Their view is that Christ merely aimed to sweep aside the mass of human traditions which had collected round the Sabbath commandment, and to establish the Sabbath more firmly than ever.* It is quite true that the Lord did attack their traditions (see Matt. 15. 6, and Mark 7. 7, 9, 13); no one doubts this for a moment. But He did more. He attacked their misconceptions as to the nature of the Sabbath law, which led to all these man-made appendices, as it were, to that day.

Did He say, "My disciples are not desecrating the Sabbath, but only your additions to the Sabbath?" Not at all! His defence is entirely different. He pleads in their justification David's action with his followers, how when an hungered, they entered the house of God, and ate the shewbread which was quite unlawful for any but the priests to eat. Why did our Lord quote an apparent sin of David in justification of His disciples? We say—apparent—for evidently in the Lord's eyes David was, like the disciples, "guiltless" (v. 7). We answer—To establish the principle that the need of David and his followers was superior to one of the strictest

* C. B. Haynes, "The Christian Sabbath," p. 44.

ceremonial laws of the Temple (the Tabernacle in David's time) see Leviticus 24. 9. Suppose David had stolen to satisfy his and his follower's hunger, would the Lord have justified His disciples on such a ground? God forbid! No need can ever justify the infraction of a moral law, whatever Jesuits may say.

We must now apply the Lord's principle. Just as David was a king in rejection, and his followers were in dire need through following him, and so were guiltless in an infraction of a ceremonial law of the Tabernacle; so also was Christ, the Greater David, a King in rejection—and His followers being in dire need through following Him, are likewise justified in an infraction of a ceremonial law—the law of the Sabbath. What justified David and his followers was their need. Otherwise their action would have been blameworthy. What then justified the Lord's disciples was their need. Otherwise their action, too, would have been open to criticism. But no need can over-ride a moral law.

What is the next step in our Lord's defence? The Pharisees had said that His disciples had done that which was unlawful. The Lord therefore referred them to the Law. "How that the priests constantly profane the Sabbath every Sabbath day and are guiltless." It was a proverb that there was no Sabbatism in the Temple; indeed, instead of less work on that day in the Temple there was more, the daily sacrifices were doubled. Now what have we here? We have the ceremonial law of the Temple over-riding the law of the Sabbath. Again, let us observe that no law of the Temple could possibly over-ride a moral law, and justify such breaches of the Decalogue such as murder, stealing, etc. Could the seventh commandment be broken by the priests, and the fact that the deed was done in the Temple excuse the perpetrator? God forbid! Remember God's condemnation of Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, for the sin related in 1 Samuel 2. 22 and 3. 13, 14, and how they were slain as a result (1 Sam. 4. 17). Yet the law of the Temple did, to use the Lord's own words, "profane"* the Sabbath, and this with

* A very strong word in the Greek; meaning, to profane, violate, desecrate, pollute.

Christ's approval. The argument here is almost like a theorem in Euclid. If the law of need can over-ride the law of the Temple, and the law of the Temple can over-ride the law of the Sabbath, how much more can the law of need over-ride the (ceremonial) law of the Sabbath. Thus the Lord's disciples were to be held guiltless.

This argument is augmented in the next verse, "But I say unto you that One greater than the Temple is here." The Lord Jesus being that "One." If the Temple service was superior to the Sabbath and could "profane" or violate it, how much more could the Lord Jesus, being greater than the Temple, violate it if He wished. Again we must observe that to suggest that our Lord could violate a moral law would almost be blasphemy, for it would be for Him to deny His own nature.

What is the next stage in the argument? The Lord quotes from Hosea 6. 6. "If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless."

How does this quotation justify His disciples? By quoting this verse from Hosea in connection with the Sabbath the Lord puts the Sabbath in the same category as sacrifice, a ceremonial matter. Just as the claims of mercy, in God's sight, were in a certain sense superior to sacrifice, so was mercy in the present instance of the disciples superior to the Sabbath. Thus the Sabbath was part of that formal and external system of honouring God peculiar to the dispensation of the law. The Sabbath, as such, was subservient to mercy or man's need. The Jews had made man and his needs subservient to the Sabbath regulation; but the Lord reverses that and makes the Sabbath subservient to man and his needs. The Sabbath was a means to an end, it was never an end in itself. Whenever therefore the keeping of the Sabbath according to the letter of the law conflicted with mercy or man's need, it was more honoured in the breach of it than in its observance.

This quotation from Hosea, then, served to show that the Pharisees had quite mistaken the intrinsic nature of the Sabbath commandment. They had imagined

that the Sabbath commandment was on a level with the other nine moral commandments of the Decalogue, which could admit of no infraction whatever. They thought that it was a law to be meticulously observed as necessary for man's salvation, and of which the least infraction merited death. Some Seventh Day Adventists are making a similar mistake. What shall we say, for instance, to the following teaching of Mr. O. A. Johnson, Seventh Day Adventist teacher, who says, "One of the conditions of salvation and having our names retained in the Book of Life is to keep the Sabbath."* On the contrary, the Sabbath, as to its nature, is providential and ceremonial, partly the one and partly the other. There may possibly be a moral principle in the observance of a day as being set apart as "unto Jehovah," but as we shall show later, such a moral aspect does not inhere in any particular day of itself. The holiness or lack of holiness of a day is not inherent, but depends upon external authority. We shall deal with this aspect of the day fully later on.

It is in connection with this providential side of the Sabbath that we read in the parallel passage in Mark 2. 27, 28 (more fully than in Matthew) that, "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. So then the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath."

Yes, the Pharisees had completely inverted the design of the day, and misunderstood its nature. It was made to serve man, but man was not made to serve or be a slave of the Sabbath. So then it comes about that the Lord Jesus, as Son of Man, the representative of man, was Lord and superior to the Sabbath in spite of it being a Divine precept (for such surely is the force of the word "even"). Observe that the Lord does not say that as "the Son of God" this is so, for that might refer to Him as the Author of that day; but as "the Son of Man," the Head of humanity and its needs; in this respect He was Lord and could over-ride it, if He thought fit. In spite of wearying our readers we must again observe that the Lord Jesus could never under any circumstances over-ride a moral law.

* "Bible Text Book." O. A. Johnson, p. 36.

Seventh Day Adventists profess to be shocked at the idea that the words, "the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath" can be interpreted to mean that He was entitled to over-ride it under certain circumstances, such as when it conflicted with the superior law of mercy or need. Yet this idea is certainly present in verse 6, where He says, "One greater than the Temple is here." If our Lord was greater than the Temple could He not also be greater than the Sabbath? If the Sabbath law is indeed a purely moral law, then we, too, would be shocked at the suggestion that our Lord could set it aside in any circumstances; but the whole objection falls to the ground when it is recognised that the Sabbath law is providential and ceremonial in its nature.

It has been argued that the words "the Sabbath was made for man" prove its universality. The issue naturally turns upon the exact force of the word "man" in the text. Did our Lord wish to intimate that He was here extending the sphere of the Jewish Sabbath to all men? Or was He using the word "man" in the narrower sense as referring to Israel, the very people of the immediate context?

It has been pointed out that the word "man" is used in the O.T. no less than 336 times when applying to Israel alone. On the other hand in the N.T. the word often refers to the Christian only: for instance, "That we may present every man perfect in Christ" (Col. 1. 28) also "Christ is the Head of every man" (1 Cor. 11. 3). So the word "man" may have a limited meaning according to the context, and when we remember that in no other Scripture is the Sabbath ever applied to Gentiles, we may well conclude that in this case the word "man" in agreement with the immediate context, namely the verses we have expounded, is limited to Israel. At any rate we can certainly say that the wider sense of mankind in general is not necessarily implied as Seventh Day Adventists so often assume.

The next Sabbath incident occurred very soon after. The Lord Jesus was teaching in the Synagogue on that day. His enemies brought a man with a withered hand there to test Him, with a view to bringing an accusation

against Him. They asked, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath Day?" The Lord answered them by asking in return, "Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good (as He was doing) or to do evil (as they were doing in attacking Him); to save life (as He was doing) or to destroy it (as they were meditating in their hearts against Him)?" He turns to their own practice and asks: "What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man of more value than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day."

To this they vouchsafe no reply, but hardened their hearts to the evident truth of what He had said. Then looking round on them with righteous indignation He forthwith healed the man. Why was the Lord, so full always of compassion and gentleness, so roused? It was at men, who laying hold of one of God's most merciful and providential institutions for man and beast, had perverted its object and made it into an instrument for torturing man. No, the Sabbath was not a purely moral precept, which could admit of no infraction whatever, but rather a providential and ceremonial precept, which as such might be more honoured in the breach than in the observance when such observance was contrary to its nature. It was to be kept in the spirit rather than in the letter. In Luke 14. 1-5, we have this argument repeated.

Lastly, in John 7. 22, 23, the Lord says:

"On the Sabbath ye circumcise a man. If a man receiveth circumcision on the Sabbath, that the law of Moses may not be broken; are ye wroth with Me, because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath?"

Again the Lord defends Himself for having healed on the Sabbath by referring to their own practice, how that the Sabbath law had to give way in favour of a ceremonial regulation of the law of Moses; this being so it must also give way to a greater operation—the making of this man every whit whole, an act of mercy. But again notice as above in Matthew 12. 7, the placing of

the Sabbath in the same category as a ceremonial law. No moral law could give way to a ceremonial law.

That the foregoing arguments as to the ceremonial and merciful nature of the Sabbath regulation are true, follows from the nature of things. Purely moral laws are not called into existence by being commanded, they inhere from natural relations. Ceremonial laws, on the contrary, are arbitrary in the sense that they only come into force by being imposed by an external authority. In agreement with this we read, "The Sabbath was made for man."

Now there is no difference inherent in the nature of days themselves. No day is holy in and of itself and by its own nature. But it can be made so by authority, if that authority so desires; and it can cease to be so by the same authority, if that authority so desires. There is no intrinsic difference between the seventh and the first day of the week. The holiness or lack of it come from an external source. And this is true of all ceremonial days or seasons. Take for instance, the Sabbatical year; the Sabbath principle is common to both this institution and to the Sabbath day, yet all admit that the Sabbatical year is not binding upon Christians—why then the Sabbath day?

Seventh Day Adventists tacitly admit a distinction between the nine moral precepts of the Decalogue and the ceremonial precept of the Sabbath, for they recognise as true Christians such men as Bunyan, Moule, Spurgeon, Wesley and many others who habitually observed the first day of the week as the Christian day of worship. But what man would they recognise as a Christian who habitually broke the third or the sixth or the seventh commandment even ignorantly? Mrs. White, their prophetess, wrote of Bunyan, "John Bunyan breathed the very atmosphere of Heaven," yet Bunyan wrote a treatise against the Sabbath in favour of the first day of the week. Would Mrs. White have written in this way about Bunyan if he had written against any of the other nine commandments of the Decalogue? We would hardly think so.

CHAPTER IX

The Apostle Paul on the Sabbath

WE now come to the teaching of the Apostle Paul on the Sabbath. There are two passages which have a bearing on the matter, Colossians 2. 14, 16, 17, and Galatians 4. 9, 10. We shall examine the former first, quoting as usual from the R.V.:

"Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the Cross;... Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's."

This Scripture is an exceedingly awkward one for Seventh Day Adventists. For here we learn:

(a) That the Sabbath is, together with the ceremonial feast-day and new moon, definitely said to be a shadow (*i.e.* type) of things to come, of which the body or substance is Christ's.

(b) That a Christian is to permit no one, not even a Seventh Day Adventist, to judge him, *i.e.*, take him to task (so Moule, Lightfoot, Moffatt) sit in judgment over him (Weymouth), subject him to censure (Tayer-Grimm), in respect of a feast-day, new moon, or a Sabbath, *i.e.*, for failing to observe them.

(c) That this is so because these shadows, including the Sabbath, here enumerated, together with the matter of meats and drinks, are included in that "bond written in ordinances" which has been blotted out.

Could one imagine a more complete reply to Seventh Day Adventists propaganda on the Sabbath? Indeed, Seventh Day Adventists admit fully that such ceremonial laws as the observance of new moons and feast-days have been blotted out—why not then the Sabbath, which the Apostle here places in exactly the same category?

Now Seventh Day Adventists profess to follow Scripture, hence they must either abstain from their judgment of others in the matter of the Sabbath in obedience to this Scripture, or they must explain it away. And this they attempt to do by contending that the shadowy Sabbath here mentioned refers, not to the weekly Sabbath, but to the "seven yearly rest days or Sabbaths" of Leviticus 23. Let us therefore patiently and thoroughly test this objection of theirs.

First we would ask—What is the natural, unrestrained force of the word "Sabbath" in the above text? Without doubt the average Bible student, unless he had a preconceived theory to uphold, would take the word to mean what it always means elsewhere in the New Testament, namely, the weekly Sabbath. Even Seventh Day Adventists admit that in many cases in which the word occurs in the N.T. (upwards of 57 according to Young's concordance) the word always means the weekly Sabbath, but they say that in this one solitary case it represents, not the weekly Sabbath, but the "seven annual or typical Sabbaths of Leviticus 23." Such a statement, on the face of it, sounds most improbable. Moreover, the Greek word "*sabbata*" (*sabbaton* is the genitive of *sabbata*) here translated "sabbath day" is exactly the same word as is used by the Hebrew translators of the Septuagint to render "Sabbath" in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue.

Then again, even a cursory examination of the passage will show that the Seventh Day Adventist meaning for "Sabbath day" is a highly unnatural and improbable one; for they say that this expression refers to the "seven annual or typical Sabbaths of Leviticus 23." But when we examine this latter chapter we find that there were seven set-feasts (Heb., *moed*, appointed or set season) not seven sabbaths. Notice carefully the opening and close of this chapter:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, the set-feasts (*moed*) of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my set-feasts" (v. 1, 2).

Then follow the "set-feasts." And the chapter closes: "And Moses declared unto the Children of Israel the set-feasts of the Lord" (v. 44).

These set-feasts or appointed seasons (*moed*) are respectively:

(1) Passover. (2) Unleavened Bread. (3) First-fruits. (4) Pentecost. (5) Trumpets. (6). Day of Atonement. (7) Tabernacles.

But these appointed seasons were grouped together into three annual festivals (Heb., *chag*) when all males were to appear before the Lord, thus: (1) Unleavened Bread. (2) Weeks (or Harvest). (3) Tabernacles (or Ingathering).

But in the same chapter, closely associated with these set-feasts we find the weekly Sabbath (v. 3); and what can be more natural for the term "feast-day" of Colossians 2. 16, to refer to these seven set-feasts of Leviticus 23, and for the term "Sabbath day" in Colossians 2. 16, to refer to the Sabbath day of Leviticus 23. 3, *i.e.*, the weekly Sabbath? Let us be fair at all costs and not force the passage. We maintain that the presumption is entirely in favour of the term "Sabbath day" having its usual meaning, namely, the weekly Sabbath; and any evidence used in rebuttal of this will need to be very strong indeed to carry conviction.

The text of Colossians 2. 16, is so important that we shall give the actual Greek words with an interlineal translation, and then define our terms

"in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day."
en merci heortēs ē noumēnias ē sabbatōn.

Heortē, feast-day; used 27 times in the N.T. in connection with the feast of the Passover, Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, Tabernacles, and finally in this passage. It is used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew *moed*, and *chag*, feast.

Noumēnia (or *neomēnia*) new moon; used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew, *chodesh*, a new moon.

Sabbata, Sabbath day. Of this word here in Colossians 2. 16, Dr. Moule, a first-rank Greek scholar, says, "the

original, *sabbata*, is a Greek plural in form and declination, but only as it were by accident. It is a transliteration of the Aramaic singular *shabbatha* (Heb., *shabbath*)."* It is to be remembered that when the New Testament was written, Greek and Aramaic, not Hebrew, were commonly spoken; thus it came about that the Aramaic "*shabbatha*," (corresponding to the Hebrew "*shabbath*") became transliterated into the Greek "*sabbata*." Thus the R.V. has "a Sabbath day," singular, instead of the plural "Sabbaths" of the A.V. This disposes of the argument of a few sabbatarians who saw in the plural "sabbaths" of the A.V. evidence (as they thought) of a variety of Sabbaths against the one regular weekly Sabbath, (*sabbaton* in the Greek above is merely the genitive of *sabbata*).

But as Seventh Day Adventists have quoted Barnes for the view that the word "Sabbath" in our text is in the plural number and therefore not the weekly Sabbath, which contradicts Dr. Moule's statement quoted above; we shall give two extracts from the Greek lexicons which fully confirm Dr. Moule.

Abbott-Smith. "*Sabbaton*, -ou, to (Aramaic *shabbatha*, transliterated *sabbata*, and this being mistaken for a plur., the sing., *sabbaton* was formed from it) and *sabbata*, -on, ta.

1. The seventh day of the week, the Sabbath:

(a) The singular form -on, to *sabbatton* (various references).

(b) As most frequent in LXX the plural form, *ta sabbata* (see above on the Aramaic form) Matthew 28. 1; Col. 2. 16; (Ex. 20. 8, elsewhere)..."

Thayer-Grimm. "*Sabbaton*, -ou, to (Heb., *shabbath*) found in the N.T. only in the historical books, except twice in Paul's Epistle; Sabbath; *i.e.*:"

1. The seventh day of each week,

(a) singular *sabbaton* and to *sabbaton* (various references),

(b) Plural, *ta sabbata* (for the singular) of a single sabbath, Sabbath day, (the use of the plur. being occasioned either by the plur. names of festivals...or by

* Cambridge Bible, Colossians, Dr. Moule, *in loco*

the Chaldaic form *shabbatha*). Matt. 28. 1; Col. 2. 16 (Exod. 20. 10; Lev. 23. 32, etc)..."

This is conclusive. Barnes is evidently in error. Notice the references to Colossians 2. 16, in both lexicons emphasised above, also the references to Exodus 20. 8, 10, the Sabbath commandment; the latter, of course being from the Septuagint. As we shall show later, if the Apostle Paul had wished to refer in Colossians 2. 16, to the quasi-sabbaths of Leviticus 23, he would have had to select the Greek word "*anapausis*," but instead of doing this, he has used the very word used by the Hebrew translators of the fourth commandment of the Decalogue.

Now the natural thing to do, if we wished to ascertain the meaning of the different terms in this passage, is to search and see if there are any other passages of Scripture where these three terms, feast day, new moon, and Sabbath day, are grouped together in this fashion. Fortunately there are quite a number of such passages, and it will be found that the context of these passages will materially help us in fixing the meaning of the terms in question. The most striking of such passages are the following:

The Levites' office was "to stand every morning to thank...the Lord, and likewise at evening; and to offer all burnt-offerings unto the Lord in the Sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set-feasts in number, according to the ordinance concerning them, continually before the Lord" (1 Chron. 23. 30, 31).

Solomon proposed to build a house "for the burnt-offerings morning and evening, on the Sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the set-feasts of the Lord our God" (2 Chron. 2. 4).

"Then Solomon offered burnt-offerings unto the Lord... even as the duty of every day required, offerings according to the commandment of Moses, on the Sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the set-feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks (firstfruits or Pentecost) and in the feast of tabernacles" (2 Chron. 8. 12, 13).

Hezekiah appointed "for the burnt-offerings, to wit, for the morning and evening burnt-offerings, and for the burnt-offerings for the Sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set-feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord" (2 Chron. 31. 3).

"For the continual (daily) burnt-offerings, of the Sabbaths, of the new moons, for the set-feasts,..." (Neh. 10. 33).

"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies" (Hos. 2. 11).

"The burnt-offerings... in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the Sabbaths, in all the appointed feasts of the house of Israel" (Ezek. 45. 17).

"In respect of a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath" (Col. 2. 16).

An examination of these passages reveals a regular order, one might even say a formula. In the first five texts we have burnt-offerings (1) daily, (2) on the Sabbaths, (3) on the new moons, (4) on the set-feasts; a regular progression. In the last two texts the daily offerings are omitted and the order is reversed, otherwise the list is the same. Now compare this order with that of Colossians 2. 16; what a remarkable correspondence!

We must next ask, Do the Hebrew words in these Old Testament pages correspond with the Greek words of the Colossian passage? Most assuredly they do. The passage in Colossians is transcribed from the Septuagint translation of these very passages. Notice the following exact correspondence:

English	Hebrew	Greek of Septuagint	Greek of Colossians 2. 16.
Sabbath	<i>Shabbath</i>	<i>Sabbata</i>	<i>Sabbata</i>
New moon	<i>Chodesh</i>	<i>Neomēnia</i>	<i>Noumēnia</i> (same word)
Set-feast	<i>Moed, chag</i>	<i>Heortē</i>	<i>Heortē</i>

So these O.T. passages may well prove to be a key to the meaning of the Colossian passage, for if we can fix the meaning of the word "Sabbath" in these passages we fix it in Colossians 2. 16.

Now let us observe that these O.T. lists refer to burnt-offerings made unto Jehovah "according to the ordinance concerning them" "as it is written in the law of the Lord" (1 Chron. 23. 31, and 2 Chron. 31. 3). Then where do we find this ordinance... "written in the law?" In Numbers 28 and 29, and there only. It is quite true that we find a list of the set-feasts in Leviticus 23, but in this latter passage neither are the burnt-offerings of the feasts detailed as in the passage in Numbers, nor are the daily burnt-offerings nor those on the new moons mentioned. So this cannot possibly be the passage referred to. Let us then turn to the passage in Numbers. Here we have in—

Num. 28. 1-8	the offerings	"day by day, for a continual burnt-offering" (v. 3)
„ 9-10	„ on the	Sabbath
„ 11-15	„ „	New moon
„ 16-25	„ „	Passover and Unleavened Bread
„ 26-31	„ „	Firstfruits and weeks
„ 29. 1-6	„ „	(Pentecost) Trumpets
„ 7-11	„ „	Day of Atonement
„ 12-38	„ „	Tabernacles

The
Seven
Feasts

The same remarkable correspondence! Burnt-offerings (1) Day by day. (2) On the Sabbaths. (3) On the new moons. (4) On the set-feasts. Precisely as in the texts above. Now no one, not even a Seventh Day Adventist, would venture to deny that the Sabbath in the above passage in Numbers refers to the weekly Sabbath. The above correspondence therefore absolutely determines the meaning of the term in the O.T. passages in question; that is in the formula, so to speak, which is transcribed in Colossians 2. 16. Hence there can be no escape from the conclusion that the term "Sabbath" in this latter passage means what one would naturally suppose, namely,

the usual weekly Sabbath. Could one wish for better identification or proof.

Furthermore, in the leading Seventh Day Adventist textbook on the Sabbath question, "The History of the Sabbath," by Conradi and Andrews, there is on page 109 a most significant admission in favour of our argument, valuable inasmuch as it is unconscious, for, in reference to Hosea 2. 11, they say:

"The Sabbath of Jehovah, His feasts, and His new moons were wrested from Him by Israel, and became 'days of Baalim,' and consequently '*her* feast days, *her* new moons, and *her* Sabbaths.'" (italics theirs).

Again: "Israel still outwardly professed adherence to the Sabbath and the feasts. The form was still preserved, but inwardly these observances had become dead forms. In reality these celebrations were no longer reverent feasts of joy to Jehovah, but were performed to the honour of Baal" (p. 111, *idem*).

In other words, according to these Seventh Day Adventist authorities, Jehovah was disassociating Himself from her (Israel's) feast days, new moons, and Sabbaths, owing to her idolatrous misuse of them. But please observe particularly Conradi and Andrews' own identification of the "Sabbath of Jehovah" (the weekly Sabbath) with her "Sabbaths;" this latter term must therefore be the weekly Sabbath. This is just what we have been proving at length. This admission ought to carry weight with Seventh Day Adventists, because it is always recognised in courts of law that unconscious admissions in favour of a truth, made by the opposition, whose natural bias lies the other way, constitutes one of the best forms of evidence. What need then have we of further argument?

Yet Seventh Day Adventists persist in declaring that the word "Sabbath" in Colossians 2. 16 refers, not to the weekly Sabbath, but to what they call "the seven annual Sabbaths of Leviticus 23." And they go on to detail a list of these "annual Sabbaths." Very good, let us pursue the matter to the very end, and patiently examine this list of theirs, and see if this is so.

Their view of the matter is put concisely in one of their publications, O. A. Johnson's "Bible Text Book," page 91, where we read:

"There were also seven yearly rest days, or Sabbaths, as follows: (a) The first day of the passover feast, the fifteenth day of the first month, Abib, or Nisan. Exodus 12. 15, 16; Leviticus 23. 5-7."

In reply we ask, Where is this day called a "Sabbath?" Undoubtedly it is called a "holy convocation;" but this term is not synonymous with "Sabbath." "Sabbath" means rest, cessation; a "holy convocation" means a holy calling together. Although the Sabbath was to be a holy convocation, yet a holy convocation is not necessarily a Sabbath. Then notice particularly that on the Sabbath there was to be "no manner of work" done (Lev. 23. 3, R.V.); whereas on the feast of Unleavened Bread, the feast referred to above, a holy convocation, there was to be no "servile work" done (Lev. 23. 7). This is a significant distinction. The expression "no servile work" evidently corresponds to Exodus 12. 16, which says that on the feast of Unleavened Bread, a holy convocation, "no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you." On the Sabbath no fire could be lit, no roasting or boiling of food (Exod. 16. 23; 35. 3). Whereas on the feast of Unleavened Bread the Passover Lamb had to be roasted with fire. Here then is a significant distinction between a "Sabbath" and a "holy convocation."

The next in Mr. Johnson's list:

"(b) The seventh day of this feast, or the twenty-first day of the first month, Abib, or Nisan. Exodus 12. 15, 16; Leviticus 23: 5-8."

We reply that this feast is exactly parallel to the feast (a) above, so the same remarks apply to it. It is also called a "holy convocation" but not a "Sabbath"; it is a day on which no servile work was to be done (v. 8).

The next in his list:

"(c) The feast of the firstfruits or Pentecost, the fiftieth day after the first Sabbath in the passover feast.

Beginning to count with the sixteenth day of Abib, the fiftieth day after that would be the feast of Pentecost, which was also a rest day (Lev. 12. 15-21)."

We reply that this day was again to be a "holy convocation" on which no servile work was to be done (v. 17) but is not called a "Sabbath."

He next says:

"(d) The memorial of trumpets, which fell on the first day of the seventh month, was a Sabbath (Lev. 13. 13-15)."

We reply, the writer has evidently neglected to notice the correction which the Revised Version makes here. The word "Sabbath" in the Authorised Version is incorrect, and should have been "rest" or "solemn rest" as in the R.V. The word in the Hebrew original occurs in the O.T. 11 times in all; of these 11 times the A.V. itself 8 times renders the word "rest," but in three cases in this chapter, verse 24 and verse 39 (twice) it is inconsistent with itself, and renders the word "Sabbath"; the R.V. corrects this, and uniformly renders the word "solemn rest." Mr. J. N. Darby in his very excellent translation of the Bible in the same way uniformly renders it "rest." The Jewish translators of the Septuagint understood the difference, and rendered the Hebrew word by the Greek word "*anapausis*" (rest) not "*sabbata*." Accordingly in the three cases in this chapter where the A.V. has "Sabbath" they have used this Greek word "*anapausis*" not "*sabbata*." In verse 3 of this very chapter we have both words together, "a Sabbath of solemn rest" (R.V.); the Greek of the Septuagint has "*sabbata, anapausis*," lit., "a Sabbath, a rest." One could scarcely translate "a Sabbath of a Sabbath," which would be nonsense. So the "Sabbath" was to be a solemn rest, but, a solemn rest is not necessarily a Sabbath. Words, by common usage, may acquire a technical or restricted sense; such is the case in regard to the word "Sabbath;" it means rest, but by law of association it acquired a restricted meaning, the weekly rest; not so, the word rendered "solemn rest" in the R.V., this never acquired such a meaning. We find then that this feast of Trumpets

was to be a "holy convocation" on which no servile work was to be done (v. 25) but is not called a "Sabbath."

He next says:

"(e) The day of Atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, was a Sabbath (Lev. 13. 26-32)."

We remark, the writer is quite correct this time. This is the only day, apart from the weekly Sabbath, which this Scripture calls a "Sabbath." Further, this reference in a remarkable way confirms what we have been just pointing out, namely, the difference between a day on which "no servile work" was to be done, and a day on which "no manner of work" was to be done. For observe that on this day, a true Sabbath, "no manner of work" was to be done (v. 28, R.V.). Compare now with verse 3, where the weekly Sabbath is spoken of. In both cases we have in the R.V. the expression "a Sabbath of solemn rest," not merely a "solemn rest" as in verses 24 and 39. How carefully Scripture distinguishes between a "Sabbath" and a "holy convocation."

He next says:

"(f) The first day of the feast of tabernacles, the fifteenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 23. 39)."

We reply, the remarks on (d) above apply fully here. This is the second case where the R.V. has had to correct the A.V. by substituting "solemn rest" for "Sabbath." This day also was a "holy convocation" on which no servile work was to be done, but is not called a "Sabbath."

He says lastly:

"(g) The last day of this feast, the twenty-second day of the seventh month, was also a Sabbath (Lev. 23. 39)."

We reply, he is again mistaken. The remarks on (d) again apply in full force. This is the third case where the R.V. has had to substitute "solemn rest" for "Sabbath" of the A.V. This day also was a holy convocation on which no servile work was to be done, but is not called a "Sabbath."

Furthermore, when we compare this list with the list in Numbers 29 and 29, we find the same careful discrimination made between a "Sabbath" on which no manner of work was to be done, and a "holy con-

vocation" on which no servile work was to be done. Compare Numbers 29. 7, the Day of Atonement, with Numbers 28. 18, 25, 26; and Numbers 29. 1, 12, 35, reading always from the R.V.

Such is their list and argument. And what does it amount to? That in only one of the above instances does this Scripture call a set-feast day a "Sabbath," namely, the Day of Atonement, and in no other.

There is, however, one passage which Seventh Day Adventists use as a last resort, namely Leviticus 23. 37, 38. Let us quote it in full to get the context.

"These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering to be made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt-offering, and a meal offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, each on its own day: beside the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside your gifts, and beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye give to the Lord."

Their argument is that the expression "beside" the Sabbaths of the Lord, shows that there must have been other Sabbaths, *i.e.*, shadowy Sabbaths. But surely the context does not bear this out. The meaning seems to be perfectly clear, namely, that not only were the Sabbaths to be proclaimed "holy convocations," but these feasts of the Lord were to be proclaimed "holy convocations" also. And that not only were offerings to be made daily and on the Sabbaths (Num. 28. 10) but these special offerings were to be made on these feast days also, "each on its own day."

No, we fail to see how this text helps their case in any way. Read the passage through again carefully, and the foregoing will appear the natural interpretation.

We may well ask, if the Apostle Paul had wished under the term "Sabbath" in Colossians 2. 16, to refer these ceremonial feasts of Leviticus 23, these, as it were, quasi-sabbaths on which no servile work was to be done, why did he not select the Greek word "*anapausis*," which, as we have shown from the Septuagint translation, does correspond to the term "solemn rest" in Leviticus 23. 3, 24, 32, 39, R.V.? The Apostle Paul makes great use of

the Septuagint in his quotations; out of 84 quotations from the O.T. about 70 are taken directly from the Septuagint. Suppose, for instance, he had written, "*en merei heortēs e noumēnias ē anapauseōs*," then Seventh Day Adventists might have had a strong case for their contention of shadowy Sabbaths in the Colossian passage. But he has not. On the contrary, instead of "*anapausis*," he has made use of the word "*sabbata*" which does not correspond to these "solemn rests," but is the very word used in the Septuagint to render the word "Sabbath" in the fourth commandment. This in our judgment completely shatters the Seventh Day Adventist argument from Leviticus 23.

(1) We have found then that the three terms grouped in Colossians 2. 16, are an instance of a formula which appears again and again in the O.T.; a formula which specifically refers to an "ordinance concerning burnt-offerings" "written in the law" in Numbers 28 and 29, which passage identifies the word "Sabbath" with the weekly Sabbath. (2) This identification is actually admitted by the highest of Seventh Day Adventists authorities, Conradi and Andrews, in the case of the formula in Hosea 2. 11. (3) Furthermore, when the S.D.A. list of "the seven yearly Sabbaths of Leviticus 23," is examined, it is discovered that the term "Sabbath" is not correctly applied by Scripture to any of them except the Day of Atonement. (4) Furthermore, if the Apostle had wished to refer to these feasts or quasi-sabbaths, he would have had to select the Greek word "*anapausis*," but he did not. On the contrary he used the Greek word "*sabbata*" which is the word actually used in the fourth commandment in relation to the weekly Sabbath. Their evasion therefore on all counts completely fails. And what follows? This—that the Jewish weekly Sabbath is, just like the new moons and feast days in the same verse, "a shadow of things to come." But the shadow has been blotted out (v. 14), now that the "body," Christ, has come. Moreover this very thing is the fulfilment of a prophecy found in Hosea 2. 11, which foretold the "making to cease" of the Jewish Sabbath in conse-

quence of the Jewish nation having become, for the time being, "lo-ammi" *i.e.*, "not My people" (Hos. 1. 9). God having cast them off because of unbelief.

There is, however, one other argument from a different angle which is sometimes brought forward by Seventh Day Adventists in the attempt to prove that the term "Sabbath day" in Colossians 2. 16 cannot refer to the weekly Sabbath. It is this—the Lord Jesus says that the Sabbath "was made for man" (Mark 2. 27); how then can it be part of that "bond written in ordinances that was against us?" The explanation is not difficult. As a providential principle the Sabbath was "for man;" but as a part of a covenant of works to be perfectly obeyed, it was against him. All God's law, moral, civil, providential, and ceremonial, was "holy and righteous and good" (Rom. 7. 12) for the purpose for which it was given. And it was, theoretically, "unto life" (Rom. 7. 10); but in actual practice it proved to be "unto death," because of the desperate sinfulness and inability of the flesh. All this is implicit in the word "bond" quoted above. Let us quote the text again:

"Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us; and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the Cross" (Col. 2. 14).

In the A.V. the word "bond" is "handwriting," and Seventh Day Adventists have sometimes objected that the fourth commandment about the Sabbath was engraven in stone, and therefore could not be blotted "out" in the manner that handwriting in a book could, nor could it be nailed to the Cross. But they have quite misunderstood the significance of this word "handwriting," or "bond" as the R.V. has it.

The word "bond" is the translation of the Greek word "*cheiographon*" and in the Thayer-Grimm lexicon it is said that this word "is metaphorically applied in Colossians 2. 14, to the Mosaic law, which shows men to be chargeable with offences, for which they must pay the penalty." That is to say, it is broken law, against us with its accusations. It is a note-of-hand or an

obligation. Bengel here observes, "When a debt has been contracted, it generally follows that the debtor by his handwriting acknowledges himself bound. The debt is forgiven: and then, and not till then, the handwriting blotted out."* Notice in passing that the apostle says "against us" (Jews) not "against you." The Colossian Christians were Gentiles, and as such had never been under the law and its ordinances.

Now what law was it to which Israel had especially "set their hand"? We answer—the Decalogue. It was to this that they had said, "All that the Lord hath spoken will we do" (Exod. 24. 7). But they did it not. This was the broken law which exacted payment or penalty in default. But, thank God, Christ has paid its claim to the full, and has "taken it out of the way, nailing it to the Cross." When He was nailed there, the law was nailed there with its curse, for there "He became a curse for us" (Gal. 3. 13). An ancient way, we are told, of cancelling a debt was by striking a nail through the bond or note-of-hand to the debtor's door. Now to the giving of the Decalogue, as a covenant of works, was attached the whole ceremonial service, which if in any way burdensome, yet was the only means by which the broken law could be made more bearable through the grace and mercy contained in it. It was the only means by which the forbearance of God could be exercised, so that He might righteously "pass over the sins done aforetime" (Rom. 3. 25, R.V.) until the transaction at Calvary dealt with them. To have cancelled this merciful provision the ceremonial law, as is maintained by Seventh Day Adventists, and left in force the Decalogue with its demand of perfect obedience, would only have been a Gospel of despair. It is this passing of the law as a whole which enabled the Apostle to draw the conclusion of verse 16, as expressed in the word "therefore," from the teaching of verse 14, the ceremonial being included in the whole.

We come now to the second passage from the Apostle Paul's writings referred to above, namely, Galatians 4. 9-11, and its teaching is very similar.

* Gnomon, *in loco*, Bengel.

"How turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain."

Here we have practically the same list as before, and in the same order, but with the Jewish Sabbatical years added.

The word "seasons" corresponds accurately with the set-feasts of the O.T. formula we have been considering. For the word "*kairos*" used here in the Greek is often used, like "*heortē*" in Colossians 2. 16, in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew "*moed*," set-feast.

The word "months" also corresponds accurately to the "new moons" of the O.T. formula. For the Greek word "*mēn*" here used, is often, like "*noumēnia*" of Colossians 2. 16, used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew "*chodesh*," new moon.

The word "days" then should, by analogy, correspond to the word "Sabbath" in the same formula. For what else can it possibly refer to? The Apostle has been taking the Galatian Christians to task for reverting to the ceremonial of the Jewish law, in matters such as circumcision and such like. Seventh Day Adventists admit this, so it seems practically certain that with the feasts and new moons he is, under the term "days," including the Jewish Sabbath in the category of beggarly rudiments to be discarded; weak, in that they had no power to enable; beggarly, in that they were barren of Spiritual life. In the Apostle's eyes such action was very serious, it was falling from grace" (v. 11).*

Finally we must notice one final Seventh Day Adventist argument against the typical or shadowy nature of the Sabbath commandment, namely, its position as a commandment embedded in the Decalogue would naturally lead one to conclude that it is a purely moral commandment like the other nine, and therefore, like them, cannot be done away. We reply that if so, why does the Sabbath

* Such is the exposition of Alford, Bengel, Conybeare and Howson, Faussett, Girdlestone, Sanday, Darby, and many others.

commandment appear similarly embedded in the 23rd chapter of Leviticus, which otherwise has to do solely with the ceremonial set-feasts of Jehovah? So their argument cuts both ways. May not the solution well be that the Sabbath has more than one aspect.

(a) In as far as it is a rest on the seventh day it is ceremonial, *i.e.*, a type looking back to God's rest at the consummation of creation, and forward to God's rest in Christ, the privilege of the believer.

(b) In as far as it is a rest for man and beast—"in it thou shalt not do any work...nor thy cattle"—it is providential (it would be absurd to speak of a moral law for a beast; moral means "belonging to the manners or conduct of men").

(c) In as far as it prescribes one day in seven to be specially set apart unto Jehovah for worship it may have a moral aspect.

We submit that the Lord's Day correspondingly has a threefold aspect; but inasmuch as it points to the New Creation consummated at the resurrection, it belongs to the first day of the week. Further, that aspect of the fourth commandment which prescribes rest at the end of the week, that is at the end of work, which inheres in the seventh day under law, is replaced by a rest given prior to work, which inheres in the Christian first day under Grace. Law speaks of soul-rest as a reward at the end of work. Grace on the contrary speaks of soul-rest as a gift, prior to, and leading to work as its fruit.

CHAPTER X

The Sabbath as a Type

WE have just proved from the teaching of the Apostle Paul that the weekly Sabbath was a shadow or type. Of what then was it a type? Like many other types it pointed two ways. (1) Back to God's rest at creation. (2) Forward to the believer's rest in Christ.

Generally speaking Seventh Day Adventists, in spite of the Scriptures we have been examining, deny that the Sabbath can be a type, for they admit the passing away of typical law. They say that it cannot be a type because "it was made before types and shadows were instituted." Without going into the matter, whether the Sabbath was instituted in Eden or not, this statement of theirs can scarcely be true, because we know that God chose a lamb to be a type long before there was any Sabbath; we read, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13. 8); connect this with, "Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was made manifest in these last times for you" (1 Peter 1. 20). So this type of a "lamb" antedated the Sabbath by a very long time. But away with such excuses as these. The Apostle Paul says that it was a "shadow," and that settles the matter.

But occasionally Seventh Day Adventists betray themselves, and admit this very thing. Here, for instance, is a quotation from one of their latest publications, "The Lord's Day," by M. C. Wilcox, pages 32, 33:

"Therefore the Sabbath which was given of God primarily and for ever to be a memorial of the mighty power of God in the creation of the Heaven and the earth, *typical* of the greater deliverance from sin" (emphasis ours).

What further need then of argument? Here Mr. Wilcox admits the very thing we have been contending for. The Sabbath is a type of the greater deliverance

from sin. This is of course the teaching of the fourth chapter of Hebrews. Let us turn to it.

"Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into His rest, any one of you should seem to have come short of it" (Heb. 4. 1).

What is God's Rest? We answer in the words of another: "It cannot mean that when creation was finished God was wearied and needed recuperation, but that His work was done, and so ideally perfect and satisfactory that He could repose within Himself and in the midst of His works, with that blessed complacency of Him who 'saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.' The harmony between God and creation, in short, was complete. Into this Sabbatism God meant man to enter. Into this Sabbatism all men must ultimately enter who find their true destiny in the Lord Jesus Christ."*

With this we entirely agree. God's Rest does not concern God only, nor, as we shall discover presently, is it the mere keeping of the weekly Sabbath, but it is a relationship with Himself into which He invites man to enter. This is quite evident if we read through Hebrews 3. 13, to 4. 11, noting especially verses 3. 11, 19, and 4. 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-11.

Into this rest God intended Adam and his to enter. They were to live, not in self will, but in constant dependence upon Him, to find in Him that full satisfaction which He alone could give. He was to be their Spring of life, the Supreme Object of their hearts' desires, their Peace, their Rest.

Now in connection with God's Rest on the seventh "day" of the creative "week" it has often been noticed that the inspired account records the end of the first six "days" of creation, but not of the seventh. After each of the six days we read, "And the evening and the morning were....," but there is no such limitation to the seventh day. Though we hesitate to be dogmatic on the matter, we submit that each creation "day" represents, not a solar day of 24 hours, but a lengthy period of time.

* Hebrews, W. D. Moffat.

In agreement with this hypothesis we find a remarkable correspondence between the order of creation as found in the first chapter of Genesis and the facts of geology and paleontology; we cannot, however, discuss this here. It may be asked why does the Holy Spirit record no end to the seventh "day?" Because the seventh day denoted a period of time which God intended to continue as long as the relations which God had instituted between Himself and man remained unbroken.

But, alas, this Sabbatic rest of God was soon to be marred by the entrance of sin. It has been said, "Holiness cannot rest where sin is. Love cannot rest where sorrow is." So God says, "Ye have made Me to serve with your sins" (Isa. 43. 24); and Christ says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (John 5. 17). Surely this refers not only to God's work of maintenance, but also to His work of undoing the effects of sin. And as for the first creation, that has felt the effects of the curse, for we read, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now" (Rom. 8. 22).

Yet in spite of this ruin God has again and again invited man to enter into His Rest. As a memorial and type of His Rest He instituted under Moses the weekly and yearly Sabbath. It was at this very time that God gave man an invitation to enter into His Rest. For when God brought Israel out of Egypt to go into the Promised Land, He intended that their stay in the Land should, in a very real sense, be an exemplification of His Rest. Israel's experience of wandering and unrest in the wilderness was not in God's plan at all. Referring to the exodus from Egypt we read, "He brought us out thence that He might bring us in to give us the land" (Deut. 6. 23). That is to say the same generation that came out of Egypt were to be given the Land. And after a necessary interval Israel arrived at Kadesh-Barnea at the threshold. But alas after the report of the spies, despite the advice of Caleb who said, "Let us go up at once and possess it, for we are well able to overcome it" (Num. 13. 30). Israel refused to go in. Joshua reasoned with them saying, "If the Lord delight in us, then He will bring

us into this land, and give it unto us; a land which floweth with milk and honey. Only rebel not against the Lord, neither fear ye the people of the land." (14. 8, 9). But Israel bade stone them with stones. God intended their life in the land to be one of blessed victory over every enemy, and of joyful service unto Himself. But as a result of Israel's unbelief, God shut the door on that generation saying, "I swear in My wrath, they shall not enter into My rest" (Heb. 3. 11).

From this it is quite clear, as we said above, that the keeping of the weekly Sabbath did not itself constitute God's rest, though it was a type of that rest, for the Children of Israel were observers of the Sabbath at the very time that they were shut out of God's Rest.

After the forty years of wandering and unrest in the wilderness that generation died every one of them, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, who had not committed the sin of unbelief. The next generation were then invited to enter into God's Rest, for we read:

"Ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord thy God giveth thee. But when ye go over Jordan...and He giveth you rest" (Deut. 12. 9, 10).

And this generation did, under Joshua, enter the Promised Land, and attained to a measure of God's rest.

"And now the Lord your God hath given rest unto you brethren, as he spake unto them" (Josh. 22. 4).

We must now ask—Did this rest which Israel experienced in the land measure up to the real rest that God intended? Alas no, though Israel was victorious over all her enemies, yet she failed to realise the ideal spiritual rest which God designed for her. The people in their prosperity, soon ceased to trust and obey Him, and started to walk in independence. The result of this departure from God is seen in the Book of Judges, and this was the very antithesis of God's Rest. The failure was not Joshua's but the people's. If they had not failed in the realisation of God's Rest, we would not have found God renewing His offer of rest, through David, in the 95th Psalm, "after so long a time," of about 500 years in the land:

"He again defineth a certain day, to-day, saying in David, after so long a time, as it hath been before said, To-day if ye shall hear His voice, harden not your hearts. For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterward of another day" (Heb. 4. 7, 8, *margin*).

Notice the emphasis on the word "to-day." The offer of God's Rest is always "to-day." But the author of the epistle to the Hebrews takes up this offer and brings it right up to date, by saying:

"There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God. For he that is entered into His (God's) rest hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from His. Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience" (Heb. 4. 9-11).

"Let us therefore fear, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to have come short of it" (Heb. 4. 1).

So this rest of God, commencing at, and dating from creation (see Heb. 4. 3, 4) though unrealised by Israel, is still available to faith even at the present time.

Now, as we have before observed, the keeping of the weekly Sabbath is not itself God's rest, yet it is a type of God's rest. This relationship appears when we notice the sudden change in the word for "rest" in the Greek of verse 9. Previously in the passage the Greek word "*katapausis*" has been used for "rest," but in verse 9, this word is suddenly replaced by the deeper and more emphatic word "*sabbatizmos*" (not "*sabbata*") which means "sabbath rest." That is to say, God's rest in its fullest meaning is sabbatic in character. This deep word "*sabbatizmos*" undoubtedly looks forward to the future eternal state, though in this life we may enter into the substance and foretaste of it in Christ. Just as the weekly Sabbath was a rest after a week's toil, so this Heavenly "sabbatism" will be an eternal rest after the toils and the troubles of this present life. Then will be enjoyed perfect rest from the presence of sin and its effects. In this way the Sabbath is, to quote the words of Mr. Wilcox, Seventh Day Adventist teacher,

"typical of the greater deliverance from sin." Bengel here observes: "In time there were many Sabbaths, but then there will be a sabbatism, the enjoyment of rest, one, perfect, eternal. The verbal noun is exceedingly emphatic."*

Though the full enjoyment of God's rest is in the hereafter, yet some say that God's Rest relates entirely to the future. We think this is an error. There is certainly a present side to God's Rest, for God's repeated offers of rest to Israel were genuine offers of a present rest; how much more so then is His offer of rest to the believer now.

God's Rest, then, is:

(1) **A present rest.** It is to be entered into by faith both here and now, not by death:

"For we which have believed (Gr. *aorist*—referring to the believer's definite acceptance of Christ once for all) do enter (Gr. *present*—it is not 'shall enter,' but are entering and continue to enter, commencing in the present and continuing right on into the hereafter; just as Israel's victory under Joshua was not achieved in one day but was progressive up to the end of the life of Joshua) into rest" (v. 3).

The believer is to fear lest he come short of it (v. 1). The time to enter in is "to-day" (v. 7).

God offers rest in two aspects: (a) a rest from the curse and guilt of sin, typified by Israel's deliverance from judgment in Egypt. (b) a rest, present and continuous, resulting from victory over the power and dominion of indwelling sin—typified by Israel's victory over every enemy in the Promised Land. Both are to be appropriated by a yielding faith, not by works of self-effort. But notice that it is the latter aspect of God's Rest about which the Holy Ghost saith, "To-day...harden not your hearts as in the provocation...through unbelief" (Heb. 3. 7, 8, 19).† Both aspects appear in

* Bengel, *Gnomon*, *in loco*.

† It is a mistake, we think, to speak as some do of the wilderness experience of Israel as being typical of the normal life of a Spirit filled Christian; surely Israel in the Promised Land is a

Matthew 11. 28, 29; the rest given to those who are heavy laden with the guilt of sin, and the rest found by those who, through faith, become yoked together with Christ in His service—"My yoke is easy and My burden is light."

To repeat: "There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God. For He that is entered into His rest (God's Rest) hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from His."

There is some difference of opinion as to who is meant by the word "he" here. It may refer to the individual believer resting from his works of self-effort, and by faith claiming victory through Christ. Andrew Murray takes it this way. He says:

"Not I, but Christ. This is the rest of faith in which a man rests from his works. With the unconverted man it is, 'Not Christ, but I.' With the feeble and slothful Christian, 'I and Christ.' I first, and Christ to fill up what is wanting. With increasing earnestness it becomes, Christ and I: Christ first, but I still second. With the man who dies with Christ it is, 'Not I, but Christ.' Christ alone, and Christ all. He hath ceased from his work, Christ liveth in him. This is the rest of faith."*

Others, however, refer the words "he," "himself," and "his" to the Lord Jesus. They ask, can it be said of any believer that he has rested from his works, both for justification and for sanctification, *i.e.*, victory over sin, as God did from His works of creation? That is the ideal no doubt, but does the believer filled with the

truer type of such a Christian. It has often been observed that Canaan is not a type of Heaven, for in Heaven there will be no conflict with evil. But some would predicate Israel's experience in Canaan as typical of the Christian's standing, *i.e.*, position in Christ, and Israel in the wilderness as typical of his experience or state. We doubt this. The Christian's standing in Christ is perfect, it is that of Christ Himself; but Israel in Canaan had, alas, its Ai, though, thank God, this was the exception rather than the rule. No, Israel in the wilderness typifies the Christian who has "life," but no victory; Israel in the land typifies the Christian who has "life more abundant;" the one had unrest, the other rest.

* "The Holiest of All" (Hebrews) p. 154, Andrew Murray.

Spirit though he is, never have his Ai? Alas that it may be so. Again, the verb "hath rested" in our text is in the aorist tense in the Greek, and so refers to a definite once-for-all act, rounded off and complete in itself. Has any believer rested in this once-for-all sense from his works? Again, this is the ideal, in measure it may be true. On the other hand, we can without hesitation say that the rest of the Lord Jesus from His work of redemption effected at Calvary is indeed parallel with the rest of God from His work of creation. Not only so, there seems a plain contrast intended between the Jesus (Joshua, the names are identical) who did not give Israel true lasting rest, and Jesus Christ, his antitype, Who does so. "Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me...and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Christ, our Forerunner has thus entered into God's Rest on our behalf, and it is in Him that we realise God's Rest.

"Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest" through our Forerunner, Christ, and not repeat the mistake of Israel at Meribah and Massah through disobedience and unbelief.

(2) **A future rest.** God's Rest through Christ as to its perfect enjoyment, though entered into now, awaits the future, when the Christian will be caught up to be with Him in glory. This future perfect rest, which the word "*sabbatismos*" implies, does not mean a life of inactivity, but that perfect life of dependence upon the Heavenly Father and obedience to His blessed will, when His children serve Him in glory.

This Sabbatism, then, is the "Christian Sabbath" if one may be permitted to use the term; it is a life of rest rather than a day of rest. It is this that the Jewish Sabbath typified. How appropriate in that type were the warnings against "any manner of work," or of carrying a burden on that day, for the rest of God is in all its aspects "apart from works" (Rom. 3. 28).

The joy and complacency of God's rest no longer in His first creation, for that was marred by sin, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8. 22). God's joy and delight now rests

in the new creation of Redemption effected at Calvary, and consummated at the resurrection, though the redemption of the body of the believer awaits the Lord's Coming. The Christian, indeed, has been loosed by the payment of the purchase price, and bought out of the slave market, the price being the "precious blood of Christ," all this was effected at Calvary, and the resurrection was the proof that it was accepted as being sufficient by God the Father. And the memorial of this consummation is not the Sabbath, but the first day of the week. The Lord Jesus as to His redemptive work is now resting, having sat down at the right hand of God.

"But He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting (waiting) till His enemies be made the footstool of His feet" (Heb. 10. 12, 13), "having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9. 12).

CHAPTER XI

The Change After Calvary

WE come now to the events which follow our Lord's resurrection, and we need to go carefully. Some defenders of the first day of the week as the day of worship for the Church are apt to read more into the narrative than is really there, just as some Seventh Day Adventists fail to notice some aspects of the record which are there. The latter often ask, why, if the Sabbath came to an end by way of limitation at Calvary with the other ceremonial of the law, do we find that the women, after buying spices for the embalming of the body of the Lord, "rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment?" (Luke 23. 56). Does this not show, they ask, that the Sabbath has not come to an end at Calvary? We reply that our Lord had previously intimated—"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth...and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come" (John 16. 12, 13). Hence, pending this further revelation, the women naturally observed the Sabbath. Moreover, in spite of this further revelation, the Jewish Church continued to zealously observe many of the ceremonial laws right up to the destruction of Jerusalem.

We do not say that our Lord, on the day of His resurrection, then and there taught the disciples to observe the first day of the week as a day of worship, He may have done so, but He may, on the other hand, have left the matter to the subsequent teaching of the Holy Spirit through the apostles. We do know that our Lord expounded many things in the Old Testament which prophetically spoke of Himself, in type or otherwise (Luke 24. 27). He may have expounded the typology of the Sabbath for all we know, but apart from what

we find in the 21st chapter of the Gospel of John, and a few other references relating to the Great Commission, and His parting words at His ascension, we are not told very much of His post-resurrection teaching.

But whether our Lord gave direct teaching on the matter of the Sabbath or not, one thing stands out clear, that is a change of attitude on His part towards the Sabbath, for we read of no instance on which He observed it after His resurrection. If indeed the Sabbath was to be the special day above all others for communion with the Lord, to hear His voice, and to gather round His Name, that is to worship Him, why did He, as it were, avoid that day in His post-resurrection ministry? Take that resurrection day, the first day of the week, how full it was of Spiritual ministry. First, the messages at the tomb, then the walk to Emmaus, with its exposition of the Scriptures, then the breaking of bread there, then that evening meeting with its message of peace to their troubled and doubting hearts, His breathing upon them of the Holy Spirit, and His giving, in anticipation of the formation of the Church, the power of administratively forgiving or retaining sins.

Seventh Day Adventists never seem to weary of pointing to the activity of the disciples on that day, the fifteen mile journey of the two disciples from Jerusalem to Emmaus, as evidence that they did not deem the day a day of rest. Of course not! How could they yet know about the day? And Seventh Day Adventists point to the evening meeting saying that the disciples had gathered there "for fear of the Jews," and therefore they could not have gathered there "for the purpose of a religious meeting." Even this is not correct. The record says that "the doors were shut" for fear of the Jews. For what purpose the disciples had gathered together is not stated; but the Lord Jesus, knowing all the circumstances, availed Himself of the gathering and hallowed it by His presence and His message. The day was a day of spiritual activity; and who will dare to say that such activity was not appropriate?

Now it has been asked by Seventh Day Adventists

whether the fact of the Lord's resurrection and these appearances on this day, important as they were, justify the practice of the Church in observing this day as the day of Christian worship. Why not observe Friday, the day of His death? or Thursday, the day of His ascension? A sufficient answer is that the resurrection day is the fulfilment of a remarkable prophecy. We must bring together some Scriptures. Let us first read Psalm 118 22-25:

"The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

In Acts 4. 10-12, we have the Apostle Peter's use of this very prophecy, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in Him doth this man stand here before you whole. He is the stone which was set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner."

Now what is this "day" referred to in Psalm 118. 24? First let us observe that the Psalmist prophesies that the redeemed of the Lord will specially rejoice and be glad in it. It must then be some specific day for this to be possible. The context shows that it cannot be the Sabbath. The Seventh Day Adventist authorities Conradi and Andrews suggest that it stands for the "Gospel dispensation." This is possible, but we question it, for the day in question is here intimately connected with a past event, the resurrection of Christ, it began with it. The Gospel age, as we have it now, did not actually begin until the Day of Pentecost, the apostles being forbidden to commence preaching until then (Luke 24. 49); and the Day of Pentecost is certainly not in view in the passage. Nor is the day of the ascension in view. But the day of the resurrection is specially in view, the resurrection being the central thought of the passage. Observe the Apostle's own parallel,

"Whom ye crucified . . . Whom God raised from the

dead." "Set at nought of you builders . . . Made the head of the corner."

When did the Jewish "builders" "reject" or "set at nought" this Stone? Only one answer is possible—when they "crucified" Him. When then was He "made the head of the corner?" When "God raised Him from the dead," *i.e.*, on the first day of the week, thus making Him the "chief corner Stone" (1 Peter 2. 6). So then we can say in the words of the prophecy, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." May not this well be the foundation of the expression used in Revelation 1. 10, "The Lord's Day," which also, when it came into use, invariably referred to the first day of the week (see later on this point)?

It was on this day also that the prophecy of Psalm 2. 7 was fulfilled, as we discover from Paul's address in Acts 13. 33:

"And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus; as also it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."

On this day therefore He became "the firstborn from the dead" (Col. 1. 18), "the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. 15. 20) and was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1. 4). Is not this then an extremely important day?

But there is more yet. The Believer's justification and therefore his rest in Christ is inseparably associated with the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection. For we read, "He was raised for our justification" (Rom. 4. 25). "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins" (1 Cor. 15. 17).

..And why is this so? It is quite true that the Lord Jesus "bare our sins in His body upon the tree" (1 Peter 2. 24); yet so long as He was held under "the power of death" (Heb. 2. 14) there was no visible proof that His sacrifice had been accepted by God the Father. To use a modern illustration, when a debt is settled by the

payment of the full amount, one asks for a receipt. This receipt is full security against any future attempt to collect that debt again, it secures to one the full benefit of the settlement. Just so, the resurrection was, as it were, God's receipt to the transaction of Calvary, it showed that the sacrifice was accepted by Him as being a full settlement. If the Lord Jesus had not risen, no sinner could claim his justification upon accepting Him. So long as the Lord, who was made a sin-offering for us, was a prisoner under the power of death, so also were we sinners under its power. So "He was raised again for our justification." If ever the Devil should insinuate a doubt as to a believer's security, he has simply to point to the fact of an empty sepulchre and say, "My Surety has been released from prison, because, having paid the uttermost farthing, 'it was not possible that He should be holden of it'" (Acts 2. 42). "Who is he that shall condemn? it is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead" (Rom. 8. 34).

Then a further reason why the Christian rest day should be the first day of the week, rather than the seventh, appears when we compare the dispensation of law with that of grace, for there is a fundamental difference between the two.

Under Law the rest of salvation results from a life of perfect obedience, "For Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby" (Rom. 10. 5). But Israel who sought righteousness by this method, *i.e.*, "by works, *I* never attained to it" (Rom. 9. 31, 32). In agreement with this legal righteousness, the Sabbath, the rest day of that dispensation, came at the end of six days during which the law said, "thou shalt labour and do all thy work." That is to say, rest at the end of work as a reward of perfect obedience.

Under Grace, on the contrary, life from the dead with its rest of salvation comes first as the "grace-gift" of God (Rom. 6. 23, Greek) through faith in Christ. Out of this as the natural consequence, spring good works. Consistently then the Christian day of rest and worship

most fittingly comes on the first day of the week, and six days of work follow. That is to say, life and rest first, then work.

The significance of the first day of the week should now be apparent. It is not merely to commemorate the historical resurrection of Christ, but it is vitally connected with what the resurrection of Christ means to the believer, and with the dispensation of Grace which then opened. It is a memorial, not of God's first creation, which was marred by sin; but a memorial of the New creation of redemption consummated and approved by the Lord's resurrection.

The appearances of our Lord on the resurrection day taken together, constituted the first manifestation of the Lord Jesus to His disciples. The second occurred on the next first day of the week, "after eight days" (John 20. 26). That is according to the Jewish inclusive method of reckoning a week later. Many Seventh Day Adventists imagine that this must be on the Monday, forgetting that the Jews often reckoned days inclusively not exclusively as we do. Compare the expressions "after three days" (Matt. 27. 63; Mark 8. 31) "in three days" (Matt. 26. 61) "the third day" (Matt. 16. 21; 20. 19) each referring to the same period, the interval between the death and the resurrection of our Lord. At this second first day Thomas was present, and again we have the Lord's message of peace. The third manifestation we read of in John 21. 4-22, for verse 14 reads, "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." These three manifestations here enumerated show that between the resurrection day and the following first day of the week the Lord did not manifest Himself; that is to say He passed over the Sabbath between these two days in silence, and did not manifest Himself. Surely this is significant, but we have yet to notice a Seventh Day Adventist teacher refer to it. Does it not show that redemption being complete, the shadow of the Sabbath had given way to the Substance? There is no evidence vouchsafed to us determining on what days of the week

the other appearances took place, of which we read in 1 Corinthians 15. 6-8. We know, however, that the day of the ascension was Thursday, being forty days after the resurrection. But Scripture does not stress this day as it does the day of the resurrection.

CHAPTER XII

The Birthday of The Church

AND now we come to the Book of Acts, and early in this book we find the first day of the week given a special stress. For it was on this day that the day of Pentecost fell, the birthday, as it were, of the Church.

To fully apprehend the significance of this day we must turn to Leviticus 23. 9-22. Read the passage through carefully. The passage describes the feast of firstfruits and the feast of weeks (Pentecost). These two feasts are closely inter-related, and neither can be understood apart from the other.

"Speak unto the Children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I shall give you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring the sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it. And in the day when ye wave the sheaf, ye shall offer a he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord. And the meal offering... of fine flour...an offering made by fire...for a sweet savour" (Lev. 23. 9-13).

"And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven Sabbaths shall there be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meal offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves...of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven, for the firstfruits unto the Lord. And ye shall present...a burnt offering...made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord. And ye shall offer one he-goat for a sin offering...and the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits for a wave offering before the Lord" (Lev. 23. 15-20).

(a) On the same evening on which the Passover lamb was slain, the Lord Jesus was offered, the "Lamb of God," "without blemish," "Christ our Passover is sacrificed."

(b) On "the morrow after the Sabbath," on the very first day of the week when the Jewish priest offered the sheaf of the firstfruits, the Lord Jesus was raised from the dead, and was figuratively waved in resurrection acceptance before God, "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. 15. 20). The he-lamb without blemish, the meal offering of fine flour, a sweet savour, associated with this sheaf of firstfruits speaks of the perfection of Christ. "Who loved us, and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour" (Ephes. 5. 2). Notice that in this case there is no sin offering. How could there be such in connection with Christ after His resurrection?

(c) Then counting from this "morrow after the Sabbath" seven Sabbaths complete, or fifty days inclusively, on the "morrow after the seventh Sabbath" were to be offered two wave loaves baken with leaven. "The antitype is the descent of the Holy Spirit to form the Church. For this reason leaven is present, because there is evil in the Church, Observe it is now "loaves;" not a sheaf of separate growths loosely bound together, but a real union of particles making one homogeneous body. The descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost united the separate disciples into one organism" (C. I. Scofield). Notice also that there were two loaves, because the Church was to be taken out from both Jew and Gentile. The middle wall of partition was broken down. Notice also that these wave-loaves were also called "firstfruits," this identifies them with the wave-sheaf, the risen Christ; the loaves being made of flour from the same crop as that sheaf. He is the Firstfruits, but "of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures" (James 1. 18).

We would at this point inquire why did the day of Pentecost only come after seven Sabbaths were complete? *

* We are not ignorant of the dispute which existed between

Is there any significance in this long delay after the day of the resurrection? We believe there is. May it not be that it was to show that the Sabbath, together with the whole economy of the law, had to be seven times past—utterly past, before God could send the Holy Spirit to inaugurate the Church as a body? Let us remember that, strictly speaking, the Church, in the New Testament sense of the term, did not exist before Pentecost. In Matthew 16. 18, the Lord said to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build My Church," not "am building." If the following words of the Apostle Peter are read through: Acts 4. 10-12; 1 Peter 1. 3, 4; 2. 4-9, it will become plain that the Apostle Peter understood that this prophecy of the Lord Jesus could only be fulfilled after He had risen from the dead.

Then after the resurrection one of the last messages of the Lord to the Apostles was that they were not to attempt to preach the Gospel until the Holy Spirit came to indwell them and form them into one body, and endure

the Sadducees and the Pharisees as to the meaning of the words "the morrow after the sabbath" of Leviticus 23. 11-15, which in turn affects the day of the week on which the day of Pentecost fell. We possess a key which the Pharisees did not, namely, these "feasts of Jehovah" are typical of the work of Christ and events arising out of it. Now no one, unless he chooses to ignore the typical teaching of these set-feasts will question the fact that when Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week, He became "the firstfruits of them that are asleep," hence the first day of the week must be the Divinely intended day for the priest to wave the sheaf of the firstfruits, that is, it is the "morrow after the sabbath" of Leviticus 23. 11. On this first day also we read that "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many" (Matt. 27. 52, 53). These surely participated with Christ in being part of the firstfruits on "the morrow after the sabbath." The "morrow after the sabbath" being thus determined, the day of Pentecost must of necessity fall on the first day of the week, as held by the vast majority of expositors. The few who have questioned this fact, have like the Pharisees neglected to consider the significance of the type. Furthermore Scripture itself says that the day of Pentecost was on the "morrow after the seventh sabbath" of the weeks intervening between the waving of the sheaf and the waving of the wave-loaves, so there can be no possibility of doubt that the day of Pentecost was on the first day of the week.

them with power. They then formed the nucleus of the Church, to which were to be added day by day those that were being saved (Acts 2. 47).

To use the words of another, "When God formed man out of the dust of the ground, all his members were fashioned, but he was not a living soul until God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Even so, it is quite true that the disciples of Christ were gathered together but they were not corporately a living temple of the Holy Ghost until He descended upon the day of Pentecost."*

So the fact that the birthday of the Church was delayed until seven (seven is the "perfect number" in Scripture) Sabbaths had gone past, and the ensuing first day had arrived seems full of significance. If the Sabbath was still to be the rest day and the day of worship for the Church, why this extraordinary emphasis on the first day? Furthermore this prominence given to the first day becomes still more remarkable when we discover, as we are about to do, that the first day is the only day which is connected with worship in the Church; the Sabbath is never mentioned in connection with the worship of Christians.

We must now examine the evidence afforded us in this book subsequent to Pentecost, as to the day of worship observed by the Church, also its attitude towards the Sabbath.

At first during the enthusiasm of the days immediately following Pentecost, the Church's birthday, we read that the Christians, "continued stedfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2. 42). "And day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people" (vv. 46, 47).

Now what does this "breaking of bread" mean? Does it mean the Lord's Supper, or simply the partaking of a meal? Authorities differ, some, notably Alford,

* C. Stanley, "What was the Sabbath?" p. 25.

deny that the passage refers to the Lord's Supper; others think that it does, and we are inclined to agree with them. Suppose however it does, is there any evidence here as to how often the early Jewish Church worshipped God in the "breaking of bread," or on what day? We must answer, No. Seventh Day Adventists often assume that the words "day by day" apply to the breaking of bread, and try to offset the evidence of Acts 20. 7, by saying that if the early Church broke bread daily from house to house, then the breaking of bread once on the first day of the week of Acts 20. 7 is insufficient to establish the first day as the day of worship. But the words "day by day" do not apply to the "breaking bread at home," but apply to the continuing "...in the temple" in the first clause. It is true that the R.V. by placing a comma after "day by day" leaves the matter open; but the Greek original is quite clear. The conjunctions "and...and" are the translation of the Greek postpositive enclitic conjunctions "*te...te*," which Prof. A. T. Robertson says are "strictly correlative, see Acts 2. 46, where the two participles are co-ordinated."* *i.e.*, of the same rank or force. Hence the words "*kath hemeron*" ("day by day") to which the first enclitic "*te*" is suffixed belongs to the first co-ordinate clause and not to the second, and so does not apply to the "breaking bread at home."

So far then we have no evidence as to the day or frequency of the Lord's Supper. We may notice here that this was undoubtedly a transitional stage in the Church's history, inasmuch as the Jewish Christians continued attending the service in the temple, although all temple ritual was now obsolete through having been fulfilled in Christ. The Jewish Church seemed slow to recognise this. We are told that right up to the destruction of the temple when Titus destroyed Jerusalem it continued to observe circumcision, vows, head-shaving, and feasts, together with the Christian ordinances.

But if we turn away from the Jewish Church to the example of the Gentile Churches as founded by the Apostle

* A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, A. T. Robertson, 3rd edition, p. 1179.

Paul, we ought to get evidence of Church practice untrammelled by Judaism. Let us turn then to the 13th chapter of Acts where the missionary journeys of the Apostle commenced.

In accordance with the Divine rule "to the Jew first and then to the Gentile" (Rom. 1. 16; Acts 13. 46) we find that the Apostle's custom was to go first to the Jewish Synagogue of the locality, if there was one, and avail himself of the services there to preach the Gospel. Of course the day on which he would obtain an audience would be on the Sabbath, exactly as missionaries of the present day to the Jews avail themselves of this day for the purpose. It was under such circumstances then that we find Paul and Barnabas preaching at Antioch in Pisidia on the Sabbath (Acts 13. 41). After the close of Paul's address we find the Gentiles asking "that these words might be spoken to them the next Sabbath" (v. 42). This was the most natural request possible, what other day could suggest itself? On the following Sabbath therefore Paul preached to almost the whole city. Upon this the Jews were filled with envy and turned against Paul "contradicting and blaspheming." So we read, "And Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly, and said, it was necessary that the Word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (v. 46). Then were the Gentiles glad, and "the Word of the Lord was spread about throughout all the region" (v. 49).

Now we must pause to ask a question. Can we, from these two cases of Gospel preaching, argue that Paul and Barnabas, as Christians, "observed the Sabbath?" for the Seventh Day Adventists would have us believe that Paul and Barnabas here "observed the Sabbath."* What do Seventh Day Adventists mean elsewhere by observing the Sabbath? They refer us to the fourth commandment as their primary authority. This commandment enjoins the keeping of the Sabbath day holy (*i.e.*, separate) by prescribing rest for both man and beast;

* As Haynes does, in his "Christian Sabbath," p. 62.

but it is silent as to worship. But they refer us also to Isaiah 58. 13, 14, which enjoins the turning away from self-pleasure to honouring and delighting oneself in the Lord. That is to say, the idea of worship is included.* Very well, do we in these two meetings at Antioch find any evidence to show that Paul and Barnabas either rested or worshipped God on either Sabbath? None whatever. Preaching the Gospel is not worship. Christian worship has to do with the adoration of God by His children, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the giving of one's substance to Him (Heb. 13. 15, 16); and one of the supreme occasions for doing so is at the "breaking of bread" or "the Lord's Supper." There was none of this on the two occasions before us, indeed verse 45 shows how impossible such worship would have been, for the Jews "contradicted and blasphemed."

Just here it is to be noted that Seventh Day Adventists, in order to prove the "observance of the Sabbath," usually employ, when referring to these Gospel meetings in Acts, such wide terms as can include Gospel preaching, and at the same time suggest to an unwary reader the further idea of worship where no worship did actually occur, *e.g.*, "conducted services," "religious meetings," "consecrated the Sabbath to religious services."† Is this candid? One may of course conduct a religious service on any day of the week, but in doing so that does not make that day a day of worship. So in these two meetings Paul and Barnabas did not observe the Sabbath as a day of public worship, they simply utilised the occasion to preach the Gospel.

Again, in connection with this second meeting Seventh Day Adventists make much ado in asking why, if the first day of the week was at that time the Christian day of worship, did not Paul inform the Gentiles that he would not address them on the next Sabbath, as they proposed, but on the morrow—that being the proper day for Christian worship, One leading Seventh Day

* "How should the Sabbath be Observed?" A. O. Tait, S.D.A., tract.

† "Christian Sabbath," Haynes, pp. 64, 65.

Adventist exclaims, "How readily our modern ministers would have remarked, 'You need not wait a whole week—to-morrow is the Christian's Sabbath; the day in which we instruct the Gentiles'."* We trust no such minister would be so utterly foolish. As if it was the occasion for the Apostles to enter into a minor point of Church doctrine with heathen, who, as yet, knew nothing of the Gospel. What they needed was to be converted to God, not taught a day of worship. People dead in sin cannot worship God. What is needed here is a sense of perspective. Besides the Apostle Paul had not yet finished with the Jews, in accordance with the rule, "to the Jew first and then to the Gentile" he had to give priority to the Jews while they were willing to listen. So what more natural proposal could there be than to preach to both Jews and Gentiles on the next Sabbath? It is difficult to be patient with such objections.

After the break with the Jews and the synagogue Paul and Barnabas ministered to the believers, and preached the Gospel until the whole region had been evangelised. But while this was being done we read of no more Sabbath meetings. We have therefore, so far, no evidence that the Apostles or the Church worshipped God on the Sabbath; nor have we any specific day mentioned as a day for Christian worship.

The next record of a Sabbath meeting is found in Acts 16. 13-15, at Troas. Here evidently the Jewish element was small, there was no synagogue, but merely a "proseuche,"† a Jewish place of prayer. At this meeting Lydia, a Jewish proselyte, together with those of her household, accepted the Gospel, and were baptized, and thus became Christians (they are called the brethren in v. 40). Lydia had been worshipping God after the Jewish fashion, but Christ having risen, no worship of God which was not through Him could possibly be acceptable to God. She was, like Cornelius, a devout seeker after light, so God sent her the light. There was nothing here which does not fall in line with our previous

* "Change of the Sabbath," the late G. I. Butler, p. 71.

† Cf. its use in 3. Macc. 7. 20; see Abbott-Smith's Lexicon.

remarks. It was a purely Gospel meeting amongst a Jewish audience, as opportunity offered, on the Sabbath. There is no evidence here as to what day of worship these Christians observed after their conversion.

The next record of Sabbath meetings is found in Acts 17. 1-4, at Thessalonica. Paul preached in the synagogue "as his manner was," *i.e.*, according to the Divine rule mentioned above. He preached three Sabbaths running, his subject again being the Gospel (v. 3). Whereupon the Jews rejected the word, and caused an uproar. Paul and Silas were forced to escape by night. Here again in these meetings there could be no possibility for Christian worship. They were simply Gospel meetings as the occasion offered.

Our next reference is found in Acts 18. 4, 5, at Corinth. We read, "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks...and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ." As before, these were purely Gospel meetings. There was certainly no opportunity here for Christian worship, because we read:

"And when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook out his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. And he departed thence, and went into the house of a certain man named Titus Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue" (v. 6, 7).

This is very significant. The Apostle Paul had to leave the synagogue in order to obtain the facility for the true worship of God. Then we read: "And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the Word of God among them" (v. 11).

After the Apostle left the synagogue there is no hint in the record as to any more Sabbath meetings. And why? Because the occasion for them had passed. And yet we are amazed to see that some Seventh Day Adventists teachers claim 78 Sabbath meetings here, one for each week of this year and a half! Did they ever read the context?*

* "Bible Text Book," p. 33, O. A. Johnson.

It is noteworthy that when treating of these Sabbath meetings in Acts, Seventh Day Adventists never seem to allude to the opposition which arose amongst the Jews, which rules out any idea of Christian worship. This is so in all the books of theirs which we have examined. We ask again, is this fair?

We have given above the whole list of Sabbath gatherings mentioned in the Book of Acts. In this book then we find not a particle of evidence for the use of the Sabbath as the Christian day of worship. Nor, it must be admitted have we so far any evidence for the first day of the week as being the Christian day of worship either.

When, however, we turn on to Acts 20. 6-12, we find the evidence we need, evidence, which, to our mind, is quite conclusive. As usual we quote from the R.V.:

"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we tarried seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow, and prolonged his speech until midnight."

This passage has suffered much at the hands of Seventh Day Adventist expositors. They insist that the meeting here described must have been on the Saturday night, and that "Paul trod the Sunday under foot all the way to Assos," and thus desecrated the day. They argue in this way because they assume that all days mentioned in the Bible are reckoned from sunset to sunset. This is not the case. A certain proof to the contrary, and strictly analogous to the present instance, is found in John 20. 19, "When therefore it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week." In the Greek the word translated "evening" is "*opsia*," concerning which Souter, in his lexicon, says it denotes "a period never earlier than sunset."* Very well then, the first day of

* Apart from the above lexical authority, a comparison of Luke 24. 29-36 with John 20. 19, will show plainly that this "evening" meeting was after sunset. For we learn that our Lord appeared to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus; and when

the week, ceremonially speaking, ended at sunset. How then is this evening still referred to as the first day of the week? Should it not be the second? Plainly then days are not always reckoned ceremonially. Again ceremonially the Jewish year began with Abib (Exod. 12. 2); but Josephus tells us that the Jewish civil year was not so reckoned, Abib being the seventh month in that reckoning. Hence there is a civil and a ceremonial method of reckoning days and years amongst the Jews. Turning back now to Acts 20. 7, if we are going to reckon the expression "the first day of the week" ceremonially as starting at sunset on Saturday, then we must be consistent, and reckon the word "morrow" ceremonially as commencing on the Sunday evening, just as it is reckoned in Exodus 16. 23, and in Leviticus 23. 15, 16. Was then Paul "intending" to depart on Sunday night or Monday morning after waiting inactive all day Sunday? Obviously not. Then there must be something wrong in this method of reckoning. But the word "morrow" is often reckoned, not ceremonially, but in a civil manner, see 1 Samuel 19. 11, and Acts 23. 31, 32, and a number of other cases. So if we reckon, as is natural, especially as Luke was writing to Theophilus, a Gentile (Acts 1. 1) that his first day evening meeting, like the first day evening meeting of John 20. 19, was on Sunday evening, all difficulty vanishes at once, and the narrative becomes clear and harmonious as a whole.

In confirmation of what we have just written, Sir W. Ramsay, whom Seventh Day Adventists themselves style "so eminent a scholar" and "archæologist," the leading authority on the Book of Acts, commenting on this passage, writes:

"In A.D. 57, the Passover fell on Thursday, April 7. The Company left Philippi on the morning of Friday, April 15, and the journey to Troas lasted till the 5th

it was "toward evening" and the day was "now far spent," our Lord, at Emmaus, joined the two in a meal, in which He made Himself known (v. 29-31) the disciples then had time to walk $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles to Jerusalem (v. 33) and when recounting all that had transpired to the "eleven" (v. 35) before our Lord appeared in the midst. This meeting therefore *must* have been after sunset.

day, Tuesday, April 19. In Troas they stayed seven days, the first of which is April 19, and the last, Monday, April 25. Luke's rule is to state first the whole period of residence, and then some details of the residence. On the Sunday evening just before the start, the whole congregation at Troas met for the Agape, religious services were conducted late into the night, and in the early morning the party went on board and set sail. In A.D. 56, 58, 59, the incidence of the Passover is not reconcilable with Luke's statistics, and is apparent from the attempts to torture his words into agreement."*

Sir W. Ramsay is not concerned with the Sabbath controversy at all, but is vindicating the historical accuracy of the historian Luke in the Book of Acts. His verdict is therefore of the greatest weight and cannot be set aside lightly by Seventh Day Adventists. He has done more than any living man to uphold the inspiration of this Book. There is no doubt in his mind as to this meeting occurring upon the Sunday night.

The next point to observe is that we have here, not a Gospel meeting, like the Sabbath gatherings already considered, but a meeting convened for the special purpose of "breaking bread," *i.e.*, the Lord's Supper, a supreme occasion for Christian worship. It is then that the contemplation of our Lord's broken body and shed blood evokes the heart's adoration and true expression of praise and thanksgiving above all other occasions. Further, it is important to notice that this worship meeting came after a stay of seven days; it was therefore not a hurried occasion, on which through exigency of circumstances, the choice of the day was limited. True it was a farewell meeting, but this is purely incidental. There were probably meetings right through the week, the record, however, does not mention them; but passing over the Sabbath in silence the record states, "upon the first day of the week when we (R.V.) were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed unto them." Now we ask if the Sabbath be the correct day for Christian worship,

* "St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen," pp. 289, 290, Ramsay.

why is it passed over in silence, and the meeting convened for that purpose held on the next day? The word "we" here, and in verse 6, shows, as all commentators admit, that Luke had joined the Apostle Paul at this point. It follows that this Sunday evening meeting was convened by both the Apostle Paul and Luke together with their party for worship. Seventh Day Adventists seem, as far as we have discovered, to ignore this passing over of the Sabbath in silence. It is quite true that the actual breaking of bread did not occur until the small hours of Monday morning, but this was owing to the Apostle prolonging his address until midnight, and to the accident which befell Eutichus, but that evidently was not the design of the meeting, normally it would have taken place early on Sunday evening after the Agape. At that time such evening meetings were the rule, there were many slaves in the Church, and their duties in the day time might well preclude their attendance at a day meeting. What Divine mercy in not putting upon the infant Church more than it was able to bear, at a time when the setting apart of a whole day of rest and worship was hardly possible.

Before we finish with the Book of Acts, we must examine one text brought forward by Seventh Day Adventists as evidence that the Church observed the Sabbath as a day of worship. This is found in Acts 15. 20, 21, quoting from the R.V.:

"But we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood. For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath."

Referring to this passage, Conradi and Andrews, in their large text book on the Sabbath, say:

"From this it is apparent that the ancient custom of Divine worship on the Sabbath was not only preserved by the Jewish people, and carried with them into every city of the Gentiles, but that the Gentile Christians attended these meetings, for if they did not, the reason assigned by James would lose all its force, as having no

application to this case. That they did attend them proves that the Sabbath was the day of Divine worship with the Gentile Christians.*

We marvel! That the Jews worshipped God in Jewish fashion is quite true. But that this worship was acceptable to God after Calvary is impossible. In this Gospel age man can only worship God through Christ (John 14. 6); and this would have been anathema to the Jews of the synagogue. See their answer to the claims of Christ shown in Acts 13. 45; 17. 5; 18. 6. Accordingly no Gentile Christian could possibly join in this Jewish worship. What then is the force of the reason adduced by the Apostle James? This, that the Gentile Christians though not under law, were to exercise grace by abstaining from practices, especially the four specified things, which would specially scandalise the Jews and would effectually stumble them and prevent them from ever listening to the claims of Christ. Remember that Christians are exhorted to "give no occasion of stumbling, either to the Jews, or to Greeks, or to the Church of God" (1 Cor. 10. 32). This passage then does not prove that the Sabbath was the day for Divine worship for Gentile Christians.

This concludes the evidence from the Book of Acts. Let us now sum up. We find no evidence after the resurrection that the Church or the Apostles ever rested or met to worship God or to "break bread" on the Sabbath, none whatever. To say that Paul "observed the Sabbath" when he preached the Gospel in the synagogues on that day, as Seventh Day Adventists do, is playing with words; nay more, it would seem a deliberate attempt by the use of equivocal words to wrongly convey the idea that he worshipped God on that day. The only evidence available in this Book as to a day of worship is found in Acts 20. 7, and this is decisive in favour of the first day of the week. We conclude therefore that Seventh Day Adventists have no case whatever from this Book. If it is said that the one instance of worship mentioned above is insufficient authority for the practice of the Church, and that it is offset by the "daily" gathering together

* "History of the Sabbath," p. 194

for that purpose mentioned in Acts 2. 46, we refer them back to our examination of that passage showing that the word "daily" does not apply to the breaking of bread. Further when we turn to 1 Corinthians 16. 1, 2, and Revelations 1. 10, this one instance in Acts 20. 7 is sufficiently supported, and this we shall do presently. We repeat, in the Book of Acts the comparison is between one instance of worship on the first day of the week and none on the Sabbath, none whatever. Let us hold fast to this.

CHAPTER XIII

"The Collection for the Saints"

WE now turn to 1 Corinthians 16. 1, 2:

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the Churches of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the Week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come."

Let us admit that this collection was probably not a public one, but was to be made by each man "at home" (by him); also, that "there is no mention of their assembling, which we have in Acts 20. 7, but a plain indication that the day was already considered as a special one, and one more than others fitting for the performance of a religious duty."* As a matter of fact, the public collection in the Assembly, following the custom of the "purse of the alms" of the synagogue, seems not to have come in until later. Yet even in this case, the giving was not to be a matter for the individual where and when he should please, but was to be under the direction of the local Assembly at Corinth. In other words, it was an Assembly or Church action, this is apparent from verse 1. Now this giving was one side of that spiritual worship mentioned in Hebrews 13. 15, 16, which says:

"Through Him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips which make confession to His Name. But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Now if this "communication" or giving of their substance on the part of the Corinthian Church was to be specially associated with the first day of the week, is it too much to conclude that the public sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (A.V.) the other side of this same

* Alford, Greek Testament, *in loco*.

church worship, should also be associated with the first day of the week? We know from Hebrews 10. 25, that there was a regular day of worship for the Church, "not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another."

The passage, if it stood by itself, is not conclusive, but when taken in conjunction with Acts 20. 7 and these other Scriptures, points one way, and one way only, namely in favour of the first day of the week as the day of Christian worship.

We shall examine the expression "the Lord's" Day of Revelation 1. 10 in the next chapter; but we must find space here for one remaining defence of Seventh Day Adventists. They refer us to Matthew 24. 20, and say that this text shows that at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem the Lord's disciples were to pray that their flight should not be on the Sabbath, this proving that they were observers of the Sabbath at that time.

We reply that this passage has nothing to do with the destruction of Jerusalem, but with the great tribulation spoken of in Jeremiah 30. 7; Daniel 12. 3; Revelation 3. 10; 7. 14; for the very next verse says: "For then shall be a great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be."

If we want our Lord's prophecy as to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, we must turn to Luke 21. 20-24, in which passage the warning connected with the Sabbath does not appear. If it be said that these two passages are parallel and describe the same events, we answer, not so; they are somewhat similar no doubt, but they are not strictly parallel, as the differences clearly demonstrate. In the passage in Matthew there is no mention of the present dispersion of the Jews amongst the nations "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," as appears in Luke 21. 24. Why then, it may be asked, the similarity in some of the language, as for instance in Matthew 24. 19 and Luke 21. 23? Because the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus may be taken as a type or foreshadowing of the great tribulation which is yet to come upon the world,

and a type must necessarily have some resemblance to its antitype. The passage in Luke 21. 20-24 carries us right on, from the destruction of Jerusalem, through the present age, to the events described in Matthew 24. 27, namely the coming of Christ in glory to this earth; it passes over in silence the events leading up to the great tribulation, and that tribulation itself, which we find in Matthew 24. 4-26.

Turning back to Matthew 24. 20, 21; this mention of the Sabbath is easily explained when we remember that Matthew 24. 4-26, has to do with the "70th week" of Daniel 9. 24-27, and has to do with the Jewish remnant of that time after the translation of the Church. The present Church age is a parenthesis which comes in between the 69th and the 70th weeks of the 70 weeks of the Daniel prophecy, and the 70th week must be of the same nature as the other 69 weeks, which are distinctively Jewish. This is evident when the exact wording of the prophecy is noticed: thus, "seven weeks are determined upon thy (Daniel's) people and upon thy holy city," that is upon the Jews. The 69th week culminated at Calvary, the 70th week has yet to take place.* The Lord's Day, the first day of the week, belongs to the Church and its age only, that is the present parenthesis. When this age ends at the translation of the Church, then Jewish time recommences. How appropriate then the mention of the Sabbath just here.

We would pass on from this point to the Millennium, that age when God again takes up Israel His people again as a nation. When they, instead of being the tail as at present, become the head, under the reign of their Messiah, the Lord Jesus. In this latter age we would expect to find the Sabbath restored, and this is precisely what is foretold. Read carefully the following passages, noting the context, Isaiah 56. 1-8; 58. 12-14; 66. 22, 23; Ezekiel 46. 1-3. From these passages it is evident that the Sabbath will be restored; but not only so, other parts of the Jewish ceremonial will be restored also. Read through Ezekiel 43. 19-27; 45. 15-25; 46. 1-24, and this

* See Sir Robert Anderson's "The Coming Prince."

will be quite clear. The ceremonial before Calvary was prospective, *i.e.*, it looked forward to the Cross. This ceremonial just mentioned will be retrospective, *i.e.*, it will look back to the Cross (just as the Lord's Supper in this age looks back to the Cross). Seventh Day Adventists quote Isaiah 66. 22, 23 as proving that the Sabbath will be observed in the New Heavens and the New Earth; but this passage does not say so. Notice the words "as...so," these words simply compare the permanence of Israel's seed and name to the New Heavens and New Earth (in the New Heavens there shall be no more night, see Rev. 21. 25, how then can there be a weekly Sabbath?). Isaiah 66. 23 is contemporaneous with the rest of the chapter, which describes Israel during the Millennium, note carefully verses 8, 10, 12, 18, and 29.

We are aware that Seventh Day Adventists deny this restoration of Israel in the Millennium, for it does not fit in with their theory of the future. How can they square this idea of theirs with Zechariah 14. 4-21, especially verses 9. 16-21, we fail to understand. However, we cannot go into that matter in this short book.

CHAPTER XIV

The Christian Day of Worship in the Sub-Apostolical Church

THERE are two legitimate reasons for appealing to the writings of the so called "fathers" of the Church which followed immediately after the death of the Apostles, in this Sabbath controversy. (a) To establish the meaning of the expression "the Lord's Day" used in Revelation 1. 10. (b) To ascertain what was the regular practice of the Church of that era as regards the day of Christian worship. We may appeal to them for their testimony as to contemporaneous usage and facts, and such evidence may be of the greatest value. Their opinions on doctrine, being uninspired, may or may not be of value according as they agree or disagree with the teaching of Scripture. As a matter of fact some of their doctrine is most erroneous.

Some Seventh Day Adventists strongly object to this appeal to the "fathers," they say that it is forsaking the Protestant position of "the Bible and the Bible only." For instance, Mr. A. W. Anderson, contributing editor of their Australian denominational periodical the "Signs of the Times," in a series of articles from June 8-29, 1925, under the caption, "Is Sunday the Lord's Day?" When objecting to such an appeal, says, "The authority of the fathers on points of doctrine is of no weight whatever, the Word of God alone contains our creed." Is this great carelessness on Mr. Anderson's part, or is it a deliberate confusing of the issues? The appeal to the fathers is not for doctrine but for facts, *i.e.*, evidence. Such is the constant practice of Seventh Day Adventists themselves; they quote largely from contemporary history to prove their contentions. For example, in Conradi and Andrews' large text book on the Sabbath,

199 pages are based upon Scripture, and 599 pages upon history. They thus quote from history in the endeavour to prove that "Sunday came in with Constantine in the fourth century," or that the Pope of Rome changed the Sabbath into the Sunday. Then they cannot consistently complain if the other side quotes from the same contemporary history to prove that this was not so, but that the observance of the first day of the week was the continual practice of the Church from apostolical times onward. No, it is difficult to avoid thinking that the real reason why Seventh Day Adventists disparage the testimony of the fathers is that this testimony is so damaging to their peculiar claims, and they know it.

The Apostle John, about A.D. 95, by inspiration wrote, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day" (Rev. 1. 10). The Greek for this expression is "*en tē kuriakē hēmera*," lit., "in the Dominical day." The word, "*kuriakē*" is an adjective in the feminine gender to agree with the feminine noun "*hēmera*"—day; there is no exactly corresponding English adjective; the nearest is "dominical." It is the same word as is used in the expression "the Lord's Supper"—"*kuriakon deipnon*" (1 Cor. 11. 20). These are the only two instances of the use of the word in the N.T. This is surely significant, but it comes exceedingly significant in view of the following facts: (1) Neither in the Scriptures nor in the writings of the fathers is the Lord's Supper ever associated with the Sabbath, this is incontrovertible, no Sabbatarian will dare to deny it. (2) Nor was the expression "the Lord's Day" in the two centuries after the death of the Apostle John, ever confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it. This latter fact has been admitted by Seventh Day Adventists as we shall show later on, but it will appear quite plainly when we examine the writings of the early fathers themselves.

Just here we must pause to remark that "the Lord's Day" is not synonymous with the expression "the day of the Lord" (1 Thess. 5. 2); for some people (not Seventh Day Adventists) make a mistake here. This is so for two reasons. (1) The construction of the two expressions

is quite different, the latter is "*hē hēmera kuriou*," "the day of the Lord." This latter day, as all know, has to do with the coming of the Lord Jesus in judgment. (2) It was while the Apostle John was "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day" that he heard what is related in Revelation 1. 11, to 3. 22, and, as nearly all expositors agree, while this is a message to seven then existing Churches, yet these Churches were typical, forming a foreview of the Church's history during the present dispensation of grace. What follows in chapter 4 and onwards was a second revelation when the Apostle was again "in the Spirit," for notice, chapter 4 commences, "After this I looked...and immediately I was in the Spirit." The Apostle John then was in the Spirit on two separate occasions. How plain then is it that the Apostle being in the Spirit on the Lord's Day in chapter 1. 10, cannot be taken to mean that he was transported as it were into the time when the Lord Jesus comes in judgment.

Before going into the evidence proving that the "Lord's Day" stands for the first day of the week, we must notice one objection advanced by Seventh Day Adventists. They say, if the "Lord's Day" is the proper title for the first day of the week, why did not the Apostle John use this expression when speaking of the first day of the week in his Gospel, for it is commonly supposed that his Gospel was written about the same time or shortly after the Book of Revelation. We answer that such use of the expression in his Gospel would have been a glaring anachronism, it not being in use at the time covered by the Gospel, *i.e.*, when our Lord lived and died and ascended. To be historically accurate the Apostle had to use in his Gospel the term in current use at the time of Christ, namely, "the first day of the week," and not a term which came into use later on.

1. **Ignatius.** This man suffered martyrdom through being torn to pieces by wild beasts in the Amphitheatre at Rome about A.D. 115. He is said by some to have been appointed bishop of Antioch, the first Gentile Church, in A.D. 69, and to have been taken from there by the Emperor Trajan to Rome, in A.D. 107. On this

journey he is said to have written his epistles. Thus, assuming that the Gospel of John was written about A.D. 97, about ten years later than the death of that Apostle, he wrote:

"No longer observing the Sabbath, but living according to the Lord's life, by which our life has sprung up again through Him."*

Here we have his witness as to the practice of the Church of that period. There have been some spurious writings attributed to this Ignatius, but the above extract has been fully authenticated. Could Ignatius have written in this way if the Church of his time had been observing the Sabbath?

2. **Pliny.** This man was a heathen governor who wrote about A.D. 107 to the Emperor Trajan about the Christians, as follows:

"They were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and to sing amongst themselves an alternating chant to Christ as God...when these things were performed it was their custom to separate and then to re-assemble to eat a common harmless meal."

The first thing that we learn from the testimony of this Roman Official is that the Christians of that time met on a regular stated day, and this only ten years (about) after the Apostle John wrote his Gospel. This is most valuable evidence indeed. The question then arises, what is this "stated day?" It must either be the Sabbath or the first day of the week, which? Surely there is no room for doubt. Referring to this meeting Pressense asks, "what can this repast be, if not that evening meal, well known in the Apostolic age, which began with the Agape and concluded with the Lord's Supper? That it was not simply the Agapes, but also the Lord's Supper, appears from the expression, *innocent repast*. The Christian laid stress on the innocent character of this feast, just because it was violently assailed by the pagans, who, taking literally the expression, 'to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son

* The rendering "but living according to the Lord's Day, on which our life is risen again," is to be rejected.

of Man' regarded the Lord's Supper as a sanguinary festival, a 'feast of Thyestes,' as they said,... It was this second gathering which alone was suppressed after Pliny's edict against unlawful Assemblies (Pliny—'and even this they had given up doing after the issue of my edict'). We know that these assemblies, forbidden by Trajan, were always accompanied by a meal taken together. The Christians then suppressed their sacramental feast, and reduced the Agape to the proportions of a simple meal, observing the Lord's Supper from that time at the public morning worship."*

The above extract from Pressense is most illuminating. How it tallies with what we find in 1 Corinthians 11. 20, 21 where, however, the Apostle had to rebuke the Christians of Corinth for lack of control during the Agape, leading to an unseemly and irreverent partaking of the Lord's Supper afterwards. Compare again with Acts 20. 7-11 when the Christians of Troas gathered together on the first day of the week, having passed by the Sabbath, for the purpose of "breaking bread." Then when we bear in mind, as pointed out before, that the Lord's Supper is never associated with the Sabbath, we are compelled to conclude that this "stated day" was the first day of the week. Here then we have the testimony of a heathen Governor, who had no theological axe to grind, which almost certainly points to the first day of the week as the regular day of worship of the Church about 10 years after the Apostle John wrote his Gospel. And when we compare this testimony with that of Ignatius above, which says that the Christians were "no longer observing the Sabbath," written about the same year, this becomes absolutely conclusive.

3. "**Barnabas.**" This epistle, ascribed by early Christian writers to Barnabas the companion of the Apostle Paul, was quite possibly not written by him. But it was written about A.D. 120; it was highly prized, even being included in the Sinaitic manuscript of the New Testament, which with the exception of the Vatican

* "Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church," p. 524, E. de Pressense, D.D. (italics his).

Codex is the oldest uncial Greek manuscript extant at the present time. Its testimony is unequivocal.

"Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that which I have made when giving rest to all things I shall make a beginning of the eighth day...that is the beginning of another world. Wherefore also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day on which Jesus rose again from the dead."

Here is excellent evidence as to the current feeling and practice of the Church about 23 years after the Gospel of John was written.

4. **Didache**, or the "Teaching of the Apostles." Written about A.D. 120 or earlier. Of this Prof. Gwatkin of the University of Cambridge says, "The work of an unknown writer, its date is uncertain; possibly even in the first century. It represents a very early stage of Church government, before the rise of (monarchical) episcopacy." With this Dr. Moule agrees, saying that it "belongs most probably to century 1, and to the Churches of Syria."*

This document says: "But on the Lord's own day (*kata kuriakên de kuriou*) gather yourselves together, and break bread and give thanks."

This is the first example subsequent to Revelation 1. 10, where we find the term "the Lord's Day" or its equivalent. However, we must pause to examine the original Greek expression here used, for Conradi and Andrews in their text book, "The History of the Sabbath" deny that the Greek refers to the Lord's Day. They say, with regard to the Greek words "*kata kuriakên de kuriou*," "these words evidently refer to the Lord's Supper, but the Greek text is incomplete."† Both these statements are untrue. The Greek text is not complete, nor can the words refer to the Lord's Supper. It is true that a word may be understood, the Greek is literally translated, "on the Dominical (-) of the Lord," but if so, the feminine gender of the word "*kuriakên*" leaves no doubt as to what this word must be. Conradi and Andrews think

* Appendix F, Ephesians, Cambridge Bible, Moule.

† "The History of the Sabbath," p. 274, Andrews and Conradi.

that it refers to the Lord's Supper. Can they know any Greek? Even a school-boy acquaintance with that language would have shown them that such would be a flagrant false concord. *Deipnon*, the Greek for "supper" is neuter in gender, and cannot possibly agree with the feminine *kuriakēn*. Later on, on page 276 of the same book, they correctly say that the adjective *kuriakos*, in question, is commonly associated with three nouns—the Lord's Supper (*kuriakon deipnon*); the Lord's life (*kiriakēn zoen*); the Lord's day (*kuriakēn hēmeran*). As we have pointed out above, supper, being neuter, is impossible. There remain therefore, life (*zoe*) and day (*hēmera*) both feminine; if the word "life" is supplied it fails to make sense, the context does not suit, not so when "day" is supplied, it suits the context perfectly. Thus Prof. Gwatkin translates, as above, "on the Lord's own Day."

But there is more yet. Andrews and Conradi happen to quote some most interesting information given by Dr. Philip Schaff, of whose scholarship there can be no doubt. Commenting on the word "*kuriakēn*" in the above extract, Schaff says:

"The first use of *kuriakēn* as a noun, but with the pleonastic addition of *tou kuriou*."

Then referring to "words used for the first time in the Didache" he says:

"*Kuriakē*, 14. 1, the Lord's Day. Occurs as a noun in Ignatius, Gregory, Nazianzen, etc., and in Apost. Const. often. . . The New Testament has the adjective, in 1 Corinthians 11. 20, of the Lord's Supper, and in Revelation 1. 10, of the Lord's Day."

We know also that *kuriakē* occurs as a noun with the meaning of the Lord's Day in the title of a book on that subject written by Melito of Sardis about A.D. 170, "*ho peri kuriakēs logos*," "the discourse about the Lord's Day."

This is most instructive. The very fact that about A.D. 120, or earlier the adjective *kuriakē* could be used in a document as a noun meaning the Lord's Day (the later cases of such usage being excellent evidence that

this was not an accident but an early example of a rule) proves positively that for some time before A.D. 120 or even earlier this use of *kuriakē* as a noun meaning the Lord's Day must have been in common speech; also that still further back the fuller expression "*kuriakē hēmera*," from which it was derived must have been in common usage with the same meaning.

Let us take a modern parallel. The Italian adjective, "piano" (Eng., soft) has now come into widespread use as the name of a musical instrument, *i.e.*, as a noun. How has this come about? Originally this class of instrument had strings which were plucked with a quill, but this admitted of only one degree of tone, the loudness could not be varied. Later a felt hammer was substituted, which could hit the strings with varying degrees of force, giving a variation in tone. This new instrument was therefore named a "pianoforte," lit., "soft-loud." When these instruments became more common, the name "pianoforte," though still in use, became shortened for convenience into "piano," and both words continue to this day. Now if we consult the "Oxford Dictionary" and find the first occurrence of this word "piano" in writing, will this first occurrence be merely a printer's error? By no means. The subsequent use of the word in the same manner will prove that this was not an error, but simply an early example of a rule. But the occurrence of the word "piano" in writing presumes its previous use in common speech for some time, and this in turn presumes the common use of the longer expression "pianoforte" still further back, exactly as has been the case. The case of the noun "*kuriakē*," the Lord's Day, is an exact parallel. The occurrence of this word as a noun in a document about A.D. 120 or earlier presumes its use in common speech some time still further back, and this in turn presumes the common use of the longer expression "*kuriakē hēmera*" still earlier, the length and common use of which was the occasion of the latter abbreviation. So we can confidently deduce from this evidence that the expression "*kuriakē hēmera*" must have been in common use somewhere about the time when

the Apostle John wrote Revelation 1. 10, about 25 years back, and this verse is simply an example of such usage. Again, as is ever the case, we have the Lord's Supper associated with the Lord's Day.

5. Justin Martyr. Born at Shechem or Samaria, of Greek parentage, lived from about A.D. 100-167. Dr. Schaff speaking of him says, "After his conversion, Justin devoted himself wholly to the vindication of the Christian religion as an itinerant evangelist with no fixed abode." He would then be an excellent witness as to the general practice of the Church of his time. Writing about A.D. 147 (about 50 years after John's Gospel) he says:

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in the 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 these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and as we said before, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings...succours the orphans and widows...and all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we hold our common Assembly, because it is the first day of the week on which God...made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead."*

Here is most excellent evidence as to the practice of the Church as a whole. Of course, as Justin was writing to a heathen Emperor, he uses the name Sunday, not the Lord's Day, for the latter term would not have been understood by the Emperor.

Justin wrote also "A dialogue with Trypho, a Jew." In this he tries to show the Jew the futility of observing the Sabbath in the present dispensation of grace. It is too long to quote, but it is the best possible evidence that in the practice of the Christian Church the Jewish Sabbath had already given way to the first day of the

* "The First Apology of Justin," ch. 67. Written to the Roman Emperor, Antonius Pius, and the Roman Senate.

week, for how otherwise could such a controversy have been possible? It is evidence also that the Jews, like Seventh Day Adventists of to-day, were trying to force the Sabbath on the Church in general.

6. Clement, of Alexandria. Lived A.D. 150-220. Although this Clement was full of doctrinal error, and is the fount of much departure from the Word of God in the Church, yet his testimony as to current fact is in no way invalidated thereby. Teaching and testimony are two entirely different things. Let us hear some of his testimony.

"The old seventh day has become nothing more than a working day."

A most definite statement of fact! Again, "He, in fulfilment of the precept, keeps the Lord's Day when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself."

Here in this curious mixture we have the "Lord's Day" associated with the resurrection. If the Sabbath had been regarded as the Lord's Day, could he have written in this way? Impossible.

7. Irenaeus. A.D. 155-202. When writing about A.D. 178 upon a burning question of his day, whether Easter should be kept according to the Jewish calendar, or be restricted to the Lord's Day, writes:

"The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the Pascal feast."

How could he have possibly written this if there had been the slightest confusion between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day? His identification of the Lord's Day with the day of the resurrection is evidence of the settled conviction of the Church of his period.

8. Tertullian. A.D. 150-230. "One of the greatest men of the early Church...he joined the Puritanic sect of the Montanists. They were orthodox in doctrine, but stern in discipline. He remained true to the faith of the Catholics, but fought them vehemently on matters

of morality and discipline" (Johnson's Cyclopaedia). Writing about A.D. 200, Tertulian says:

"In the same way if we devote Sunday to rejoicing, from a far different reason than sun-worship, we have some resemblance to some of you (the Jews) who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury. Others suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity."

What a remarkable piece of evidence! How could the heathen (obviously) have come to such a mistaken opinion of the Christian worship unless the latter had been for some considerable time observing the first day of the week? The observance of the first day must of necessity have been widespread and universal for such a mistaken opinion to have been possible.

9. Origen. A. D. 185-253, writes:

"Thus was he (John the Baptist) born to make ready a people for the Lord, a people fit for Him at the end of the covenant now grown old, which is the end of the Sabbath period. It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to keep the Lord's Day."

If the Church had confused the Sabbath with the Lord's Day it would have been quite impossible for him to have written this.

10. "Apostolical Constitutions." Church life in the 2nd and 3rd centuries.

"Christians are commanded to assemble for worship every morning and evening...but principally on the Sabbath day, and on the day of the resurrection of the Lord, which is the Lord's Day, assemble yourselves together without fail, giving thanks to God."

There are at least five other places in this document where the observance of these two days is enjoined, and in which the first day of the week is called the Lord's Day. This quotation undoubtedly enjoins the observance of both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day (of this see later). It is constantly quoted by Seventh Day Adventists as evidence for the observance of the Sabbath in this period;

then let them be consistent and bow to it as being evidence also as to the meaning of the Lord's Day.

This list might be further expanded by quoting writers of later dates. But our object has been to collect all the evidence available from the 2nd century, which determines the practice of the Church which followed on immediately after the death of the Apostles.

Conclusions to be Drawn from the above Evidence.

(a) The Lord's Day.

First and foremost the expression, "the Lord's Day" has been endorsed by the Spirit of God by its use in Revelation 1. 10, it has His sanction. It is clear then that there must be a day which is particularly and truly the Lord's own day. As we have pointed out already, this day cannot be the apocalyptic day of Jehovah. It remains then that it must either be the Sabbath or the first day of the week. Seventh Day Adventists urge that it is the former, we, on the contrary, believe that it is the latter. If this Scripture had plainly identified the "Lord's Day" with one of these two days, there would have been an end of controversy on the Sabbath question. But it has not done so. Is there any contemporary evidence available? None, unless indeed the "Didache" is contemporary, which is very possible, see quotations from Gwatkin and Moule above. But evidence from the era immediately following is available, and this evidence has been quoted above. The evidence which bears upon the meaning of the expression "the Lord's Day" is found in extracts Nos. 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Of these the Didache, No. 4, shows us that the expression must have been in common use not long after the Apostle John wrote the Book of Revelation, if not at that very time. The use of the adjective *kuriakē* as a noun with the meaning of the "Lord's Day" necessitating this. This extract also shows the close association there was between the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper. Extracts 6, 7, 9, 10 show that this close association continued right up to the close of the second century, and also definitely identified the Lord's Day with the day of the resurrection, the first day of the week.

The foregoing testimony is all that is available from the era in question; it is the testimony of those who had been or almost had been in actual communication with the Apostles themselves, and it represents not the opinions of the writers on doctrine, which often were erroneous, but their witness as to the current usage of the Church as a whole on the matter of the Lord's Day, for they were writers of wide geographical distribution. Their witness points one way, and one way only; and show us that, starting from the death of the Apostle John and continuing on, the Church identified the "Lord's Day" with the day of the resurrection, and it was the day of days on which the Lord's Supper was partaken. There is no contrary evidence whatever. Neither the fathers of this era, or later, ever identify the "Lord's Day" with the Sabbath, nor is the Sabbath ever associated with the Lord's Supper. This unanimity as to the meaning of the Lord's Day on the part of the early "Fathers" is a remarkable fact, and can be explained only by the hypothesis that no other alternative, such as the Sabbath, was possible. We pause now to ask a question, "Who are more likely to be correct as to the meaning of the expression the 'Lord's Day,' Seventh Day Adventists, who live 1800 years after the close of the N.T. Canon, or those who lived immediately after, and were amongst the first to use the term?" To ask the question is to answer it.

Now while most Seventh Day Adventists try to discount the above evidence, a few of them evidently feel its weight. For instance, Mr. A. W. Anderson, contributing editor of their Australian denominational periodical "Signs of the Times," in its issue for June 8, 1925, quotes Dr. Hessey as follows:

"In the two centuries after the death of St. John the Lord's Day was *never confounded* with the Sabbath, but *carefully distinguished* from it."

And Mr. Anderson endorses this by saying:

"The historical development of Sunday observance is set forth *very clearly* by Dr. Hessey" (emphasis in both quotations ours).

Exactly! We, too, with Mr. Anderson endorse Dr. Hessey, he is indeed very clear. So Mr. Anderson, in endorsing Dr. Hessey, in effect admits fully what we have been labouring to prove. And he is not the only Seventh Day Adventist teacher to admit this. In the same periodical, in its issue for August 22, 1927, a writer makes the following quotation:

"The idea of the Lord's Day is *wholly distinct* from that of the Sabbath, *never* for a moment confused with it in the early Church, in which indeed, the observance of the Sabbath long survived, sometimes as a festival, sometimes as a fast" (emphasis ours).

Then follows this admission by the Seventh Day Adventist writer—"This is the *truth*."

Again we agree, though we would observe that this survival of the Sabbath noted above, would be in those churches in which the Jewish element persisted. Dr. Philip Schaff, in his history of the Apostolical Church, says,

"So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, Scripturally observed the Sabbath, the annual Jewish feasts, and the whole Mosaic ritual, and celebrated in addition to these the Christian Sunday, the death and resurrection of the Lord, and the Holy Supper. But this union was gradually weakened, and was at last entirely broken by the destruction of the Temple. The Jewish Sabbath passed into the Christian Sunday."

These two Seventh Day Adventist admissions are very significant. There is then no further need to argue the matter. We can agree that immediately after the death of the Apostle John, "the Lord's Day was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it."

But other Seventh Day Adventists try to discount the above evidence and conclusion by stressing the undoubted fact that, even in the time of the Apostles, grave apostasy from the truth was manifesting itself, therefore the writings of the "Fathers" must be treated with suspicion. We notice, however, that when the testimony of the "Fathers" can be adduced in favour of the Sabbath, they do not hesitate to use it; but when it favours the

first day of the week, it is "suspicious." Is this fair? However, let us look into the matter a little more closely. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that one of the errors connected with this apostasy consisted in misnaming the first day of the week the "Lord's Day" in place of the Sabbath. What then should we expect to find? Surely this—that whereas as a general rule the "Lord's Day" would be an alternative name for the Sabbath, yet in a few places this expression would be used for the first day of the week, and this difference would be a matter of controversy. But such is emphatically not the case. On the contrary, the practice of naming the first day of the week the "Lord's Day" by the Church was unanimous, widespread, not local. Very well, it is quite impossible for an error in practice to have suddenly arisen simultaneously over as large an area as was covered by the Church of that era. It would necessarily have taken considerable time to grow by spreading from place to place, yet, "in the two centuries after the death of St. John, the Lord's Day was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it." There is only one conclusion possible. The Church in this matter must have followed the practice of their immediate predecessors, namely, the very Church founded and instructed, under the Spirit's guidance, by the Apostles themselves, and was perfectly correct in its practice. We are driven therefore to the conclusion that the "Lord's Day" is verily and indeed the first day of the week.

(b) The regular day of worship of the early Church.

The foregoing ought, to a candid mind, to be sufficient evidence to establish the Lord's Day, the first day of the week, as the Christian day of worship, on which the Church partook of the Lord's Supper, the highest form of Christian worship. But the above is abundantly confirmed when we examine the evidence afforded by the other extracts quoted above.

Ignatius informs us that the Church no longer (about 10 years after the death of the Apostle John) observed

the Sabbath. Pliny, writing at the same time, informs us that the Church met however on a regular "stated day" to partake of the Lord's Supper, a supper never associated with the Sabbath. "Barnabas" about 13 years later informs us that this day was the "eighth day," *i.e.*, the resurrection day. The Didache about the same time, or earlier, calls this day on which the Lord's Supper was partaken "the Lord's own Day." Justin Martyr, an itinerant evangelist, when writing to the heathen Emperor unacquainted with Christian terms, states that the "common assembly" day was Sunday, and gives a detailed report of this assembly for partaking of the Lord's Supper. A little while later Tertullian mentions this Sunday gathering, but expressly tells us that it had nothing to do with the worship of the Sun, despite the mistaken conclusion of the heathen. What an array of evidence! Yet the Australian Seventh Day Adventist periodical "Signs of the Times" can publish an article by a Mr. E. K. Slade in which he dares to say: "No account is given in the New Testament of the observance of Sunday, or the first day of the week by early Christians. We have no such fact recorded in history until the third or fourth century, when Sunday gradually came into... prominence through the strange blending of pagan rites with apostate Christianity." The wonder is that the Editor, who presumably has the interests of truth at heart, was willing to publish such an article. Listen again to this of Mrs. White, "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark (of the beast). Sunday came in with Constantine; and it is the sign of the beast, for we owe its observance to the Pope of Rome."* Again we marvel! If, indeed, we owe the observance of Sunday to the Pope of Rome, how is it that the Greek "Orthodox Church," which so strongly resisted the Papacy, also observed the Sunday and not the Sabbath? No; the Papacy had nothing whatever to do with the establishing of the first day of the week as the Christian day of worship no matter what they themselves claim.

* "The Great Controversy," Mrs. E. G. White, vol. 4. p. 281.

Now to make our examination of the evidence complete, we must refer to the fact that there is undoubted testimony to the fact that sometimes both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day were observed by the same body. Such a testimony we find in extract No. 10, the "Apostolical Constitutions." How are we to account for this? It is ever to be remembered that after the preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles, the Judaizing party constantly followed on their heels, corrupting the doctrine of Grace with legality, trying to add to faith in Christ the observance of the Jewish law with its rites and days. The Apostle Paul was compelled to use the most vehement warnings against such teaching, see Galatians 1. 7-10. Now assuming that the first day of the week was the correct day for worship, it would only be expected that the Judaizing party would strenuously oppose it by their Jewish Sabbath and their other feast days. Hence the warning of Galatians 4. 10, and Colossians 2. 16, "Ye observe days and months and times and years." The whole Epistle of Galatians is a polemic dealing with this Jewish attack, so the passage in Gal. 4. 10 cannot be referring to the Galatians observing heathen feast days as Seventh Day Adventists would have us to believe. We know indeed that the Jewish Church at Jerusalem and in the vicinity observed the Jewish ritual right up to the destruction of Jerusalem. So it is only to be expected that in some cases where the Jewish element preponderated the observance of both days the Sabbath and the Lord's Day might be the case. Such is the explanation of the extract from the "Apostolical Institutions" quoted above.

In the middle of the second century we know there was controversy on the matter, as is evidenced by Justin's "Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew." In this dialogue the Jew asks, "Why do you select and quote whatever you wish from the prophetic writings (Justin had quoted from Isaiah 1. 13 and similar passages) but do not refer to those which expressly command the Sabbath to be observed?" It would appear that Trypho was a forerunner, as it were of modern Sabbatarians.

But, be it noted, in such cases where the Sabbath was observed by the Christians, the Lord's Day was also observed. We can find no cases in the writings of the second and third centuries where the observance of the Sabbath solely by itself is enjoined or even mentioned for worship. On the other hand, as we have quoted above there are quite a number of cases where the first day of the week, the Lord's Day, is enjoined as the only one and proper day of worship in the Church.

Now, however valuable this evidence as to the current practice of the sub-apostolical Church is, and it is indeed very valuable, that evidence above which definitely settles the meaning of the expression "the Lord's Day" is really of far greater value; for this settles the fact that the first day of the week is the Lord's Day. Then if it is His day and not man's (or Rome's) surely it has the highest possible sanction as a day to be specially set apart for His worship, for what other possible reason could this day be His day? May it not very well be that this title "the Lord's Day" points to a special revelation on the matter made by the Lord Jesus after His resurrection, before His ascension, which was included in the "many other things which Jesus did" which were not written (John 21. 25). Whether this be so or not, the above evidence admits of only one possible explanation, that in the matter of the expression "the Lord's Day," and in the observance of this day, these early Church Fathers were simply following the practice of their immediate predecessors, namely, the very Church founded and instructed by the Apostles themselves, indications of whose practice we find in Acts 20. 7; 1 Corinthians 16. 1, 2; and Revelation 1. 10.

Seventh Day Adventists are very fond of quoting Roman Catholic Catechisms, even calling them a "confession of the criminal,"* in which the Romish Church claims to have changed the Sabbath into the Sunday. For instance:

"Are Protestants following the Bible or the Holy Catholic Church in keeping Sunday? The Protestants

* "The Lord's Day," M. C. Wilcox, p. 83.

are following the custom introduced by the Holy Catholic Church."*

Now this Roman Catholic question and answer is calculated to deceive; it is a piece of casuistry, for all depends on what is meant by the words "the Holy Catholic Church." The present Roman Church claims to have started with the Apostles, they identify themselves with the Church of that time. But Protestants cannot possibly allow this. But associate the "Roman Catholic Church" of the present time with what developed some centuries later, and with this Seventh Day Adventists concur. If the expression "the Holy Catholic Church" refers to the Church formed at the Day of Pentecost, and instructed and built up by the Holy Spirit, through the agency of the Apostles, Protestants may well admit that they are following its practice. But they deny firmly that they are following the practice of the Papal Church which did not develop until long after. But owing to the arrogance of the Papal Church, and the carelessness of Protestants, the Papal Church has practically appropriated to itself the title "the Holy Catholic Church," so the above question and answer would suggest to the unwary reader the Protestants are following a change of day made some centuries after Christ. And Seventh Day Adventists in quoting such questions and answers in this way are playing upon this confusion of ideas for the same purpose. We repeat, "Read the above question and answer with the idea of the Apostolic Church of the N.T. times in mind, and Protestants will agree; but read them with the idea of the later Roman Catholic Church in mind, then Protestants must disagree. The use of these R.C. Catechisms by Seventh Day Adventists in this manner is only calculated to deceive the unwary, and is most unfair. We would note, however, that the "Catholic Dictionary" by Addis and Arnold, a R.C. publication, after quoting Revelation 1. 10; Acts 20. 7; 1 Corinthians 16. 1, 2, says that these texts "seem to indicate that Sunday was already a sacred day on which deeds of love were especially suitable. Hebrews 10. 25 shows this much: that Christians,

* "Idem," p. 85.

when the epistle was written, had regular days of assembly. The Scriptural references given above show that the observance of Sunday had begun in the Apostolic age, but even were Scripture silent, tradition would put this point beyond all doubt." To this no exception can be taken, it does not aim at deception, though by the word "tradition" we would understand the testimony (not the teaching) of the Fathers who were the immediate successors of the Apostles, just as we have shown above.

CHAPTER XV

The Christian and the Lord's Day

THE question now comes up, "What is the Christian's relation to the Lord's Day? How is he to observe it? Are there any rules in the New Testament with regard to its observance? Also should it be set apart by the State as a National Rest Day.

The answer to these questions is by no means easy, we must tread warily, and exercise forbearance with those who do not see eye to eye with us, for all have not the fullest light on the matter.

(a) The Christian is one who owns the Lord Jesus Christ as his Lord, hence he necessarily has the closest relation to his Lord's Day. That which concerns his Lord concerns him also. The very title "the Lord's Day" is an indication of the concern with which the Lord regards the day. The Christian's loyalty to the Lord Jesus should then lead him so to use the day as will please Him, and to refrain from doing anything on that day that would displease Him. Let him ever say, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Psalm 118. 24). On other days, though there may be time for family worship and evening meetings as opportunity offers, there is usually little time for spiritual refreshment, owing to necessary duties or business. But on the Lord's Day with its let up from the daily routine, there is abundant opportunity for united worship, mutual edification, and spiritual refreshment, which will fit the child of God for the strain of the ensuing week. On this day, above all others, the Christian can take time to have communion with his Lord. How he should heed the exhortation which says:

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another,

and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh" (Heb. 10. 25).

(b) Next, as to rules or restrictions governing the observance of the Lord's Day. When we examine the New Testament for such we soon find that there are none to be found. Not only so, we find that the Christian is nowhere commanded to observe the Lord's Day. Now why is this? Surely because the observance of the day with Him is not a legal matter, but a privilege; he is "not under law, but under grace." The loyalty of a renewed conscience cannot but find expression in the setting apart of this day for his Lord. The guiding principle we find unfolded in Romans 14. 1-12, especially verses 5, 6:

"One 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."*

Plainly it is a matter the believer must settle between himself and his Lord. The matter of esteeming one day above another, or of esteeming all days, is a question of a quickened conscience, "to his own Lord he standeth or falleth" (v. 4).

Furthermore, the contrast here is between one man who honours one day above another, and another who honours every day as unto the Lord. This latter "aims not 'to level down' but to 'level up' his use of time, to count every day holy, equally dedicated to the will and work of God."† The word "alike" introduced into the A.V. and the R.V. to complete the sentence must not be misunderstood, it does not imply the secularisation of every day, but the dedication of every day. Let us stress the word "esteem," which Alford renders "select for honour."

Moreover the esteeming or honouring of every day

* The A.V. adds, "and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." This is omitted by most authorities. It is probably a gloss, introduced later, to complete the parallel suggested by the last part of the verse.

† Dr. Moule, Romans, Expositor's Bible, *in loco*.

is the characteristic of the more enlightened Christian in contrast with his "weak brother," who esteems one day; for notice the Apostle's parallel—the enlightened brother eateth all things and esteems every day, the weak brother eats only herbs and esteems one day above another.

Now how can this be? Is there then to be no weekly rest day in this dispensation? A little patience will clear the matter up. Dr. Moule here observes: "The question has been much debated whether the observance of the Sabbath was one of the tenets of the 'weak brethren' and so whether it is here ruled by St. Paul to be not of permanent moral obligation (cf. Col. 2. 16). If by 'the Sabbath' is meant the last day of the week strictly, the answer to both questions must be yes."*

On the other hand F. W. Grant remarks: "Here a question may be raised with regard to the Lord's Day. How does the principle here affect that? It would seem that it does not come into the question—just because the Lord's Day is given us not in the way of a legal command, but as a privilege, in order that the observance may be anything really acceptable to God. What the Apostle has before him is, of course, as the meats and drinks show, the Jewish distinctions of meats and days, which have passed away."†

This is quite true. Could it be a mark of weakness to observe the Lord's Day? It is His Day for what purpose? To be disregarded? We judge not. Assuming for sake of argument the Seventh Day Adventist hypothesis, that the first day of the week "came in with Constantine," then on their own showing the Apostle could not possibly be referring to that day. Well to what day can he be referring? We reply, a Jewish day; the parallel of ceremonial distinctions between meats and drinks proves this, whether that of a "feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow of the things to come" (Col. 2. 16). In this latter passage the same association of meats and drinks occur. At Rome, we know, there was a strong Jewish element in the Church (see Rom.

* Dr. Moule, Romans, Cambridge Bible, *in loco*.

† F. W. Grant, Numerical Bible, *in loco*.

2. 17; 7. 1; and chapters 9, 10, 11) and evidently there were some recriminations between them and the Gentile converts as regards the Jewish ceremonial days, especially the Sabbath. Hence the timeliness of the Apostle's remarks in this chapter. It would certainly be a mark of weakness and lack of enlightenment for such a Jew to continue to observe a new moon or a Sabbath. But such a Jewish brother who observed the Sabbath as unto the Lord from motives of scruple was not to be "despised," nor was he, in turn, to be censorious of his fellow believer who refused that day.

But how are we to understand the case of the more enlightened brother who "esteemeth every day?" Surely he is one who in accordance with the teaching of Hebrews 4. 1-11 has realised that his "Sabbath rest" is a life of rest in Christ through faith. In this respect every day is equally holy unto God, his whole time is consecrated to God.

"There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God. For he that is entered into His rest hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from His. Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest."

It is this life of rest in Christ of which the Sabbath was a type, a turning away from the works of self-effort, to Christ, both for justification and sanctification of life.

There is an obvious lesson to be learnt here. There are among Seventh Day Adventists quite a number of loyal hearted children of God, whose hearts are better than their doctrines. They honestly, but mistakenly we think, observe the Sabbath day as unto the Lord; in this we think they are weak brethren. Nevertheless on this account the more enlightened Christian is forbidden to "despise" them.* To their own Lord they stand or fall. But they, in their turn, should refrain from "judging" Christians in respect of the Sabbath day in obedience to Colossians 2. 16. It is this very "judging" which is such a conspicuous feature of their propaganda which has called forth this rejoinder of ours. As we have said before in our preface, had it not been for their persis-

* Rom. 14. 3.

tent practice of seeking out Christians of the various churches with a view of pressing the Sabbath upon them, especially in heathen fields where native converts have little facilities for instruction, this book would probably never have been written.

The foregoing remarks apply to those who observe a particular day out of loyalty to their Lord. But there are other Seventh Day Adventists who would predicate the observance of the Sabbath as a condition of Salvation. That is to say, they would add to faith in Christ the condition of Sabbath keeping in order that a man may be saved. This is exceedingly more serious. The Epistle to the Galatians was written expressly to confute this form of error. Salvation is by grace through faith (Eph. 2. 8) apart from works of law (Rom. 3. 28), apart from ritual (Gal. 5. 2) apart from observance of days or seasons (Gal. 4. 9, 10). Grace from its very meaning excludes conditions of any kind. Any man who attempts to add any such conditions to faith is, according to the Apostle Paul, "anathema" (Gal. 1. 8, 9).

And yet T. M. French, Director of Homiletics and Mission Polity (1920) in the Seventh Day Adventists' college of Berien Springs, Michigan, stated, "We believe in justification by faith in Christ, but on the condition of our keeping the moral law."*

Has anyone, has any Seventh Day Adventist, ever kept the moral law without offending in one point? Surely not. Who then according to this teacher can be saved? Thank God that the Apostle Paul wrote:

"We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (Rom. 3. 28).

Again, Mr. O. A. Johnson, Instructor in Bible and History, in Union College, College View, Nebraska, writes:

"One of the conditions of salvation and having our names retained in the book of life is to keep the Sabbath."†

* Quoted in Putnam's "Legalism and the Seventh Day Question" p. 6.

† "Bible Text Book," p. 36.

And again, "Man must refrain from sinning if he would remain under grace."*

Does Mr. Johnson understand what grace means? Grace has been defined as the unmerited favour of God, it cannot be deserved, it is opposed to law-works of any kind, see Romans 11. 6; Ephesians 2. 8, 9. We are glad, however, to note that among other and later writers of this body there is a tendency to recede from the terrible error into which Mr. Johnson falls.

So the observance of the Lord's Day is not a legal matter, but one of loyalty to a loved Saviour. The day is His necessarily, and in our treatment of this day, it is "the love of Christ" which "constraineth us"—"that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2 Cor. 5. 14, 15). So in avoiding the one error of legality we must avoid falling into the opposite one. Some who have seen quite clearly that the Christian day of worship is not the Sabbath, but the Lord's Day, have over stressed that aspect of the truth that Christians "are not under law, but under grace," and have gone to the other extreme in contending that as there are not any restrictions attached to this day in the New Testament, they are free, while using the day as one for worship, to do otherwise as they please, and to seek their own pleasure on it. To such the warning of Galatians 5. 13, surely applies:

"For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love be servants one to another."

Would it be love to one's fellow man, in an inconsiderate freedom, to join in with those who make it impossible for people to keep the Lord's Day? Again and again one has heard of cases where the unnecessary use of public conveyances by professing Christians on the Lord's Day has been the subject of criticism on the part of the unbeliever. We are aware that there are cases on which activity on the Lord's Day cannot be avoided, such as dairies, and such occupations; also sea voyages often

* "Bible Text Book," p. 70.

necessitate travelling on this day. But let us remember that the world is very quick to see inconsistencies in a Christian's conduct. And whether it is due to the common confusion of the Sabbath with the Lord's Day or not, the fact remains that the world does not really associate laxity on the Lord's Day with spiritual Christianity. How careful then ought the Christian to be not to let his "good be evil spoken of" (Rom. 14. 16). The Apostle Paul gives much timely warning on the matter:

"But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak" (1 Cor. 8. 9).

"Judge ye this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling" (Rom. 14. 13).

"It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak" (Rom. 14. 21).

Let us then keep on the safe side, and avoid things which are "not expedient," the law of love will constrain us to only do those things which build up and pull down.

"Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbour's good" (1 Cor. 10. 24).

Again, while it is true that the seventh day Sabbath has passed as far as this dispensation is concerned (for it is yet to be restored when God again takes up His chosen people Israel, see Isaiah 56. 2-7; 66. 22, 23; Ezekiel 46. 1-3) and the Lord's Day has taken its place, yet grace does not propose a lower but a higher standard than law. If then under law we read concerning the Sabbath:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, and the holy of the Lord honourable; and shall honour it, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord" (Isa. 58. 13, 14).

Then let us under grace give even a higher honour to the Lord's Day, not keeping it in a legal manner, but out of loyalty to the Lord, whose day it is; recognising that it is a day fraught with greater possibilities,

greater spiritual blessings, commemorating, as it does, the New Creation, our finished redemption.

As to details in its observance about which there may be uncertainty, let us not so much say: What is there wrong in doing this? or, Where is this forbidden? but, Will this thing please my Lord? Will it help or hinder my brother? Let us go to the Lord, and get direct from Him His will on the matter, He will give a tender conscience and make the matter clear.

(c) Should the Lord's Day be observed as a national rest day? Here we need to go very warily. One has only to read history to realise what a thorny matter this has been. We therefore shrink from being dogmatic on the question, but would submit the following principles for consideration.

God created man, and knows his physical frame, and His providential setting apart of one seventh of time for bodily rest and recuperation cannot be departed from with impunity. All other proportions of time tried at different times by man have proved detrimental. Witness the proportion of one in ten tried at the French Revolution. So we submit that God's proportion of one in seven is the wisest possible one. Again, God deals not only with individuals as individuals, but with nations as nations, and surely that nation which collectively honours God by setting apart a national rest day on which God may be honoured by its subjects, will be more favoured by Him than a nation which follows the example of the Continental Sunday. Now, while the religious observance of the Lord's Day cannot be imposed by the state on an individual if he is unwilling, yet the state can and should limit unnecessary activity on that day, and see that no impediment is put in the way of its due observance by the individual who does wish to do so. Take the matter of Sunday amusements, that section of the public which demands such are surely very selfish in thereby imposing Sunday work on employees who are deprived of their weekly rest. Of course people will be selfish, such is human nature; but is it not the function of a wise government to prevent such selfishness

from injuring another section of the community? However, the subject is one bristling with perplexities, and we cannot in a short book like this devote sufficient space to properly cover the ground. Our object has been different, namely, to elucidate the Sabbath-Lord's Day controversy.

Lastly Christians are to ever remember that they are to be "subject to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13. 1). All restrictions of the state which do not conflict with the plain teaching of the word of God should be loyally obeyed by the Christian subject.

A Final Summing Up.

1. The Decalogue, the main plank of the Seventh Day Adventist platform for Sabbath observance is, as is shown by its address and exact wording, a purely Jewish code. It is inseparably connected with the Sinaitic or "old" covenant, which covenant had to do with Israel alone.

2. The Abrogation of this "old" covenant in favour of the "new" covenant carried with it the abrogation of the Decalogue. This is expressly taught in 2 Corinthians 3.

3. This last statement is in no way invalidated by Matthew 5. 17, or Romans 3. 31, the word "law" in both passages having a much wider signification than the Decalogue.

4. The Seventh Day Adventist "two-law" theory of a distinction between two systems of law, one—the "law of God" the "moral law," contained, they say, in the Decalogue, and second—the "law of Moses" the "ceremonial law" written in a book, completely breaks down. It is contrary to the usage of the Old Testament, contrary to the usage of the Lord Jesus, contrary to the usage of the New Testament. There are no two such systems of law.

5. Individual precepts may be classed as moral, ceremonial, providential, civil, etc., according to their object. Some precepts may partake of more than one signification.

6. The change at Calvary involved the passing away of the whole Mosaic law as a connected system of legislation, not the "ceremonial law" merely.

7. The standard of conduct for the Christian is found in the teachings "of grace." The Christian's rule of life is that of loyalty to Christ Himself. He is "not under law, but under grace." As under grace, the righteous requirement of the law is fulfilled in him (not by him)

when he walks not by self-effort, "after the flesh," but by faith, "after the Spirit."

8. These "teachings of grace" in the epistles of the New Testament embody generally the moral principles of the Mosaic law, and include all the principles of the Decalogue except the Sabbath regulation, which is nowhere enjoined.

9. The Sabbath precept of the Decalogue is not a purely moral precept, but is partly providential, and partly ceremonial. This follows both from the direct teaching of the Lord Jesus, and from that of the Apostle Paul.

10. The Apostle Paul specifically says that, like the Jewish feast days and new moons, no one is to take the Christian to task for refusing to keep the Sabbath, it being "a shadow of things to come."

11. Thus the Sabbath is a ceremonial law, and Seventh Day Adventists admit that ceremonial laws have been done away.

12. The Sabbath is a type of God's rest in Christ for the believer.

13. After Calvary we never read of the Lord keeping the Sabbath, on the contrary any honour given was to the first day of the week.

14. This honour of the first day seems a fulfilment of the prophecy found in Psalm 118. 22-25. The Christian can rightly say, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it."

15. The first day of the week received a special honour as being the birthday of the Church.

16. In the Book of Acts, the Sabbath, being the one day when an audience of Jews was possible, was utilised by the Apostle Paul, in accordance with the Divine rule, "to the Jew first," for the purpose of preaching the Gospel, as long as they would consent to listen. But there is no evidence whatever that it was ever used as a rest day or as a day of worship by Christians.

17. The only evidence after the resurrection as to a day of worship in the Book of Acts is the instance mentioned in Acts 20. 7; this day was specially convened

for the purpose of breaking bread. This instance is not offset by Acts 2. 46.

18. This day is also associated with an act of spiritual worship in 1 Corinthians 16. 1, 2, namely the giving of the Christian's substance unto God.

19. The first day of the week is called the "Lord's Day" by the Holy Spirit in Revelation 1. 10. Being such, it is worthy of the highest honour possible at the hands of the Lord's servants.

20. This statement is proved to the hilt by the fact that the sub-apostolical Church never on any occasion associated this term "the Lord's Day" with the Sabbath, but invariably with the first day of the week, and also the worship of the Lord's Supper was never associated with the Sabbath but always with the first day of the week. The two days, the Lord's Day and the Sabbath were carefully distinguished.

21. This unanimity in practice and association can only be explained on the understanding that it had its root in apostolical practice.

22. Though the above is so, Christians are not to despise individual Sabbatarians who out of devotion to their Lord observe the Sabbath. Nor should Seventh Day Adventists judge, as they so constantly do, their fellow believers in the Lord Jesus who observe the Lord's Day, the first day of the week.