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INTRODUCTION

What is the Lord's day? A recent answer is that it is the day of our Lord's second coming. But the Apostle John said eighteen centuries ago, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10). Did the Lord come a second time eighteen hundred years ago? Of course not. However, men with a theory to sustain never bother with a matter that flatly contradicts their theory! How do they deal with the passage? They simply have John transported someway through the entire period of time, which they call the "gospel age" or "the church age" to the very day that Christ makes his reappearance; at which time the theory calls for Christ to rebuild the tabernacle of David and begin a thousand years' reign of universal peace. This is strange to our ears. Not only is the transporting of John through time a strange thing, but the instructions he received, after being carried to that future date, is stranger still, especially in the light of the theory itself, which this wild interpretation forces on this passage. Let us examine Revelations 1:10 in the light of both the theory and the interpretation.

After John got there, or rather after he got then—for he was carried in time rather than in space—he was told to write seven letters to seven churches which are represented as having been in Asia Minor during John's lifetime, or earlier than 100 A.D. Let us read: "What thou seest write in a book and send it to the seven churches: unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamum, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea". Now this transporting in time is a strange thing in itself, but for John to have to write those churches a call to repentance from that future date is just too strange to entertain at all! One cannot say that those churches were also carried through time to the Lord's second coming, for some of them were too corrupt to be "in
the Spirit,” and besides the theory won’t have churches subsequent to that event, because that event will terminate the so-called “church age”!

But still “the Lord’s day” must mean the day of the “second advent” in order to save the theory of a future kingdom, especially the “tabernacle or kingdom of David”, for otherwise how can they deal with Revelations 1:9, which says, “I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ”; and also Rev. 3:9, which says, “These things saith he that hath the key of David”, etc.? These passages affirm that John was in the kingdom before 100 A.D., that Christ is the door-keeper, and that the key to the door is “the key of David,” and unless we carry John through time until Jesus comes again how can we save David’s throne for the future? If the kingdom of David is not to be established so John could be in it before the “parousia” then something must be done with the passages which declare that John was in the kingdom eighteen centuries ago, and that the “key” to the door was “the key of David”; ergo, John being “in the Spirit” must have been transported to the date when Jesus will come again, at which time, at the earliest, the kingdom will be set up!

But this does not begin to settle the difficulties that such an interpretation raises. At the time of the “parousia” the theory calls for Jesus to be in Jerusalem using the “keys” there, but the passage under consideration represents him as being with John on the “Isle called Patmos,” over in the Aegean sea! But the theory must be saved in spite of Christ, John, geography, space, time or deity, so a little discrepancy like that should not bother. Could they not transport Patmos (“in the Spirit”, of course) over to Jerusalem, and fix everything just right? Perhaps they will. At any rate that would be transportation in space—the only sort a sane mind can conceive—and is less absurd to try to imagine than transportation in time!

Less fantastic than the above theory, but erroneous
nevertheless, is the view that John was “in the Spirit” on the sabbath day. Sabbatarians often so contend. Believing that the sabbath is the Lord’s day and knowing that the sabbath was the seventh day of the week (Ex. 20:11), they “keep” Saturday after a fashion in an attempt to obey the Mosaic code. Part One of this study entitled, “Is The Sabbath Binding on Christians?” undertakes to show that Christians are under no obligations to keep the sabbath, and it follows that John was not sabbath-keeping on the Lord’s day.

There is another view having considerable support in Protestant bodies in Ireland, Scotland, England and America, though never held by either Protestants or Catholics on the continent of Europe or in other so-called Christian lands, viz., the first day of the week—Sunday—is the Christian sabbath and that this Christian sabbath is the Lord’s day—that somehow “somewhere” God changed the sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week, and hence Sunday, the Lord’s day, should be observed as a sabbath. No scripture is offered—and no more reason—for the position, except they say that “man needs one day’s rest out of seven.” Now God has never required a man to rest one day out of seven except when he specifically commanded what particular day of the seven was to be kept, and that was the seventh day of the week. Men have no authority to select some needed rest day and call it the “Christian sabbath.” Such presumption is neither Christian nor the sabbath. Men sometimes need more than one rest day out of seven, especially under the N.R.A. But these “off days” are not Christian sabbaths—or sabbaths of any kind—not even Roosevelt sabbaths!

But I am reminded here that the word “sabbath” means “rest”, and that any rest day is therefore a sabbath day. The etymology of the word shows that “sabbath” does mean “rest”, but to press that point would make one observe the sabbath every time he took a nap or laid off an hour from his employment! The fundamental error in such reasoning is the con-
fusion of ordinary and technical terms. Sabbath by usage does not mean rest in the ordinary sense of the word at all, but is a holy rest consecrated to God by his appointment. “Tomorrow is a solemn rest; a holy sabbath unto Jehovah” (Ex. 16:23). Suppose sabbath is taken in its etymological sense of rest—any rest—then let us see what we shall see. It is a rule of interpretation that you can substitute the meaning of a word for the word itself and still make out the exact sense, as for example, you can substitute “immerse” for “baptize” in the Bible and have no difficulty at all, but you cannot make sense in many passages by substituting “sprinkling” for “baptism”. Let us try this rule of interpretation on the word “sabbath” and assume that the word means simply “rest”. Then we shall substitute rest for sabbath in the following passage: “There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God” (Heb. 4:9). Now substituting “rest” for “sabbath” we read: there remaineth therefore a rest rest for the people of God! How absurd!

One should never use technical words in the ordinary sense. Confusion will always result. Often the ordinary meaning is at opposite poles from the special or technical meaning. To illustrate, take the word “general.” In its ordinary connotation it means the ordinary as opposed to the unusual, the majority, or customary, but its special or technical meaning in the military field is the particular, the extraordinary, and is applied without qualification only to the highest military officer in the army. To show that the word “sabbath” means “rest” means nothing unless one can show where God commanded men to rest on the first day of the week and to do it as unto him—in other words, a “solemn rest.” Of course this can’t be done, and there is therefore no “Christian sabbath.”

This study is a attempt to show that Christians are under obligations to observe the first day of the week, Sunday, as the Lord’s day—a day of worship instead of a day of rest as such, and that on this day the Lord’s supper shall be eaten. True it is, that the service or-
dained for the Lord's day may sometimes require some or all cessation from secular employment on Sunday in order for the Christian to observe the worship in the Lord's honor and memory. It is likewise true that the service may require a greater expenditure of effort than would the same number of hours in secular toil. To call such a sabbath is to misname it, from any standpoint.

While there is nothing in the New Testament which forbids one's following his secular occupation on the Lord's day, except where one's working on Sunday may offend a weak brother, or in cases prohibited by civil statute—one must not offend either a weak conscience or Caesar (Rom. 13, 14)—yet nothing must be allowed to come between the Christian and the worship ordained of God for the Lord's day. We must learn to put first things first (Matt. 6:33). A Christian cannot afford therefore to think of spending the Lord's day in frivolity or money-making and then go to church at night, eat the Lord's supper with those who cannot attend at any other hour, and "kid" himself into thinking that he has worshipped God—not because one part of the Lord's day is more sacred than another part—for it is not—but because he puts first things last, not in point of time only but in interest and importance as well.

That this study, which has benefitted me greatly, may possibly assist others in some small way, it is sent forth with the prayer that all of us may have a clearer view and deeper appreciation of "the Lord's day", and that "some sweet day after awhile", we shall inherit the glories that John saw "in the Spirit on the Isle called Patmos on the Lord's day".
Is the Sabbath Day Binding On Christians?

Should Christians observe a sabbath in any sense whatsoever, and do the Scriptures so require? Sabbatarians answer "Yes," I answer "No." The issue is joined. "To the law and the testimony" for the final answer. What saith the Scriptures?

1. First—There is no "Christian Sabbath." Neither the term nor the thought is in the Bible. Let him who thinks so produce the passage which even seems so to teach. I repeat that it is not in the Bible.

2. Second—The sabbath of the Decalogue was a Hebrew institution and was never commanded of any Gentile whether saint or sinner, and the reason assigned by Jehovah for giving the sabbath to the Hebrews precluded its being given to any others. "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day" (Deut. 5:15). For a Gentile to observe the sabbath of the Decalogue would be as anomalous as for a white American to celebrate Emancipation day—which in Texas is June 19th—Sabbatarians among the white Gentiles have the same obligation to observe "Juneteenth" as they have to observe the Hebrew sabbath.

3. Third—Even the Hebrew sabbath was to cease. "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts" (Hosea 2:11). This does not say that part of her feasts, part of her new moons or part of her sabbaths should cease; nor does it say that some of her
feasts, some of her new moons, or some of her sabbaths should cease, but that her feast days, new moons, sabbaths and solemn feasts should cease. Has God fulfilled his promise? and, if so, when? “Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way nailing it to his cross * * * * Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon or of the sabbath days” (Col. 2:14-16). This should settle the matter.

But in case this is not conclusive, note the following: Israel broke the old covenant. They despised it; therefore God determined to make a new covenant. “Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt: which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them” (Jer. 31:31, 32).

To the wicked covenant-breakers Amos brought God’s message, “Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell grain? and the sabbath that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small? ... Jehovah hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein? Yea, it shall rise up wholly like the River; and it shall be troubled and sink again, like the River of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord Jehovah, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day” (Amos 8:4-9).

Here it is asserted that the new moon and the sabbath would be gone when the sun should go down at noon and when the earth became darkened in the clear day. Then would be fulfilled the prophecy of
Hosea, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts" (Hosea 2:11). When did the sun go down at noon, and when was the earth darkened, in the clear day? "Now from the sixth hour (twelve o'clock) there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour (Matt. 27:45); "And it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun’s light failing: and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst" (Luke 23: 44, 45). This occurred at the crucifixion of Christ, hence the old covenant was then removed, the solemn Jewish feasts were abrogated, their new moons were gone and the sabbaths had ceased, “nailed to the cross . . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect to a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day” (Col. 2:14-16).

4. Fourth—The Jewish sabbath was never intended to be universal, temporally, else it would have been made known to Adam, Abel, Noah, Abraham and other patriarchs, and would not have been first revealed twenty-five hundred years after Adam; nor was it intended to be universal geographically, else it would have been suitable to all peoples in all climates. That neither of these conditions obtained I call attention to the following observations:

i. D. M. Canright, himself a converted Sabbatarian, (Tract Number 5, page 1) says:

"If Adam, or the Patriarchs before Moses, kept the sabbath, it is not so stated in the Bible. Whether a sabbath had been kept or not, it is evident that a new day was given to the Jews at the exodus. The sabbath is first mentioned in Ex. 16:23, over twenty-five hundred years after creation. God then made known the sabbath, and gave it to the Jews only. Proof: ‘Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, * * * * and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath’ (Neh. 9:13, 14). ‘I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and
The sabbath, then, was given to the Jews only. Hence it is properly called the Jewish sabbath. It was a sign between God and Israel. Hence it could not have been for others. Their deliverance from Egypt was commemorated by the sabbath. Proof: ‘Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, * * * * therefore, the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the sabbath’ (Deut. 5:15).

ii. E. C. Fuqua, in “The Sabbath Law Abrogated,” pages 1-5, says:

**God’s Rest Day was Given Solely to Israelites.**

“The seventh-day sabbath was created purely by God’s resting on that day. It was, therefore God’s rest day. (Gen. 2:2, 3). It was His alone for 2500 years, or until He gave it to fleshly Israel through Moses: ‘Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them’ (Ezek. 20:12). ‘Thou madest known unto them thy holy sabbath’ (Neh. 9:14). ‘Ye shall keep my sabbaths’ (Ex. 31:13). God says He made known the sabbath to the Israelites, which was done through Moses after their baptism in the Red Sea (Ex. 16:23). To teach that the sabbath was known before that date is to contradict God. It was first revealed on that date and to that people: God gave it to them and to them alone. No others could keep it: ‘See, for that Jehovah hath given you the sabbath’ (Ex. 16:29). ‘Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, verily, ye shall keep my sabbaths’ (Ex. 31:13). ‘Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever.’ This word ‘forever’ completely limits the sabbath law to the descendants of Jacob: it was theirs ‘forever’: no other people could ever possess it. Thus circumcision was pronounced an ‘everlasting covenant’ in the flesh of Abraham (Gen. 17:13). Both circumcision and the sabbath were given, and limited to the flesh of Abraham, and when the fleshly distinction between Jew and
Gentile was abolished in the death of Christ (Eph. 2:11-19; Col. 3:11), these two covenants (circumcision and the sabbath) passed away. In the stead of the former we now have the 'circumcision not made with hands' (Col. 2:11, 12); in the stead of the latter we have not a recurring, twenty-four-hour sabbath, but an eternal sabbath rest awaiting us in heaven (Heb. 4:9). Temporal ordinances and covenants passed away with the flesh of Abraham in which they operated. The sabbath was a temporal rest, for its rest is broken fifty-two times a year—proving it was only a type of eternal 'sabbath rest.' The Jew labored through the week for his rest day; the Christian labors through life for his sabbath rest. Repetition marked the Jew's service; but to the Christian there is one period of incessant activity to be terminated by an unbroken rest, in heaven. The Christian has and can have no other sabbath.

"If it be objected, that because the sabbath covenant was to be kept by the Jews 'throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant' (Ex. 31:16), it could not pass away so long as there are Jews on earth; I reply, precisely the same thing is said of the Passover, the burning of incense, and other Jewish ordinances. Of the Passover it is said: 'Ye shall keep it a feast to Jehovah: throughout your generations ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever' (Ex. 12:14). Of the offering of incense we read: Aaron 'shall burn it, a perpetual incense before Jehovah throughout your generations' (Ex. 30:8). The same is said of the burnt-offering (Ex. 29:42); of the feast of first-fruits (Lev. 23:14); of various other 'ceremonial' exactions; which proves that the sabbath was an ordinance just like these."

The Significant Introduction to the Decalogue
The introduction to the Ten Commandments—the preface designating the subjects to whom the Decalogue was issued—itself was written with the finger of God upon the tables of stone and embodied in the
Ten Commandments. It reads: “I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” etc. (Ex. 20:2, 3). The pronouns “thou,” “thee” and “thy”, employed throughout the Ten Commandments, limit the Ten Commandments to the identical people named in the introduction. This people, says the introduction, were those that had been in Egyptian bondage and had been delivered therefrom. The Decalogue, therefore, was given to fleshly Israel, the emancipated offspring of Jacob. To these only God gave it. If others “keep” it, they illegally appropriate to themselves the property of another.

That the words of this introduction were spoken and written by God in the day of the Decalogue itself is affirmed by Moses. Beginning with verse one (Ex. 20) we read: “And God spake all these words, saying,” * * * then follow the words of the introduction and the Ten Commandments. It is thus shown that God spoke the words of the introduction as a part of the decalogue. Now that these words were written on the tables of stone is as sure: “And Jehovah delivered unto me,” says Moses, “the two tables of stone written with the finger of God; and on them was written according to all the words, which Jehovah spoke with you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly” (Deut. 9:10). This forever settles that point. To print or exhibit this document without the introduction (as Sabbatarians always do), and call it “The Ten Commandments,” is to deceive. Wherever the Ten Commandments go, God intended this introduction to go with it, to show to whom the commandments were issued. That would prevent the effort commonly made to make the Ten Commandments apply to Christians. God has never so applied them. Indeed, to publish the Ten Commandments without the introduction is analogous to publishing the Constitution without the preamble or the publishing of a statute without the “enacting clause.”
"The Title is Confirmed Alone in Fleshly Israel"

"For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all" (James 2:10). The title of the Decalogue is both affirmed and confirmed in the introduction written upon the same tables with the Ten Commandments. In the face of this title written by God, to apply the Ten Commandments to any other nation is to reject God's title and re-write it in favor of another people, thus changing the law; for it is a matter of law that the emancipated Israelites alone should possess the Decalogue as there written. It could never become a law to any other people, until the title could be revised and re-written to include other nations. But that would necessitate the destruction of one of the two tables (the first table on which the title was engraved) and this would require the re-writing of that entire table. But this was never done. When Christ died the Ten Commandments bore the original title—were still the law to fleshly Israel exclusively. Whoever, therefore, applies the Ten Commandments to any other people, changes what was the law of God. Before any part of the Decalogue could be binding upon Gentiles, the whole thing would have to be abrogated, then a re-writing of the document in such a form as would be good for Gentiles to keep, leaving off such portions as were not good for them. Such precisely has been done in the New Testament."—Fuqua.

The Sabbath First Given to Man Through Moses

In a nervous effort to prove that the sabbath law was made binding upon all mankind Sabbatarians assert that it was observed by all righteous men from creation until Moses. But speaking directly of the Ten Commandments Moses said: "Jehovah our God made a covenant with us in Horeb (Sinai). Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day" (Deut. 5:2, 3). Then he quotes the entire Decalogue,
with its sabbath enactment. The sabbath, therefore, was not known until Moses. God indeed had rested after creation, but no man knew of it until Moses revealed it.

On the matter of the suitability of the Sabbath to the entire world the following observations are in order:

I quote from "Adventism Refuted in a Nutshell" by D. M. Canright,

"The requirements concerning the sabbath show that it was not meant for all the world:

1. It must be kept from sunset to sunset (Lev. 23:32). But in the extreme north, there are months together when the sun is not seen. It is all night.

2. No fire must be built on the sabbath (Ex. 35:3). Sabbatarians break this law every 'sabbath.' They would freeze to death in winter if they did not.

3. They must neither bake nor boil on the sabbath (Ex. 16:23). Sabbatarians do both, so break the sabbath.

4. Sabbath breakers must be stoned (Ex. 31:15). They cannot do this now. This shows that the sabbath was not designed for all the world.

"The sabbath, with all Jewish holy days, was to be abolished. 'I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths' (Hosea 2:11). Plain enough. Paul says the sabbath, with all these days, was abolished at the cross (Col. 2:14). 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days' (Col. 2:16). Plain enough, if men care to see. Paul warned the Galatians against keeping any of the holy days of the old law. 'Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you * * * * * Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law', etc. (Gal. 4:10, 11, 21). This includes the sabbath, with all Jewish holy seasons of the law. Again: 'One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully
persuaded in his own mind' (Rom. 14:5). 'Every
day' must include the sabbath. No Sabbatarian would
use language like this. Plainly Paul's idea was that
the sabbath was abolished.

"That Col. 2:16 includes the weekly sabbaths is
proved by these facts:
1. Time and time again in the Old Testament the
weekly sabbath is associated with new moons, feast
days, meats, etc., just as Paul here gives it. See Lev.
23; Num. 28; 1 Chron. 23:30, 31; 2 Chron. 2:4; 8:13;
31:3; Neh. 10:33; Ezek. 45:17; 46:1-11; Hosea 2:11,
and Col. 2:16.
2. If Paul had meant to name the weekly sabbaths,
he must have used just the words he did, 'sabbath
days', for that is the only term that is ever used for
the weekly sabbaths. See the following, where exact­
ly the same terms means the weekly sabbath: (Ex.
31:13). 'My sabbaths' (Lev. 19:8; 23:38). 'The sab­
baths of the Lord' (Isa. 56:4; Ezekiel 20:12, 13; Luke
4:31); 'The sabbath days' (Luke 6:9; Acts 17:2 and
Col. 2:16).
3. In the Greek precisely the same word and form
of the word, 'sabbaton', is repeatedly applied to the
weekly sabbath. See Matt. 28:1; Luke 4:16, etc.
4. The word sabbath occurs sixty times in the New
Testament. In fifty-nine times out of the sixty, it is
freely admitted by all the Sabbatarians that the week­
ly sabbath is meant; but in the sixtieth case, where
exactly the same word is used both in Greek and Eng­
ish, they say it must mean some other day.
5. 'Feast days and new moons' include all the
other holy days of the Jews; hence, 'the sabbath day'
must mean the weekly sabbaths.
6. In the original Greek, the word 'sabbaton' here
as used by Paul is never applied to the annual sab­
baths, except to just one, Lev. 23:32, which would not
be 'sabbath days', plural.
"The sabbath was a shadow or type of Christ. 'Let
no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ' (Col. 2:16, 17). Then it must have ended at the cross (See also Heb. 4:1-9).

“We do not have to keep the seventh day under the gospel, because we are under a ‘new covenant’ (Heb. 8:6-13), ‘a new and living way’ (Heb. 10:20), and ‘are not under the law’ (Rom. 6:14). Nothing is binding on us Gentile Christians merely because it was once commanded in the Old Testament. There God commanded them to offer sacrifices circumcise their sons, keep the Passover, the new moons * * *, etc. We do none of these now. Why not? Because not required in the New Testament. So the sabbath’s being commanded in the Old Testament is no proof that we must keep it under the New. Turning to the New Testament, we find no command to keep the seventh day. Jesus never said, Keep it. Paul never said so, nor did James or John or any apostle. There is no blessing promised for observing it, no penalty for breaking it. There is a total silence as to any requirement concerning it for Christians. The duty enjoined in each of the other ten commandments is plainly commanded in the New Testament. Thus: the first commandment, Acts 14:15; second, 1 John 5:21; third, James 5:12; fifth, Eph. 6:1; sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth, Rom. 13:9. But where is the seventh day enjoined? Nowhere in the gospel. The omission cannot be accidental, but designed. Why is this, if the old sabbath is still binding?

“Jesus kept the Passover, Pentecost, new moons, and all Jewish days as well as the sabbath, so no argument can be drawn from his observing it. Jesus said that man was superior to the sabbath and that he was Lord of it (Mark 2:27, 28). After the resurrection, there is not recorded a single meeting of Christians on the seventh day, except as they met with Jews in Jewish worship. Here are all the cases where the sabbath is men-
tioned: Acts 13:14, 27, 42-45; 15:21; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4; Col. 2:16. When Christians met by themselves, it was not on the sabbath, but on the first day of the week (Acts 20:7). Every time Paul went to meeting on the sabbath, it was to preach to the Jews. So he circumcised Timothy on account of the Jews (Acts 16:3). Those who still held to the sabbath were to be treated as weak brethren (Rom. 14:1-5).

"The law, of which the sabbath was a part, was fulfilled at the cross. Thus the keeping of the law was decided to be 'a yoke upon the necks of the disciples' (Acts 15:10); 'Ye are not under the law' (Rom. 6:14); 'Ye are also become dead to the law' (Rom. 7:4); 'We are delivered from the law' (verse 6); 'Christ is the end of the law' (Rom. 10:4); 'The ministry of death written and engraven on stones * * * * * is done away' (2 Cor. 3:7-11); 'The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. * * * We are no longer under a schoolmaster' (Gal. 3:24, 25); the law was nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14-16); 'there is made of necessity a change also of the law' (Heb. 7:12); 'The law made nothing perfect' (verse 19); 'The law was a shadow of the good things to come' (Heb. 10:1). So the law does not bind the seventh day upon us.

"All the apostles and first converts to Christianity were Jews, raised to keep the sabbath, and, hence, naturally would have favored its continuance. Yet the great fact stands out clear that the Christian church from the very beginning has not observed the seventh day, but has kept the first day. This stupendous fact can only be accounted for upon the supposition that this change was made by divine authority"—Canright.

Likewise, I call attention to these remarks in the "Sabbath or Lord's Day, Which?" by D. R. Dungan, who says,

"The penalty for violating the law of the sabbath was death (Ex. 31:14, 15): 'Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off
from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.'

"Numbers 15:32-36): 'And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks on the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses: The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses.'

"No one claims that such a law could be observed in our climate, say nothing of the Laplands, or the great area of northern countries. Hence, we are compelled to say that the people could not keep the law as it was given, or that its rigor has since then been abated, and that, too, by the same authority that gave it being.

"Has the law been abated in its rigor, and yet left standing? Here the Bible has been silent. It is commonly said that the law of the sabbath now stands, but the penalty has been changed or taken away. But of all this, the Bible knows no more than it does of pilgrimages to Mecca. Jesus taught that not one jot or tittle of the law should in any wise pass till all should be fulfilled. Hence, the only way for these penalties to disappear can be found in the removal of the law as a whole. The penalties stand or fall with the law itself."

**Some Necessary Conclusions.**

From all this, it is just as evident as it can be, that the law was given to the Israelites and to them alone. They were in a land where it might be observed. And they were expected to remain there. So far we are warranted in saying:
1. There is no account of the law having been given to any other people than the descendants of Jacob.
2. It is plainly stated that it was not even given to their fathers. Hence, that it was given alone to those who came out of Egypt, and to their children forever throughout their generations.
3. No Gentiles could be held responsible for a law that was never given to them. This accounts for the fact that they were never reproved for having disobeyed the law of the sabbath.
4. The penalties of the law could only be removed by the authority which enacted them. God gave them, and he alone could remove them. Hence, as long as the law remained, even picking up sticks on the sabbath must be punished with death. It is left for us to see in the further discussion of the subject, how the penalties of that law were removed by the law being taken out of the way and nailed to the cross of Christ.
5. Fifth: The Ten Commandments of which the sabbath law was a part has been done away or abolished.

Covenant Including the Sabbath Abolished

1. The Ten Commandments Were Called the Covenant (Ex. 34:28)
   “And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights: he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.”

2. His Covenant, the Ten Commandments (Deut. 4:13)
   “And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.”

3. Tables of Covenant—Two Tables of Stone (Deut. 9:9-11)
   “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, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights, I neither did eat bread, nor drink water; and the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone written with the finger of God; and on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spake with you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly. And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights, that the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant.”

4. Given Not to Fathers
(Deut. 5:1-14)

“And Moses called all Israel and said unto them, Hear O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, and do them. The Lord God made this covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day * * * * I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods before me * * * * Keep the sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord hath commanded thee * * * * but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.”

5. Made This Covenant When Brought Out of Egypt
(1 Kings 8:9-21)

“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. * * * * And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.”

6. New Covenant Promised
(Jer. 31:31-34)

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and
with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God and they shall be my people."

7. New Covenant Has Been Made
(Heb. 8:6-13)

"But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt: because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord * * * In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old."
The Old Covenant with its sabbath was done away. The New Covenant without a sabbath has been made and confirmed, hence we have no sabbath to keep.

Covenant of Promise Versus Covenant of the Law

The old covenant was preparatory to the coming of Christ. God had made a covenant of promise to Abraham saying that in Abraham and in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blest. Later God made the Ten Commandment covenant—the law—with Israel, because of transgressions, but this law—covenant—could not interfere with, circumvent, or disannul the promise made to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before, and confirmed by Jehovah with an oath.
Paul argues in Galatians the 3rd chapter, verses 13 to 25, that Christ came and fulfilled the law, redeemed us from it, gave us life, and fulfilled the promise God made to Abraham. Hear the Apostle: “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

“And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, Verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under the schoolmaster.”
"Moral" and "Ceremonial" Laws

In order to escape the force of these passages Sabbatarianists undertake to make a distinction between Moral and Ceremonial Laws, claiming that only the ceremonial parts of the old covenant have been annulled, which they describe as the law of Moses.

Sabbatarianists claim that the Ten Commandments are the "Moral law" and are therefore the "law of the Lord" whereas other parts of the Pentateuch are the "ceremonial law" and are only the "law of Moses," and that further, the "Moral Law"—"The law of the Lord"—has never been done away while only the "ceremonial law"—the "law of Moses"—has been abrogated. Where is the passage which refers to the Ten Commandments as the moral law? Echo answers, Where? Besides the Bible refers to the so-called "ceremonial law" as the "law of the Lord," as in the case of Jesus and his mother. "And when the days of their purification according to the law of Moses were fulfilled they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord), and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle doves or two young pigeons" (Luke 2:22-24) referring to Exodus 13:2, 12 and to Leviticus 12:8, 11, neither of which passages has the slightest references to the Ten Commandments. Was not God the Lord? "And they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly" (Neh. 8:8). This whole book is referred to as the "law of God." Second Kings 14:6 refers to Deuteronomy 24:16 as being in the "Book of the law of Moses." Second Chronicles 35:12 refers to Leviticus 3:3 as being in the "Book of the law of Moses." Ezra 6:18 refers to Numbers 3:6 as being in the "Book of Moses." Mark 12:26 refers to Exodus 3:6 as being in the "Book of Moses." First Corinthians 14:34 refers to Genesis 3:16 as being in the "law." Hence Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are referred to by inspira-
tion as the law of Moses or the "Book of the law of Moses." Not one thing is known of the Ten Commandments except what is included in the law of Moses. If the law of Moses has been "done away or abolished" then the Ten Commandments have been done away, as they are included in the law of Moses.

That the law of Moses included the Ten Commandments may further be proved from the following passages. "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me?" (John 7:19). "Thou shalt not kill" is the sixth commandment. "For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and whoso curseth father or mother let him die the death" (Mark 7:10). This is the fifth of the Ten Commandments. As a matter of fact the "law of Moses" was the "law of the Lord" to fleshly Israel—simply two terms for the same thing. God was the Author and he only used Moses to make it known, as Nehemiah said. "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandest them, commandments, and statutes, and a law, by Moses thy servant" (Neh. 9:13, 14).

The only writing that we have any knowledge of God's ever doing was on Mount Sinai. Moses went up with Joshua as his servant and staid forty days and nights. While there God wrote the Ten Commandments on two tables of stone with his "finger" (Ex. 31:18). When Moses came down he found the people worshipping a golden calf that Aaron had made. In his anger he threw down the stone tablets and broke them. After Israel had been punished, God called Moses up into the Mount again and told him to bring two hewn tablets with him and that he would write upon these tablets "the words that were on the first tablets, which thou breakest" (Ex. 34:1). He did so, but used Moses as his amanuensis, instead of writing them this time with his finger. "And Jehovah said
unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the
tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee
and with Israel. And he was there with Jehovah forty
days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor
drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words
of the covenant, the ten commandments” (Ex. 34:27,
28).

Moses was as much the writer of the Ten Command-
ments as they have come down to us as he is the writer
of the rest of the Pentateuch, since he wrote both,
hen it proper to speak of the Pentateuch, both in
part and in whole as the “Law of Moses.” God is as
much the Author of the rest of the Pentateuch as he
is of the Ten Commandments, since he used Moses
to write all of it—even the Ten Commandments on the
second set of tablets! No wonder Luke uses the terms
“Law of Moses” and “Law of the Lord” interchange-
ably (Luke 2:22, 23). When one argues that the
“Law of Moses” has been abrogated, he logically ad-
mits that the “Law of the Lord” has been abrogated.
When he argues that the Ten Commandments as the
“Law of the Lord” is binding he, at the same time,
argues that the rest of the “Law of Moses” also de-
scribed as the “Law of the Lord”—is binding. God
makes no such distinctions and men must not. All
parts of the law stand or fall together. This is logi-
cally admitted further by sabbatarians who refuse
to eat pork!

Let no one suppose, however, that because the law
has been done away that there is no value in the
Pentateuch. It is valuable as history. When a na-
tion’s law is changed, or abrogated, this does not do
away with the nation’s history! People who admit
that the “Law of Moses”—exclusive of the Ten Com-
mandments—has been done away ought to be able to
understand this, and one must stretch his credulity to
believe that they do not understand it.
Moses' Shining Face

I call the reader's attention now to an argument on Moses' Shining Face and The Covenants, which shows that the writing in stone which was abolished was the Ten Commandments.

"And it came to pass, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tablets of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the Mount, that Moses knew not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him. And when Aaron and all children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh. And Moses called unto them; and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him and Moses talked with them. And afterward all the children of Israel came nigh; and he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in Mount Sinai. And till Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face. But when Moses went before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out. And he came out and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded. And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone; and Moses put the veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with him" (Ex. 34:29-35).

What became of this covenant, these ten commandments, which were written and engraven in stones and delivered to Israel when Moses' face shone so he had to put a veil before his face while he spoke to the children of Israel? Read Paul's answer to this matter as follows: "For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone but in fleshly tables of the heart. And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward; who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life. But if the
ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech, and not as Moses which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away” (2 Cor. 3:2-16).

Jesus Fulfilled all the Law

In Matthew 5:17-18 Jesus said that not one jot or tittle should pass from the law till all should be fulfilled and that he came to fulfill it. This implies that Jesus would fulfill it, and hence it would pass away. The foregoing scriptures show that he did fulfill it, and that he did take it away. “He taketh away the first that he might establish the second” (Heb. 8:13; 10:9).

In Isaiah 42:21 the Lord promised to magnify and make honorable the law. Until Jesus kept it it had never been kept perfectly. He proved it could be kept, and that it was holy, just and good. He kept it in all its parts. The only seeming infraction was his plucking corn on the sabbath day, on the occasion of his teaching that human needs were superior to sabbath days, shewbread, or any other Mosaic enactments (Mt. 12:1-8).
SHALL CHRISTIANS BE IN BONDAGE OR SHALL THEY BE FREE IN CHRIST?

Galatians 4:19-31: “My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ is formed in you. I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you. Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.”

Those who undertake to keep the law which includes the Hebrew sabbath, undertake a yoke which the Jews themselves were unable to bear and which was specifically not bound on Gentile Christians (Acts 15:5-29).

Fallen From Grace

“For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John 7:17). The Jew lived in and through the law, but the Christian by and through grace (Eph. 2:5, 8-10). To return to Moses is to make Christ of no effect to us and to fall away from grace. “Ye are not under law but under grace” (Rom.
6:14). Again, “Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace” (Gal. 5:4). Certainly nothing is binding on Christians, that causes them to fall from grace!

**Freed from the Law**

“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should become married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead” (Rom. 7:4). Verse 7 shows this law to be the ten commandments.

**CONTRAST OF THE OLD AND NEW COVENANTS**

**The Old**

1. Priests and Levites were ministers of the old covenant (Heb. 9:1-10).
2. The letter (2 Cor. 3:6).
3. Ministration of death (2 Cor. 3:7).
4. Ministration of condemnation (2 Cor. 3:9).
5. Written and engraven in stones (2 Cor. 3:7).
6. Glorious, done away (2 Cor. 3:11).
7. Veil upon their heart (2 Cor. 3:14).
8. The Old Testament or Covenant (2 Cor. 3:14).
9. Spoken from Mount Sinai (Gal. 4:24).
10. Bondage (Gal. 4:25).

11. Spoken to the Jewish fathers by the prophets (Heb. 1:1; 8:8, 9).
12. Changeable priesthood (Heb. 7:12).
13. Imperfect priesthood (Heb. 7:12).
14. Priesthood had Decalogue (Heb. 7:12).
15. Priests without an oath during the law (Heb. 7:21).

**The New**

1. Christians are able ministers of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:6).
2. The Spirit (2 Cor. 3:6).
3. Ministration of the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:7).
4. Ministration of Righteousness (2 Cor. 3:9).
5. Written in the heart (2 Cor. 3:11).
6. More glorious, remaineth (2 Cor. 3:11).
7. Veil done away in Christ (2 Cor. 3:14).
8. The New Testament or Covenant (2 Cor. 3:6).
9. The other from Mt. Zion (Isa. 2:3; Micah 4:2).
10. Freedom (Gal. 4:26; 5:1).

11. Spoken unto us by the Son (Heb. 1:1; Matt. 17:5).
12. Unchangeable priesthood (Heb. 7:24).
13. Perfect priest (Heb. 7:26).
14. The law changed (Heb. 7:12).
15. Christ a priest by an oath since the law (Heb. 7:28).
16. The very substance (Heb. 10:1).
18. No more remembrance of sins (Heb. 10:16, 17).
20. True tabernacle made by the Lord (Heb. 9:11; Matt. 16:18).
21. For every creature (Mk. 16:15, 16; Eph. 2:11-18).
22. The law of the spirit of life (Romans 8:2).
23. Has a Lord's day (Rev. 1:10).
24. The first day of the week (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2).
25. That he might establish the second (Heb. 10:9).

Therefore the sabbath has been taken away, and is not bound on Christians. Rather those who would be justified by the law in keeping the sabbath are fallen from grace (Gal 5:4), and the injunction of the apostle Paul is still in order: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy or vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect to a holy day or of the new moon, or the sabbath days which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2:14, 16, 17).

Conclusion

Therefore, there being
1. No Christian sabbath;
2. The Jewish sabbath never having been enjoined on the Gentiles; and
3. The Jewish sabbath having been abrogated, it follows that no Christian, whether Jew or Gentile, is under any obligation to keep any sabbath.

Part II

THE LORD'S DAY

Chapter I

Text: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10).

Proposition: The Lord's day is the first day of the week and Christians should observe it as a day of worship to God in which service the Lord's Supper should be eaten.

Proof—

1. The Lord's day may properly be said to be the day of the Lord, as we say that John's book is the book of John. But the term "day of the Lord" is used in, at least, two senses in the New Testament; as for instance, "The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night" (1 Thess. 5:2), where the judgment day is clearly meant; and then there is the "day" especially set apart for divine worship, as in Acts 2:20, "the great and notable day of the Lord". This was prophesied by Joel in Joel 2:28, 29. Peter said that this was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:16). Pentecost always came on the "morrow after the sabbath" (the seventh day), hence, "the first day of the week", or as some were wont to say, the "eighth day". This is evident from Leviticus 23:15, 16. Thus the "day of the Lord" fell on the first day of the week, the birthday of the church of the Lord. Read Acts 2nd chapter. The first day of the next week would again be the day
of the Lord but less "notable" than the Pentecost day, which was "the beginning" (Acts 11:15). On "the great and notable day of the Lord" the first members of Christ's church were added, and on that day they began a practice steadfastly adhered to through the apostolic period of "continuing in the apostles' teaching, the fellowship, the breaking of bread and in prayers" (Acts 2:41, 42).

If it be insisted by Sabbatarians that the Lord's day is the sabbath on the grounds that Jehovah referred to the sabbath as "My holy day" in Isaiah 58:13, it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that in the new dispensation Christ is uniformly meant when term "Lord" is used (See Acts 2:36). Besides, if John had meant to suggest that the day of his "revelations" (Rev. 1:10) was on the sabbath it would not have been necessary to have used a term employed only in a secular sense before the Christian dispensation when the good religious word sabbath was already at hand. The word he used was the adjective form of "Lord" never before employed with the word in a spiritual connotation. Just as Paul used this new form of the word "Lord" in connection with the Lord's supper (1 Cor. 11:20), a purely Christian feast, in contrast with feasts of the law and common repasts; so John employed it for the Lord's day, that is, a day different from the "days" of the law, which had been "nailed to the cross" and taken away.

2. The Lordian Day.

A. M. Weston, sometimes president of Eureka College remarks in The Evolution of a Shadow: "What, then, are the ideas or forms that bring nearest of all to the object of the day—that is, to the commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord. First, the day itself does it, when separated from others, with that thought in view. Therefore, any exercises which contribute to the same end, belong most appropriately to that day. But the Lordian Supper approaches the specific object even more closely ** * * Nothing else
connected with Christian worship so embodies in its forms the idea of the resurrection as this. No wonder, then, that the disciples, converted and instructed under the oversight of the apostles, came together to the Lordian Supper, on the Lordian day, as at Troas ** You may call it by its secular name, Sunday; by its number, 'the first day of the week', or by its proper religious title, the 'Lordian day'; but never, unless you would misrepresent it, call it the Sabbath ** All hail, glad Lordian day! Morn of the blest! Noon of the happy heart! Eve of the tranquil soul! Let every hour be given to thoughts, words and deeds, such as the Master's short, eventful life exemplified, and the Master's welcome plaudit shall approve” (Quoted from Brandt's The Lord's Supper.)

Why Brother Weston used the adjective "Lordian" for the translated possessive "Lord's" will be apparent from the following quotation from The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Art. Lord's Day —Formerly it was supposed that the adjective, Kuri-akos, (Translated "The Lord's") was a purely Christian word, but recent discoveries have proved that it was a fairly common use in the Roman Empire before Christian influence had been felt. In secular use it signified "imperial," "belonging to the Lord"—the emperor—and so its adoption by Christianity in the sense "belonging to the Lord"—to Christ—was perfectly easy. Indeed there is reason to suppose that in the days of Domitian, when the issue had been clearly defined as "Who is Lord? Caesar or Christ?" the use of the adjective by the church was a part of the protest against Caesar-worship ** And it is even possible that the full phrase, "The Lord's day" was coined as a contrast to the phrase, "The Augustean day," ** a term that seems to have been used in certain parts of the Empire to denote days especially dedicated in honor of Caesar-worship. "Lord's day" in the New Testament occurs only in Rev. 1:10, but in the post-apostolic literature we have the follow-
ing references: Ignatius, Ad Mag. "No longer keeping the Sabbath but living according to the Lord's day, 35, "The Lord's day began to dawn" (cf. Matt. 28:1), verse 50, "Early on the Lord's day (cf. Luke 24:1); Barn. 15:9, "We keep the eighth day with gladness on which Jesus arose from the dead." I. e. Sunday, as the day of Christ's resurrection, was kept as a Christian feast and called "the Lord's day," a title fixed so definitely as to be introduced by the author of Ev. Pet. into phrases from the Canonical gospels. Its appropriateness in Rev. 1:10 is obvious, as St. John received his vision of the exalted Lord when all Christians had their minds directed toward His entrance into glory through the resurrection. This "first day of the week" appears again in Acts 20:7 as the day on which the worship of the "breaking of bread" took place, and the impression given by the context is that St. Paul and his companions prolonged their visit to Troas so as to join in the service. Again, 1 Cor. 16:2 contains the command "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store", where the force of the form of the imperative used (the present for repeated action) would be better represented in English by "lay by on successive Sundays," etc.

Young's Analytical Concordance: "The Lord's"—"Belonging to the Lord, Kuriakos." He gives only two instances of the use of this word in the N. T., i. e., 1 Cor. 11:20, and Rev. 1:10.

It is more than accidental that the adjective form Kuriakos is only used twice in the New Testament, once for the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11:20 and once for the Lord's Day in Rev. 1:10 and that the only mention of the Lord's Supper by name and the Lord's day by name is in these two passages. People who reverence the word of the Lord will not try to separate them.

God has joined them together; let no man presume to part them asunder. They are peculiarly the Lord's, and the Supper is observed on the Day.

3. The "Lord's day" is invariably referred to the
first day of the week by the Christian writers in the centuries immediately succeeding the Apostle John's times.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, Art. "Sunday"—Sunday or the Lord's day, in the Christian world, the first day of the week, celebrated in memory of the resurrection of Christ, as the principal day of Christian worship. An additional reason for the sanctity of the day may have been found in its association with Pentecost or Whitsun. There is no evidence that in the earliest years of Christianity there was any formal observance of Sunday as a day of rest or any general cessation of work. But it seems to have from the first been set apart for worship. Thus, according to Acts 20:7, the disciples in Troas meet weekly on the first day of the week for exhortation and the breaking of bread; 1 Cor. 16:2 implies at least some observance of the day; and the solemn commemorative character it had very early acquired is strikingly indicated by an incidental expression of the writer of the Apocalypse (1:10), who for the time gives it that name ("The Lord's Day") by which it is almost invariably called by all writers of the century immediately succeeding apostolic times. Indications of the manner of its observance during this period are not wanting. Teaching of the Apostles (C. 14) contains the precept: "And on the Lord's day of the Lord come together and break bread and give thanks after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure". Ignatius (Ad Magn. C. 9) speaks of those whom he addresses as "No longer Sabbatizing, but living in the observance of the Lord's day on which also our life sprang up again". Eusebius (H. E. iv. 23) has preserved a letter of Dionysius of Corinth (A.D. 175) to Soter, bishop of Rome, in which he says: "Today we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we read your epistle"; and the same historian (H.E. 4. 26) mentions Melito of Sardis (A. D. 170) had written a treatise on the Lord's day. Pliny's letter to Trajan in which he speaks of the meetings of Christians "on a
stated day” need only be alluded to. The first writer who mentions the word Sunday as applicable to the Lord’s day is Justin Martyr; this designation of the first day of the week, which is of heathen origin (see Sabbath), had come into general use in the Roman world shortly before Justin wrote. He describes (Apol. i. 67) how “on the day called Sunday” town and country Christians alike gathered together in one place for instruction and prayer and charitable offerings and the distribution of the bread and wine; they thus meet together on that day, he says, because it is the first day in which God made the world, and because Jesus Christ on the same day rose from the dead.

As long as the Jewish Christian element continued to have any influence in the Church, a tendency to observe the Sabbath as well as Sunday naturally persisted. Eusebius (H.E. iii. 27) mentions that the Ebionites continued to keep both days, and there is abundant evidence from Tertullian onwards that so far as public worship and abstention from fasting are concerned the practice was widely spread among the Gentile churches. Thus we learn from Socrates (H.E. vi. c. 8) that in his time public worship was held in Constantinople on both days; the Apostolic Canons (can. 66) sternly prohibit fasting on Sunday or Saturday (except Holy Saturday); and the injunction of the Apostolic Constitutions (V. 20; cf. ii. 59, V. ii, 23) is to “hold your solemn assemblies and rejoice every Sabbath day (excepting one), and every Lord’s day”. Thus the earliest observance of the day was confined to congregational worship, either in the early morning or late evening. The social condition of the early Christians naturally forbade any general suspension of work. Irenaeus (c. 140-202) is the first of the early fathers to refer to a tendency to make Sunday a day of rest in his mention that harvesting was forbidden by the Church on that day. Tertullian, writing in 202 says: “On the Lord’s day we ought to abstain from all habit and labor of anxiety, putting off even our business.”
In connection with the above excerpt from the Britannica there is this very interesting footnote from the Epistle of Barnabas: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also in which Jesus rose from the dead."

In this connection, Brother E. C. Fuqua gives the following quotations from the Ante-Nicene Christian Library in his tract, "The Lord's Day":

"A. Justin Martyr (A. D. 120)—'But Sunday is the day on which we hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day arose from the dead'—Apology Chap. LXVII.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The above quotations are enough to show that the Lord's day is the first day of the week; that the Lord's day is not the Jewish Sabbath, that in both apostolic
and post-apostolic times Christians met together on the Lord’s day for the observance of the Lord’s supper and fellowship; that the Lord’s day is not a “Christian sabbath” but a day of worship; and that those who observe Saturday as sabbath are judaizers removed from the grace of the gospel; and, that those who profess to observe the Lord’s day as a Christian sabbath are mistaken, and if they do not on that day observe the Lord’s supper, they pervert the institutions of the gospel.

From the *Lost Gospel of Peter* the following quotation is offered for what it is worth.

“And at dawn upon the Lord’s day Mary Magdalene, a disciple of the Lord fearing because of the Jews, since they were burning with wrath, had not done at the Lord’s Sepulchre the things which women are wont to do for those that die and for those that are beloved by them—she took her friends with her and came to the sepulchre where he was laid. . . . And they went and found the tomb opened and coming near they looked in there; and they see there a young man sitting in the midst of the tomb, beautiful and clothed in a robe exceeding bright, who said to them Wherefore are ye come? Whom seek ye? Him that was crucified? He is risen and gone. But if ye believe not, look in and see the place where he lay, that he is not [here]; for he is risen, and gone thither whence he was sent. Then the women feared and fled”—*Lost Books of the Bible* pp. 285, 286.

4. Standard authorities unite unanimously in declaring that Sunday, “the first day of the week,” is the Lord’s day.

Smith’s *Bible Dictionary* Art. *The Lord’s day.*

“It has been questioned, though not seriously until of late years, what is the meaning of the phrase *Te kuriake hemera* which occurs in one passage only of the Holy Scripture, Rev. 1:10, and is, in our English version, translated ‘the Lord’s day.’ The general consent both of Christian antiquity and of modern divines
has referred it to the weekly festival of our Lord's resurrection, and identified it with 'the first day of the week,' or 'Sunday,' of every age of the church. But the views antagonistic to this general consent deserve at least a passing notice.

"1. Some have supposed St. John to be speaking, in the passage above referred to, of the Sabbath, because that institution is called in Isaiah Lvi. 13, by the Almighty Himself, 'My holy day.' To this it is replied, If St. John had intended to specify the Sabbath, he would surely have used that word, which was by no means obsolete, or even obsolescent, at the time of his composing the Book of Revelation.

"2. Another theory is, that, by 'the Lord's day,' St. John intended 'the day of judgment,' to which a large portion of the Book of Revelation may be conceived to refer.

"3. A third opinion is, that St. John intended, by 'the Lord's day,' that on which the Lord's resurrection was annually celebrated, or, as we now term it, Easter Day. Supposing that Te kuriake hemera of St. John is the Lord's day, what do we gather from Holy Scripture concerning that institution? How is it spoken of by early writers up to the time of Constantine? What change, if any, was wrought upon it by the celebrated edict of that emperor, whom some have declared to have been its originator?

"Scripture says very little concerning it; but that little seems to indicate that the divinely inspired apostles, by their practice and by their precepts, marked the first day of the week as a day for meeting together to break bread, for communicating and receiving instruction, for laying up offerings in store for charitable purposes, for occupation in holy thought and prayer. The first day of the week so devoted seems also to have been the day of the Lord's resurrection. The Lord rose on the first day of the week, and appeared, on the very day of His rising to His followers on five
distinct occasions—to Mary Magdalene, to the other
women, to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, to
St. Peter separately, to ten apostles collected together.
After eight days, that is, according to the ordinary
reckoning, on the first day of the next week, He ap­
ppeared to the eleven. On the day of Pentecost, which
in that year fell on the first day of the week, ‘they
were all with one accord in one place,’ had spiritual
gifts conferred on them, and in their turn began to
communicate those gifts, as accompaniments of in­
struction, to others. At Troas (Acts 20:7), many
years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Chris­
tianity had begun to assume something like a settled
form, St. Luke records the following circumstances:
St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and ‘abode
seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when
the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preach­
ed unto them.’ In 1 Cor. 16:1, 2, that same St. Paul
writes thus: ‘Now concerning the collection for the
saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia,
even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let
everyone of you lay by him in store, as God hath pros­
pered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.’
In Heb. X. 25, the correspondents of the writer are de­
sired ‘not to forsake the assembling of themselves to­
gether, as the manner of some is, but to exhort one
another,’ an injunction which seems to imply that a
regular day for such assembling existed, and was well
known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. And last­
ly, in the passage given above, St. John describes him­
self as being in the Spirit ‘on the Lord’s Day.’"

“This term has from the very earliest times been ap­
plied in Greek and Latin literature to the first day of
the week in its religious aspect.”

Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious Knowl­
edge Art. “Lord’s Day”—“A designation of the first
day of the week first found in Rev. 1:10.”
Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Art. "Sunday"—"Only three times in the New Testament is there any reference to a religious observance of Sunday. St. Paul urged his converts at Corinth to put aside money for charity every Sunday (1 Cor. 16:2). Shortly after writing this he preached at a service at Troas, which is mentioned as if it were a regular institution (Acts 20:7). Thirty years later, perhaps, the author of the Apocalypse wrote: 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Though not quite conclusive, the evidence makes it probable that the observance of Sunday began among St. Paul's churches, which were predominantly Gentile."

The *New International Encyclopedia*, Art. Sunday—"The first day of the week, observed by Christians, almost universally in honor of the resurrection of Christ. For some time after the foundation of the Christian church the converts from Judaism still observed the Jewish Sabbath to a greater or less extent, at first, it would seem, concurrently with the celebration of the first day, but before the end of the Apostolic period, Sunday, known as the Lord's day, had thoroughly established itself as the special day to be sanctified by rest from labor and by public worship."

A *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, by Shailer Matthews and Gerald Birney Smith, Art. on "Sabbath and Sunday"—"Traces of the observance of the first day of the week are found in the New Testament (Jno. 20:26; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2). But there is no command to observe the day, and in the literature of the first three centuries observance of the Lord's day is a joyful privilege, not a legal obligation. The first legal recognition of the day is in a decree of Constantine published in 321, which calls it the venerable day of the sun. Laws requiring rest from labor were promulgated in the reign of Charlemagne (cir. 800), and became general in most Christian nations. The notion that the obligation of the third (fourth) command-
ment has passed over to Sunday making that the 'Christian Sabbath' is quite modern and confined to English speaking countries. It was first advocated by the Rev. Nicholas Bownd, a clergyman of the Church of England in The True Doctrine of the Sabbath (London 1606) and speedily became the prevalent idea among the Puritans, whence it has descended to most of the protestants of England and America, but has never found acceptance in Continental Europe, among Protestants or Catholics." (Signed) Henry C. Vedder.

The New Catholic Dictionary Art. "Lord's Day Special name for the first day of the week in the New Testament. This day was chosen to honor the day on which our Lord rose from the dead. On this day the faithful are obliged to hear mass and rest from all servile work.
—C. J. D."

Hovey, Manual of Theology and Ethics, pp. 289, 290. "Of the several theories maintained by Christians as to the Lord's day, the following deserve particular notice:
a. That men are under no obligation to keep it by abstaining from secular business; either (1) because reason and Paul unite in declaring that all days are alike—a view which we need not pause to refute or (2) because the fourth commandment of the decalogue and the original appointment of the Sabbath require all men to keep the seventh day of the week holy. But this view is inconsistent with the language of Paul in Col. 2:16; Gal. 4:9, 10; and Rom. 14:5; with the testimony of Christian writers, like Justin Martyr, as to the practice of the early churches; and the principle laid down by Christ, that the Sabbath was made for man—that is for his highest good.

"(b) That by the authority of Christ, the first day of the week has been substituted for the seventh—the day being changed, but the command to observe it by abstaining from all secular labor remaining in full force. The defenders of this theory insist that the decalogue is binding on Christians, from the first com-
mand to the last, though God has seen fit to ordain the Lord’s day shall take the place of the Jewish Sabbath. This theory has prevailed extensively in England, Scotland and the United States; and a great deal may be justly said in its favor. Yet it does not seem to be entirely consistent with the language of Paul in the passages cited above; with the view of fair-minded writers in the early church, or with the general character of the new dispensation. . . . The adherents of this view are careful to call the Lord’s day the Christian Sabbath, a designation which is never given it in the New Testament, or by any Christian writer of the first three centuries.

"(c) That the duty of keeping the Lord’s day rests entirely on the practice and authority of the church. . . . This theory overlooks the real grounds of Christian obligation in this matter, and tends to great laxity in observing the Lord’s day. Where it prevails, recreation, if not business, will be sure to encroach upon the proper use of the day, as a period for religious worship and instruction, and thus defeat the end of its appointment.

"d. The duty of consecrating the Lord’s day to religious uses rests upon the authoritative example of the Apostles (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10; Heb. 10:25); confirmed (1) by the practice of the early churches . . . . The practice of the early churches tends to establish very firmly the distinction between the Lord’s day and the Jewish Sabbath” [Here he makes some further observations which are not at all well taken but adds] “For, since the resurrection of Christ, the first day of the week takes precedence of every other in religious interest, and it is practically impossible for Christians to feel as deep an interest in the finishing of the work of creation as they do in finishing the work of atonement.”

Further he says of Christians as legislators “(6) That they forbid ordinary labor on the Lord’s day for
such reasons as these, namely (a) that all may have the amount of rest which is favorable to health and long life, and (b) that those who desire it may be able to worship God undisturbed.” Ibid p. 414.

McClintock & Strong, Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedia Art. Lord’s Day. “The expression so rendered in the Authorized English Version (en te kuriake hemera) occurs only once in the New Testament, viz., Rev. 1:10, and is there unaccompanied by any other words tending to explain its meaning. It is, however, well known that the same phrase was, in after ages of the Christian church, used to signify the first day of the week, on which the resurrection of Christ was commemorated.”

John Wesley “Notes,” Rev. 1:10: “On the Lord’s Day—On this our Lord rose from the dead: on this the ancients believed he would come to judgment. It was therefore with the utmost propriety that St. John on this day both saw and described his coming.”

American Commentary on John, Jude, and Revelation by Justin A. Smith in consultation with James Robinson Boise: “On the Lord’s Day. The reasons for holding that this can only mean the First Day of the week (1 Cor. 16:2), are noticed below. This is the first occurrence of the phrase, anywhere in the New Testament. The manner of its use here, however implies that it was a designation of the Christian day of rest and worship already so common as that it could not fail to be understood” (Rev. 1:10, in Loco).

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, A Commentary Critical and Explanatory—“On the Lord’s Day. Though forcibly detained from church communion with the brethren in the sanctuary on the Lord’s day, the weekly commemoration of the resurrection, John was holding spiritual communion with them. This is the earliest mention of the term ‘the Lord’s day.’ But the consecration of the day to worship, almsgiving, and
the Lord’s supper, is implied Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; cf. John 20:19-26. The name corresponds to ‘the Lord’s supper,’ 1 Cor. 11:20. Ignatius seems to allude to ‘the Lord’s day’ (Ad Magnes 9), and Irenaeus in the Quaest ad Orthod 115 (in Justin Marytr). Justin Martyr, Apology 2, 29 & C., ‘On Sunday we all hold our joint meeting; for the first day is that on which God, having removed darkness and chaos, made the world, and Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead. On the day before Saturday they crucified Him; and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, he taught these things.’ To the Lord’s day Pliny doubtless refers (Ex. 97, B 10), ‘The Christians on a fixed day before dawn meet and sing a hymn to Christ as God,’ & C. Tertullian De Coron c, ‘On the Lord’s day, we deem it wrong to fast.’ Melito, bishop of Sardis (second century), wrote a book on the Lord’s day (Eusebius, 4:20). Also, Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, 4:23, 8 Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 5 and 7:12; Origen, c. Celo 8:22. The theory that the day of Christ’s second coming is meant, is untenable. ‘The day of the Lord’ is different in the Greek from ‘the Lord’s (an adjective) day,’ which latter in the ancient Church always designates our Sunday, though it is not impossible that the two shall coincide (at least in some parts of the earth), whence a tradition is mentioned in Jerome, on Matthew 25, that the Lord’s coming was expected especially on the Paschal Lord’s day.”

I do not have access to the following reference books but D. R. Dunagan quotes B. B. Edwards’ Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, published in 1858 as follows: “We are informed by Eusebius that from the beginning the Christians assembled on the first day of the week, called by them the Lord’s day, for the purpose of religious worship, to read the scriptures, to preach and to celebrate the Lord’s Supper (Page 1040).”

Likewise Dungan quotes Chamber’s Encyclopedia.
on the subject of the Sabbath. "He has come to the edict of Constantine, and gives something on this side of it: 'A new era in the history of the Lord's day now commenced, tendencies toward Sabbatarianism, or confusion of Christian with the Jewish institution beginning to manifest themselves. They were slight till the end of the fifth century, and are traceable chiefly to the evils of legislation'."

Then he quotes Johnson's *Encyclopedia* as saying, "The resurrection of Christ and his subsequent appearances to his disciples till his ascension, and the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit on the first day of the week led to that being set apart for the special religious assemblies of Christians, and for the simple services of their faith. For a time the Jewish converts observed both the seventh day, to which the name Sabbath continued to be given exclusively, and the first day, which came to be called the Lord's day. Later, the apostle Paul sought to relieve their consciences from the obligations of keeping the Sabbath (Rom. 14:5; Col. 2:16) .... Within a century after the death of the last of the apostles we find the observance of the first day of the week, under the name of the Lord's day, established as an universal custom of the church, according to the unanimous testimony of Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian. It was regarded not as a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath (which was denounced together with circumcision and other Jewish, anti-Christian practices), but rather as a substitute for it; and naturally its observance was based on the resurrection of Christ rather than on the creation rest-day, or the Sabbath of the decalogue"—D. R. Dungan, *The Sabbath or Lord's Day Which?* pp. 75, 76.

5. Church Historians testify that the early Christians regarded the first day of the week as the Lord's day and that it was customary for them to meet for the breaking of bread that day.

1. Mosheim, one of the greatest authorities of early
church history says (Murdock’s translation): “When the Christians celebrated the Lord’s Supper, which they were accustomed to do chiefly on Sundays, they consecrated a part of the bread and wine of the oblations by certain prayers pronounced by the president, the bishop of the congregation” Vol. I, p. 137.

Again, “On the first day of the week (on which Christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God) Constantine required, by a special law, to be observed more sacredly than before”—Ibid p. 278, Sec. 5.

Again: “The Christians assembled for worship of God in private dwelling-houses, in caves, and places where the dead are buried. They met on the first day of the week; and here and there also on the seventh day, which was the Jewish Sabbath”—Ibid Century II, part II, Chap. IV, Sec. 8.

ii. Neander, admittedly the peer of any historian of the early period, deposes: “But since we are not authorized to make this assumption, unless a church consisted for the most part of those who had been Jewish Proselytes, we shall be compelled to conclude that the religious observances of Sunday occasioned its being the first day of the week. It is also mentioned in Acts 20:7, that the church at Troas assembled on Sunday and celebrated the Lord’s Supper. . . . They rejected the Sabbath which the Jewish Christians celebrated, in order to avoid the risk of mingling Judaism and Christianity, and because another event associated more closely another day with their feelings. For, since the sufferings and resurrection of Christ appeared as the central point of Christian knowledge and practice, since his resurrection was viewed as the foundation of Christian joy and hope it was natural that the day which was connected with the remembrance of the event, should be specially devoted to Christian communion”—Neander, Planting and Training of the Christian Church, p. 159
6. But Sabbatarians delight to say that Constantine changed the sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day. They do not talk long until they claim Sunday was made the Sabbath by the Roman Catholic church and that Sunday observance is of the Pope and not of the New Testament. As samples of their propaganda, I herewith offer two excerpts from documents in my possession. But parenthetically, I shall remark that all Constantine did for Sunday was to make it a legal holiday, allowing uninterrupted worship. This only provided for by law what had been observed in the face of persecutions by many for nearly two hundred years. In 1863, by proclamation the president made the last Thursday in November a legal holiday of national thanksgiving, but in doing this he only approved by the majesty of law the custom over two hundred years' old. It did not mean that there had never been a Thanksgiving day until the president's proclamation in 1863. But note these two excerpts:

i. In the *Biblical Educator*, December, 1912, F. A. Detamore, Seventh Day Adventist, in debate with D. A. Sommer, Christian, wrote the following:

In the year A. D. 321, Constantine issued the first Sunday law, which reads as follows:

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being lost slip, men should lose the commodities granted by heaven."

Constantine was the first of Roman emperors to profess conversion to Christianity, but historians testify that he was only a nominal Christian, and that he continued to worship the sun till his death. He had granted liberty to the Catholic church, however, and has since been considered by them as a Christian. Because of this law Catholics claim Sunday as a church day rather than an institution of the Bible. In fact they challenge the Protestant world for Bible authority for observing Sunday. The following statement was made by a Catholic priest at Hartford, Kansas, and reported in the Hartford Weekly Call of February 22, 1884:

"I am not a rich man, but I will give $1,000.00 to any man who will prove by the Bible alone that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep. No, it cannot be done; it is impossible. The observance of Sunday is solely a law of the Catholic church, and therefore is not binding upon others. The church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships
upon that day in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic church. Is it not a living miracle that those who hate us so bitterly, obey and acknowledge our power every week, and do not know it?"

Also quite recently E. G. Crosier handed out a tract in Austin, Texas, in which appeared the following:

In 1889 the ministers of the different churches got together, while their town—Harlan, Iowa—was being stirred by a series of meetings held by a Seventh-day Adventist minister. The Adventist minister told the people that Father Enright of the Catholic Church had offered $1,000 for a text to prove that the first day of the week should be kept holy by Christians. These ministers wired Father Enright to visit Harlan and speak on the subject of the first day of the week, and why it should be kept. To make this meeting was advertised for many miles around. Long before the time came for Father Enright to deliver his sermon in the public square, the little town was well filled with people. The ministers had two or three reporters to take down every word of the Catholic Father. Taken from the Harlan paper of December 19, 1889, we find the speech as follows—

FATHER ENRIGHT ON THE SABBATH

"My brethren, look around you upon the various wrangling sects and denominations. Show me one that claims or possesses the power to make laws binding on the conscience. There's one on the face of the earth—the Catholic church—that has the power to make laws binding upon the conscience, binding before God, binding under pain of hell fire. Take for instance the day we celebrate—Sunday. What right have the Protestant churches to observe that day? None whatever. You say it is to obey the commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' But Sunday is not the Sabbath according to the Bible and the record of time. Everyone knows that Sunday is the first day of the week, while Saturday is the seventh and the Sabbath, the day consecrated as a day of rest. It is so recognized in all civilized nations. I have repeatedly offered $1,000 to any one who will furnish any proof from the Bible that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep, and no one has called for the money. If any person thinks this to be a fair way for me and tomorrow evening publicly acknowledge it and thank him for it. It was the Holy Catholic church that changed the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, the first day of the week. And it not only compelled all to keep Sunday, but at the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 346, anathematized those who kept the Sabbath and urged all persons to labor on the seventh under penalties of anathemas.

"Which church does the whole world obey? Protestants call us every horrible name that they can think of—anarchists, the scarlet colored beast, Babylon, etc. And at the same time profess great reverence for the Bible, and yet by their solemn act of keeping Sunday they acknowledge the power of the Catholic church, the Bible says, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' But the Catholic Church says, No, keep the first day of the week, and the whole world bows in obedience."—The Industrial American, Harlan, Iowa, December 19, 1889.

Sabbatarians also recklessly use history, and often get by with it, as the books quoted are often rare and inaccessible to the general public. In his excellent little "Sabbath or Lord's Day, Which?" D. R. Dungan pertinently offers the following observations:
“Many honest and intelligent people are deceived by the statements of history which they have published. I know of no work more deserving of censure for unfairness than ‘The History of the Sabbath,’ by J. N. Andrews. Scraps of statements are taken out of their legitimate connections, and testimonies wrung from authors who testified nothing in their favor. To call such procedure pettyfogging, is to apply a term entirely too feeble for the expression of the true thought. He has not only quoted every erratic statement which could be so applied as to favor his theory, but he finds history which other men cannot find. In the second edition of the work the author acknowledges to have quoted from an edition of Neander not now in use, and to have used a statement which the historian did not put into his revised work. Many Sabbatarians have been found in the different ages of the church. Of course, these can be had to testify in favor of that institution.

“It is common, I might say universal, to claim that Sunday had no existence till the time of Constantine, or that it was never regarded as sacred till that time, and then only by virtue of the edict of a king who was a heathen. If you hear a lecture from one of them it will be clearly affirmed; if you read a tract, it will be boldly stated, but if you have before you a work which is expected to fall into the way of the critical world, you will find it only hinted. After the patched work of quotations has been furnished, the author will assume such to be the purport of what has been produced. As a sample of many things which might be cited, I call attention to Mr. Andrews on the ‘Sabbath, pp 346-7:

“On the seventh day of March (321), Constantine published his edict commanding the observance of that ancient festival of the heathen, the venerable day of the sun. On the following day, March eighth, he issued a second decree in every respect worthy of its heathen predecessor. The purport of it was this: ‘That
if any royal edifice should be struck by lightning, the ancient ceremonies of propitiating the Deity should be practiced, and the haruspices should be consulted to learn the meaning of the awful portent. The haruspices were soothsayers who foretold future events by examining the entrails of beasts slaughtered in sacrifice to the gods. The statute of the seventh of March enjoining the observance of the venerable day of the sun, and that of the eighth of the same month commanding the consultation of the haruspices, constitute a noble pair of well-matched heathen edicts. That Constantine, himself, was a heathen at the time these edicts were issued, is shown not only by the nature of the edicts themselves, but by the fact that his nominal conversion to Christianity is placed by Mosheim two years after his Sunday law."

"This is the manner of the argument. What is lacking in the testimony is to be made up by telling the readers what is the sum or the purport of an edict. I have no interest in defending Constantine. He exhibited many inconsistencies. He was a politician, and, while he came eventually to regard Christianity as the only religion which could be of any particular value to any person, and though we could not say that he had reached that conclusion in the year 321, we must say, if we have paid any attention to the edict itself, that it was his purpose to set Christians at liberty to worship as they preferred. This, however, was not all: he extended the same rights to all his subjects. As to his requiring any day to be kept as a day of heathen worship, there is not a particle of evidence in its favor. History can not even be distorted into such a thought. No Christian understood it so, and if that had been the idea which attached to that edict, Christians would not have submitted. They were yet ready to die for their faith in Christ, and would not, under any circumstances, have submitted to a heathen worship. But
instead of that, they regarded it as a release for their religion and a restoration of their liberties.

"Nothing more than disgust can be excited for the shallow pretensions or utter disregard for truth of a man who will say that Constantine wished to favor heathenism by the so-called Sunday law of 321. From 313 he had been removing all obstructions to Christian worship, and those who were in slavery were released. Those who had lost their lands had them restored to them again. He even went so far as to urge his people to accept this religion. Hence no man can find an easier way of convincing all readers of history of his entire unworthiness as an author than to make such statements respecting Constantine and his edicts as are made by Mr. Andrews."—D. R. Dungan, sometime president of Drake University.

Moreover the Roman Catholic church through her scholars and official publications declare that "the first day of the week," "the Christian Lord's day" is not the Sabbath nor that Sunday should be regarded as the Sabbath, regardless of what one or two more or less irresponsible priests may have said fifty years ago. Sabbathians could not have got by with their point but for the widespread foolish Protestant idea that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that, somehow, the Decalogue is binding on Christians.

Roman Catholics sanctify Sunday as a day in which no "servile" work is to be done, to be sure. They do not claim that Sunday is the Sabbath however, to say nothing of claiming that they have changed the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week. They also claim that it is by the authority of the church that they demand the cessation of ordinary labor on the Lord's day. James Cardinal Gibbons in "Faith of Our Fathers" says, "Third—A rule of faith, or a competent guide to heaven, must be able to instruct in all the truths necessary to salvation. Now the scrip-
tories alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from all unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day we never sanctify” p. 86, 77th edition.

This is pretty hard on those who profess Sunday to be the Sabbath, but on those who know that the observance of the Sabbath was commanded only of the Jews and that no Sabbath is enjoined on Christians, it does not have any effect. Moreover it shows that Sunday is not considered by Catholics as a substitute for the seventh-day Sabbath. Catholics “sanctify” many days, Christmas, Lent and various “Saints” days, for which there is not the remotest shadow of biblical authority—days on which they abstain from “unnecessary servile work” but they are not “Sabbath” days. Moreover the very term “unnecessary servile work,” shows Sunday is not the Hebrew Sabbath enjoined in the Decalogue, for no work of any sort, i. e., baking, building a fire, or picking up sticks, was allowed on that day.

The first day of the week, as a day of Christian “worship,” started under the ministry of the apostles guided by the Holy Spirit, but as a “rest” day one must come this side of the apostolic age, and whether the Lord’s day became a rest day by edict of Constantine or by Papal decree, or by ecumenical council it is not of inspiration and the Christian who works on the Lord’s day before or after worship violates no law except the law of the land, where such law on Sunday observance exists.
The New Catholic Dictionary Art. "Sabbatarians, members of a sect who, though not Jews, hold to the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath rather than the Christian Lord's day. Some of them, while observing Sunday, have sought to make it as rigorous as the Sabbath of the Old Law; others, more consistently keep the seventh day of the week instead of the first, as a day of rest. The former have been found in various Protestant bodies, the latter are generally members of such sects as the Adventists, Seventh-Day Baptists, etc. After the settlement of the Judaizing controversies of the 1st century, Sabbatarians arose again in the 16th century, and have continued until the present time. —C. E."


7. Comments

Every one conversant with the New Testament knows that there was a strong Judaizing element in the church which taught that if Gentile converts were not circumcised and kept the law of Moses they could not be saved. This was the occasion of the "conference" at Jerusalem. See the fifteenth chapter of Acts. The Ebionites were a sect of Judaizers which flourished in the days of Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr. The faithful had no little trouble with them. Much of Paul's labors and writings were necessary to offset this schismatic influence (Rom. 14:1-10; Col. 2:8-17; Gal. 1:1-13). "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain" (Gal. 4:10, 11).

In communities of Jews there would be synagogues—houses for worship on Saturday, the Sabbath of course. Paul and other Christians would go there to preach,
just as at Philippi he resorted to a place of prayer out by the river’s brink. Sabbatarians like to count such instances and they reach the interesting conclusion that Paul kept eighty-four Sabbaths! But they never find Paul or any other apostle or evangelist in the New Testament, after a congregation of Christians had been formed, ever addressing a Sabbath-day gathering. There is not a place on record where a purely Christian public service was held on the Sabbath day. Christians worshipped on “the first day of the week,” but never, so far as the New Testament shows, on the Sabbath. Let us have a list of some convenings of disciples: Jesus arose on the first day of the week (Mark 16:1-8). That day Jesus met his disciples (Jno. 20:19). “After eight days” they met again, which was on the first day of the week. “On the eighth day” and “after eight days” are only two ways the Jews have of saying the same thing, as for example Jesus said he would rise “after three days” (Mark 8:31), and yet he quite as emphatically said that he would rise “the third day” (Matt. 16:21). The eighth day from the first day of one week would be the first day of the next week. Now our Lord met with the disciples on the first day of the week and thus personally indorsed such meetings, but at no time do we learn of his meeting with the disciples on the Sabbath after he nailed it, together with the rest of the bond-writing contained in ordinances, to his cross (Col. 2:14-17).

The church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. On that day the Holy Spirit came. On that day provision was made for all mankind to be saved (Acts 2:39). Peter called it the “great and notable day of the Lord” and it was on the first day of the week, as Pentecost always came on the “morrow after the Sabbath” (Lev. 23:15-16). On that day converts were added to the church (Acts 2:41, 47) and these continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching as evidently they did so from the first,
but their teaching was not their own but the Lord's who said of his supper, "This do in memory of me." Then the first communion service in memory of Christ was performed on the first day of the week. We read that they stedfastly "broke bread" (Acts 2:42) and the language in Acts 20:7 shows that it was customary for them to assemble themselves together regularly on the first day of the week for communion purposes. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them," and the same custom prevailed at Corinth (1 Cor. 16:2): "Upon the first day of the week let everyone of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him that there be no gatherings when I come." Paul said he gave the same order to the churches in Galatia showing their practice there, and the meeting on the "first day of the week" is the only stated or regular meeting we read of in the Bible for Christians; and we are urged not to forsake such meetings. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching" (Heb. 10:25).

**Conclusion**

In the light of history and scholarship, both Catholic and Protestant, and the plain pronouncements of the Bible, one must conclude:

1. That the Lord's day is the first day of the week.
2. That the Lord's day is neither a seventh-day Sabbath, nor a first-day Sabbath.
3. That Lord's day worship is from the Lord and his apostles and not from Constantine.
4. That there is no "Christian Sabbath."
5. That the Lord's supper on the Lord's day is founded on apostolic precedent.
6. That such Lord's day worship was a regular service in New Testament times.
7. That Christians ought not neglect it as some did in New Testament times and as some still do today.

CHAPTER 2

QUESTIONS CONCERNING
THE LORD’S SUPPER

The following questions are asked and deserve serious and studied answers.

1. Upon what day or days should the Lord’s supper be observed? Is its observance limited to the first day of the week?

2. Did not Paul observe the Lord’s supper on a Monday? See Acts 20th chapter. If so, might not the supper be observed on any day?

3. Since the supper was instituted on “Maundy Thursday” are not those Christian churches which observe the Lord’s supper Maundy Thursday acting scripturally in so far as their observation of the supper on that day is concerned?

4. If the Lord’s supper’s observance is limited to the first day of the week, is it necessary to observe the supper every Lord’s day, that is, as often as the first day of the week comes around?

5. What connection exists between the Jewish Passover and the Lord’s supper?

6. Does “breaking bread” always refer to the Lord’s supper?

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

The supper was instituted at the Passover feast, a feast commemorating the delivery of Israel from Egyptian slavery, when the paschal lamb was slain and its blood sprinkled on the door posts of the houses of Israel, and the death angel “passed over” the houses of the Israelites but slew the first-born of the Egyptians
—a feast which was one of the institutions of Israel. Jesus said, “With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer” (Luke 22:15). Why? It afforded an opportunity to contrast the laws and institutions of Moses, the prototype of Christ, and the laws and institutions of the Lord’s own dispensation, just as the transfiguration of the Lord had served as such an opportunity, on another occasion (Matt. 17. They were eating in memory of an important event in Israel’s history, and suddenly the Master introduced the memorial feast honoring his own death, and added the injunction, “This do in remembrance of me.” If we emphasize the word *this*, it shows the contrast with the Jewish feast; if we emphasize the word *do*, it marks the imperative necessity of its observance; if we emphasize the phrase *in remembrance*, it shows the futurity of its observance when the Master would be gone, and since loyal Jews could not and would not forget the feast of the paschal lamb, the disciples must commemorate a more important event, the death of the Lord for the salvation of their souls; if we emphasize the phrase *of me*, then Christ stands in emphatic contrast by way of *virtue*, importance, and incomparable *greatness* with all who have gone before, and the Lord’s supper is therefore by so much more superior to all the feasts of the law of whatever sort or kind.

When the Passover was given the Hebrews were instructed to observe it annually on the fourteenth day of the first month of their year. No such instructions were given to the disciples. Rather they were assured that the Holy Spirit would be given them who would “guide them into all truth” (Jno. 16:13). Then having the Holy Spirit to bring these words of Jesus to their remembrance and guide them “into all truth,” we may inquire if this promise was fulfilled, and, if so, upon what day or days did the Holy Spirit guide them to observe the Lord’s supper?

That the Holy Spirit did guide the disciples into all
truth is obvious from the words of the apostle Peter, "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue" (2 Peter 1:3). Then the when and how often the Lord’s supper should be observed was revealed by the Spirit; in other words, the Spirit guided the disciples to observe the supper at all times when its observance would be a part “of life and godliness.” Moreover, the Spirit gave a complete revelation of the Lord’s will on the matter—revealed it fully—else “all things pertaining to life and godliness” would not be known. Then on what day or days did the Holy Spirit guide the disciples into the observance of the supper? This study will show that the early Christians, eating and drinking in the Lord’s supper in Christ’s kingdom, in the memory of Christ, observed the Lord’s supper regularly on the Lord’s day—the first day of the week—and observed the supper on no other days.

**UPON WHAT DAY SHALL THE LORD’S SUPPER BE OBSERVED?**

The answer sometimes by some people is: *just any day!* In the light of scripture teaching can we answer likewise? No, for the very good reason that apostolic precedent allows no such answer, and no one claims that there is a precept commanding the observance of the supper *just any day*. Let us examine the claim put forward that the day is inconsequential and that any day is permissible.

Acts 2:42 tells that the disciples “continued stedfastly in the apostolic teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.” That “the breaking of bread” here refers to the Lord’s supper cannot be gainsaid. But verse 46 says of the disciples, “And day by day, continuing stedfastly in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart.” Here a similar but not identical expression occurs. Verse 42 speaks of
“the breaking of bread.” Verse 46 tells of “breaking bread at home” and explains it, “took their food with gladness and singleness of heart.” This is declared to be their food,” that is common meals. “The breaking of bread” refers to the Lord’s supper and was not theirs but the Lord’s. “I speak unto wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread. . . . Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons” (1 Cor. 10:15-21). This passage shows conclusively that the Lord’s table is His—not the disciples’ “food.” It follows, therefore, that Acts 2:46 is not an example of the disciples eating the Lord’s supper daily, for this does not refer to the Lord’s supper, at all. Then upon what day did the disciples observe the Lord’s supper? “And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them at 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” (Acts 20:6, 7). Luke says, “We came together to break bread.” Did they do what they came together for? The reverent student of the word of God answers yes; and that is his only answer. Then they observed the Lord’s supper on the first day of the week. He tells us also that Paul “preached”—“discoursed with them” (A. R. V.)—literally dialogued (dielegeto) with them—until midnight “intending to depart on the morrow.” If the disciples did what they came together for on “the first day of the week” the Lord’s supper had already been observed when Paul began discoursing “with them intending to depart on the morrow.”
But those who would impeach the integrity of these disciples, including the apostle Paul, in order to sustain communion on just any day have Paul and the disciples dillydallying with the purpose of their coming together until the next day, and then observing the Lord’s supper! How do they reason this way? They find Paul “breaking bread” the next morning before starting on his overland journey, and they assume that this was the Lord’s supper. It must be so for they want it to be so!

What are the facts? Eutychus had fallen out of a third story window and was picked up as dead. “And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Make ye no ado; for his life is in him. And when he had gone up, and had broken the bread, and eaten, and had talked with them a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. And they brought the lad alive, and were not a little comforted. But we going before to the ship set sail for Assos, there intending to take in Paul: for so had he appointed, intending himself to go by land” (Acts 20:10-13). If one will note the change of pronouns he can’t escape the conclusion that Paul ate a meal—not the eucharist that is, the Lord’s Supper—on Monday. Read Acts 20:6-14 again. Note that Luke says “we” came together on the first day of the week to break bread. That Paul broke the bread; that he ate; that he talked a long while; that he departed. Where were the “we” from the time Paul began to “discourse with them”—the disciples in Troas? The “we” had left beforehand. Verse 13: “But we, going before to the ship set sail for Assos, there intending to take in Paul.” Think of it, Luke and other supposedly faithful men meeting on “the first day of the week to break bread” and having to leave before Paul would “break” it! No, the disciples met for the communion and observed it on “the first day of the week,” as they had met to do. Luke and others of Paul’s company left, but Paul re-
mained and "discoursed with them," the disciples at Troas. He talked with them until midnight, restored the unfortunate sleepy Eutychus, then ate a common meal, and then set forward on his journey. Such a common meal after the Lord's Supper was not uncommon. Due to the distances some disciples had to travel—and walk, at that—such a meal served a good purpose, as well as an opportunity for social intercourse. It was the abuse of this social privilege that made it necessary for Paul to condemn it in the First Corinthian letter. It had become of such importance to some that they were not fit to observe the Lord's Supper, hence Paul says, "But in giving you this charge, I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that divisions exist among you and I partly believe it.... when therefore ye assemble yourselves together it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper: for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken. What have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you? In this I praise you not" (1 Cor. 11:17-22). Then he proceeded to instruct them in the proper spirit and decorum necessary to observe properly the Lord's Supper (verses 23-33). Consequently, he enjoined them—in view of their abuse of the common meal often eaten after the observance of the Lord's Supper, called the *agape* or "love feast" by church historians. "If any man is hungry, let him eat at home; that your coming together be not unto judgment" (verse 34).

That such a common meal was only a custom is evident from Paul's forbidding its observance where it interfered with the worship of God, which, of course, rests not on custom but upon the fiat of the Lord Almighty. See John 4:22-24; 1 Cor. 11:23-33 above.
That such a “custom” did exist is evident from Paul’s breaking “the bread” (Acts 20:11), and from the following excerpt from Pliny the Roman governor of Bithynia to Emperor Trajan of Rome.

Pliny “the younger” (so-called to distinguish him from his uncle of the same name) born around 61 or 62 A.D., distinguished pupil of the renowned teacher Quintilian, and one of the most polished of Roman writers, but chiefly distinguished himself as an author by letter-writing; at least most of his extant works are letters. He was consul of Rome in the year 100, and governor of Bithynia under Emperor Trajan in the years 106-108. One of his letters to Trajan tells of his punishing Christians until he became uncertain how to proceed further and asked the Emperor’s advice. Among other things he said, “They [Christians] declared that the whole of their guilt or error was that they were accustomed to meet on a stated day before it was light, and to sing in concert a hymn of praise to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by an oath, not for the perpetration of any wickedness, but that they would not commit any theft, robbery, or adultery, nor violate their word; nor refuse when called upon to restore anything committed to their trust. After this they were accustomed to separate and then to reassemble to eat in common a harmless meal.”—Epistles of Pliny, X 97.

That the above is not a private interpretation of mine, will be shown by the following comments from well-known writers, whose scholarship is, at once intelligent, fair and scholarly.

McGarvey, New Commentary on Acts, Acts 2:42-47: “The breaking of bread and the prayers in which they stedfastly continued, are the breaking of the emblematic loaf, or the observance of the Lord’s Supper, and the public prayers in the congregation. The frequency with which the loaf was broken is not here intimated; but it was doubtless the same weekly ob-
servance of this ordinance which we afterward find in existence in distant congregations. This, as well as the number and character of the prayers offered at the meetings, was so well known to Theophilus that it was needless to give the details” [Verse 46] “The breaking of bread mentioned here is not the same as that mentioned above at verse 42; for here the reference is to bread for food, as is seen in the qualifying clause, they did take their food with gladness, and singleness of heart!”

And it is also expressly stated that this breaking of bread was at home, and corresponds in practice to the advice of the Apostle Paul, “What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in; or despise ye the church of God and put them to shame who have not?”

Moreover the Syriac Version of the Scriptures preserves the distinction between the breaking of ordinary bread and “the breaking of bread” in the eucharistic observance of Christ’s death. This version called the Peshito, is in the language that Jesus and the Apostles spoke, and its translators knew how to express the Greek in harmony with the ideas of early Christians. Besides it was made soon after the New Testament was written. Translated by the scholarly James Murdock into English, it reads:

Acts 2:41-42 “And some of them readily received his discourse, and believed, and were baptized. And there were added on that day about three thousand souls. And they persevered in the doctrine of the legates; and were associated together in prayer, and in breaking the eucharist. And fear was on every mind: and many signs and prodigies were [wrought] by the hand of the legates in Jerusalem. And all they who believed, were together; and whatever belonged to them, was of the community. And they who had a possession sold it, and divided to each one as he had need. And they continued daily in the temple, with one soul: and at home, they broke bread and took food
rejoicing, and in the simplicity of their heart. And they praised God, and had favor with all the people. And our Lord added daily to the assembly those who became alive.”

Acts 20:7 “And on the first day of the week, when we assembled to break the eucharist, Paul discoursed with them, because he was to depart the next day.”

Acts 20:11. “And when he had gone up, he broke the bread and tasted [it].”

The Peshito sometimes uses the broad term bread, for the narrower eucharistic loaf, as in 1 Cor. 10:16; also 11:24; but the content shows the narrower significance in each instance, as is illustrated by these passages, “And the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” “Took bread and blessed, and brake [it] and said, ‘Take eat; this is my body.’” In such uses of the broad term bread it is impossible not to know that it refers to the eucharist.

Of the abuse of the agape in Corinth referred to elsewhere, the Peshito translates 1 Cor. 11:20, as follows: “When therefore ye come together, ye eat and drink, not as is becoming on the day of our Lord,” which shows that there was an unusual kind of eating on the Lord’s day.

Albert Barnes, Presbyterian, notes on Acts 20:7 “And upon the first day of the week. Showing thus that this day was then observed by Christians as holy time. Comp. 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10.”

“To break bread—Evidently to celebrate the Lord’s supper. Comp. 2:46. So the Syriac understands it, by translating it, ‘To break the eucharist’; that is, the eucharistic bread. It is probable that the apostles and early Christians celebrated the Lord’s Supper every Lord’s day.”

Verse 11—“And had broken bread, and eaten. Had taken refreshment. As this is spoken of Paul only, it is evidently distinguished from the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.”
This ought to be plain to everyone. Some people can understand that they ought to "go to church Sunday," and some even think Sunday is the Christian's sabbath even though the Bible does not say so, yet the same people cannot see that Christians should "go to church Sunday" the first day of the week "to break bread," though the Bible says that the early Christians did so (Acts 20:7); nor can they see, apparently that the Lord's day is a day of worship, which is likewise clearly taught. There is no authority for any kind of Sunday observance except acts of worship, and of these, the only act peculiar to the Lord's day is the Lord's Supper.

Olshausen Biblical Commentary on The New Testament. [Acts 20:7-12] "The following account of the meeting in Troas, and of the falling of a young man named Eutychus from the window of the third story, is not of much importance considered in itself, but it is interesting, first, because it presents an example of a meeting by night, and, secondly, because it shows that the observance of Sunday existed as early as the times of the apostles, which is also proved by 1 Cor. 16:2. The connexion plainly leads to the conclusion, that the apostle wished to observe Sunday with the church, and to celebrate the Lord's Supper, as also the agape with them, before he left Troas. The most natural supposition is, that from the very commencement of the church, believers distinguished the day of our Lord's resurrection, and celebrated it with solemn meetings. Thus the observance of this day spread equally among Christians, both of Jewish and Gentile extraction."

Jamieson, Faussett and Brown, Critical and Explanatory Commentary [Acts 20:6, 7, 10-12] "Where we abode seven days—i.e., arriving on a Monday, they stayed over the Jewish sabbath and the Lord's day following: occupying himself, doubtless, in refreshing and strengthening fellowship with the brethren during
the interval. 7. Upon the first day of the when the disciples came together. This compared with 1 Cor. 16:2, and other similar allusions, plainly indicates that the Christian observance of the day afterwards distinctly called the Lord's day, was already a fixed practice in the church—broken bread and eaten—denoting a common repast, as distinguished from the breaking of the eucharistic bread.”

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD’S SUPPER

On the night our Lord instituted the supper he said: “I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in My kingdom” (Luke 22:29, 30). This statement was made by the Master immediately after the Supper was instituted. “And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, saying, this is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, this cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you” (Luke 22:19, 20). These passages show clearly, first, that Jesus wanted the Lord's Supper to be observed; that it was to be observed in his memory. Now the kingdom was not established until the following Pentecost after the institution of the Supper (Mark 9:1; Acts 1:8, 2:1-4), hence the Supper was not observed in his memory until Pentecost. Second since the Supper was to be observed in his memory, that is, “in remembrance” of Christ, the observance before his death was only illustrative of the manner of observance to show the disciples how to obey the command in its future observance in his kingdom and in his memory.

Third, moreover, from its special observance, before the event which it was to commemorate and, in the absence of special instructions as to time, one can not tell from its initial observance when, nor how
often, the Supper was to be observed. The way to settle these questions is to observe the conduct of the apostles who were at the first Supper with him, and who were faithful in "keeping the feast" according to the commandment of their Lord and ours. What was their practice? Note carefully the following points.

1. First, the disciples came together regularly on the first day of the week. This is implied in 1 Cor. 16:2, where provision for weekly contributions toward the liquidation of the Corinthians' pledge or "purpose" for the relief of the poor in Judea, was made by the Apostle Paul.

2. The object of their coming together was the observance of the Lord's supper. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread" (Acts 20:7), shows that such a practice was observed weekly, and only prejudice against such practice could blind anyone to this obvious truth who is at all familiar with the passage, for if the passage read, "And on the first day of the year, when the disciples came together to break bread," everyone would know that it was the custom to break bread on New Year's day, or if the passage had read, "And upon the first day of the month, when the disciples came together to break bread," everyone would know that it was the custom of the disciples to break bread monthly, and on the first day of the month, at that. There is really no excuse for anyone's misunderstanding Acts 20:7. But to understand the passage is to recognize the weekly observance of the Lord's supper, by the early Christians. If it be observed that neither this passage nor any passage says "every first day of the week," it is only worth replying that a week has only one first day, and that biblical language is not silly, nor is it supposed to be. And should it be observed that the passage does not say the first day of every week, one can only reply that God did not say to the Jews, to whom he gave the decalogue, remem-
ber the sabbath day of every week to keep it holy! Yet no Jew ever misunderstood that when a sabbath day came he might excuse himself from its obligations, because the Lord neither said every sabbath day nor the sabbath day of every week! Christians ought to be as intelligent as Jews.

TO BE REMEMBERED

1. The first day of the week—Sunday—is the Lord’s day. This is not a sabbath day—a day of rest. It is peculiarly the Lord’s, however, just as the Lord’s Supper is his in a peculiar sense. Any act of worship or service to God can be done on any other day that can be done on the Lord’s day except the observance of the Lord’s supper. Anything can be done on the Lord’s day that can be done any other day, which does not interfere with the observance of the Lord’s Supper, so far as divine legislation is concerned. If the Lord’s supper may be properly observed on any day as well as on the Lord’s day then the Lord’s day does not differ in any respect from any other day, and it is not the Lord’s day in any peculiar sense of usage, or observance, at all.

4. If Christians may observe the Lord’s Supper on just any day, then why did Paul and his companions, who landed at Troas on Monday, wait a whole week in order to celebrate the Lord’s supper with the disciples in Troas. Remember they were anxious to leave, Paul being “ready to depart on the morrow” and the others leaving before all the exhortations had been given, Luke telling us that “we” had “gone before hand unto the ship,” because they were anxious to reach “Jerusalem by Pentecost.”

5. The spirit was to guide the disciples into all truth (Jno. 16:15). He guided them into the observance of the Lord’s Supper on the first day of the week but did not guide them into its observance on any other day of the week. Weekly observance is a part
of the truth. Daily observance is no part of the truth.

6. God has given us in his divine power—the word of God—all things that pertain to life and godliness (2 Peter 1:3) Weekly observance of the Lord's supper, that is, its observance on the first day of the week, pertains to life and godliness, because it is in the word of God. Observance on any other day, and neglect of it on the first day of the week, is not pertaining either to life or godliness.

7. The Scriptures furnish us thoroughly unto every good work that we may be perfect people of God (2 Tim. 3:16, 17). They do not furnish us with authority for the observance of the supper any day except the first day of the week, nor do they furnish us a week whose first day may be properly observed without our assembling together with the saints to observe the Lord's Supper, except in cases where circumstances make it physically impossible to do so, and then we are to be with the saints "in the spirit," as, in the case of John on the island of Patmos. Note the following:

Critical and Explanatory Commentary Rev. 1:10: "Though forcibly detained from church communion with the brethren in the sanctuary on the Lord's day, the weekly commemoration of the resurrection, John was holding spiritual communion with them. This is the earliest mention of the term "the Lord's day." But the consecration of the day to worship, almsgiving, and the Lord's Supper, is implied Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; cf. John 20:19-26."

8. Since we are not authorized to observe the Supper any day except the Lord's day we should not undertake to observe it on other days, for we are exhorted not to go beyond what is written (1 Cor. 6:4).

9. The tabernacle was a type of the church. The table of showbread was a type of the Lord's table. The twelve loaves representing the twelve tribes of Israel were a type of the one bread—the Lord's Supper. The priests were a type of Christians. The sabbath, a
day of rest, was a type of the Lord’s day, a day of worship. The showbread was to be eaten in the tabernacle; the Lord’s Supper should be eaten in the church—the assembly—the priests were to set the showbread in order on the table every sabbath; the Christians should set the Lord’s table and eat the Lord’s Supper every Lord’s day. Read Lev. 24:5-9; Heb. 9:1-10; 1 Peter 2:5-10; 1 Cor. 10:16-22; 11:23-33; Rev. 1:10; Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2. No priest dared to fail to observe this, as this was their bread, nor did they presume to set the table any other days than the sabbath because God did not say, “Thou shalt not set the table of showbread except on sabbath days.”

10. Christians are warned, “Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together... and exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching.” Whatever the day approaching may mean, whether the Lord’s day — the day Christians were wont to assemble, and probably what the author of Hebrews 10:25 had in mind, or the day of Judgment, as some have held, or whether the day of Israel’s doom, the destruction of Jerusalem, it matters little. The warning in solemn, and their assembling was not an incidental, indifferent, haphazard affair. The term “the assembling” shows it to have been a definite, specific, regular gathering. Such was the meeting for the observance of the Lord’s Supper on the first day of the week, and it is the only such assembling revealed in the New Testament, that is to say, of a continued, consistent, stated meeting, but such is the meeting on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread revealed to be. And no wonder is it, for the Master said, “This do in remembrance of me.” Grateful to their Lord who had died for them, we are not surprised that Christians should have had such an assembly for such a purpose.

11. That such an assembly on the first day of the week was not an incidental matter is testified to by the fact that the early Christians under the instruc-
tion of inspired apostles and evangelists met regularly, though, by doing so, they laid themselves open to the direst persecution—even death. Dare Christians now living under the most favorable circumstances treat lightly the assembly of the saints and count the regular observance of the Lord’s Supper a minor and unimportant matter?

12. The Lord said, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves” (Jno. 6:53), referring to himself. Even many of his disciples said, “This is a hard saying.” It was a hard saying, but was true. He said of the bread of communion, “This is my body,” and of the fruit of the vine, “This is my blood.” “This do in memory of me.” The Apostle Paul tells us that as often as we eat the bread and drink the cup we “proclaim the Lord’s death till he come.” The communion of the body and blood of the Lord points back to his death for sinners and forward to his coming for the saints. It is observed on the Lord’s day, a monument to his glorious resurrection, the day he brought to light “life and immortality,” and gave the pledge that, though we shall “walk through the valley and shadow of death,” yet we shall live. “Thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Let us not forget the Lord’s supper on the Lord’s day, the greatest, grandest monument ever erected by even God Himself.

“MAUNDY THURSDAY”

Tradition has fixed Friday as the day of the crucifixion called “Good Friday.” Thursday before has been dubbed by ecclesiasticism as “Maundy Thursday,” the night on which Christ instituted the Supper. It is getting to be popular now for some churches, claiming to be New Testament churches, to observe the Supper on “Maundy Thursday.” Is it lawful? Let us examine the claim that it is. They say, that the Supper was instituted on Thursday. Very well. Then should
the Supper be observed on all Thursdays or only on "Maundy Thursday?" If any Thursday, then why did Paul not observe the Supper at Troas on Thursday instead of waiting until Sunday, having arrived at Troas Monday before, especially since they were hurry ing to Jerusalem? If only on "Maundy Thursday," on the ground that that Thursday is lawful, since the Supper was instituted on that Thursday, do they eat the Passover too, seeing the Lord’s Supper was instituted on "Maundy Thursday" during the Passover feast? This "Maundy Thursday" business came from the Apostasy and not from apostles.

There was no "Maundy" observance of the Lord’s Supper in the first Christian century. It grew up after the age of inspiration. John L. Brandt, in his “The Lord’s Supper” (pp. 188-191) quotes from Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History the facts such as a historian can gather from reliable sources, both the practice in apostolic times and the gradual innovations occurring in the second, third and fourth centuries. Bear in mind that Mosheim is without a peer as a historian for the early ages of Christianity. He says:

"LORD’S SUPPER—FIRST CENTURY"

“All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church at Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.

“In these assemblies the Holy Scriptures were publicly read, and for that purpose were divided into certain portions or lessons. This part of divine service was followed by a brief exhortation to the people. The prayers which formed a considerable part of the public
worship, were introduced at the conclusion of these discourses. To these were added certain hymns, which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by persons appointed for that purpose, during the Lord's Supper and the feasts of charity. Such were the essential parts of divine worship which though, perhaps the method and order in which they were performed were not the same in all . . . .

“LORD’S SUPPER—SECOND CENTURY”

“In these times the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was celebrated, for the most part, on Sundays, and the ceremonies observed on that occasion were such as follow. Of the bread and wine, which were presented among other obligations of the faithful, a part was separated from the rest and consecrated by the prayers of the bishop. The wine was mixed with water, and the bread was divided into several portions. A part of the consecrated bread and wine was carried to the sick members of the church, as a testimony of fraternal love, sent to them by the whole society. It appears by many and undoubted testimonies, that this holy rite was looked upon as essential to salvation.”

LORD’S SUPPER—THIRD CENTURY

“Several alterations were now introduced in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, by those who had the direction of divine worship. The prayers used upon this occasion were lengthened; and the solemnity and pomp with which this important institution was celebrated, were considerably increased, no doubt with a pious intention to render it still more respectable. Those who were in a penitential state, and those also who had not received the sacrament of baptism, were not admitted to the Holy Supper; and it is not difficult to perceive that these exclusions were an imitation of what was practiced in heathen mysteries. We find, by accounts of Prudentius and others, that gold and silver vessels were now used in the administration
of the Lord's Supper; nor is there any reason why we should not adopt this opinion, since it is very natural to imagine that those churches which were composed of the most opulent members, would readily indulge themselves in this piece of religious pomp. As to the time of celebrating this solemn ordinance, it must be carefully observed that there was a considerable variation in different churches, arising from different circumstances, and founded upon reasons of prudence and necessity. In some, it was celebrated in the morning; in others, at noon, and in others, in the evening."

**LORD'S SUPPER—FOURTH CENTURY**

"It appears farther, by innumerable testimonies, that the Lord's Supper was administered (in some places two or three times the week, in others on Sunday only), to all those who were assembled to worship God. It was also sometimes celebrated at the tombs of the martyrs and at funerals; which custom, undoubtedly gave rise to the masses, that were afterward performed in honor of the saints, and for the benefit of the dead. In many places, the bread and wine were held up to view before their distribution, that they might be seen by the people, and contemplated with religious respect; and hence, not long after, the adoration of the symbols was unquestionably derived. Neither catechumens, penitents, nor those who were supposed to be under the influence and impulse of evil spirits, were admitted to this holy ordinance."

From this it is clearly seen that when people little by little depart from the simplicity of the "ancient order of things" there is no stopping place. Well-meaning changes, if unauthorized by God's word, as surely land one into complete apostasy as do willful perversions and intended corruptions. We may completely trust no religious guide except the New Testament.

But there is still more to be said about this "Maundy Thursday" business. If a special case were made
out for the observance of the Lord’s supper on “Maundy Thursday” on the ground that it is proper now to observe the supper on the day Jesus instituted it, the question would be still an open one, for it might be that Maundy Wednesday or Maundy Tuesday would be the time for this special observance of the Lord’s supper, since only tradition can be relied on to say that the Lord was crucified on Friday. Numbers of excellent Bible students, including the renowned Westcott, are convinced that Friday was not the crucifixion day. “Good Friday” is mere tradition but on it depends “Maundy Thursday.” No one can tell the day of the week with certainty on which the supper was instituted from either the Bible or a calendar. But given a Bible and a calendar anyone can tell when Spirit-guided Christians observed the supper, and thus obeyed their Lord by honoring his memory. “Maundy Thursday” has only apostate tradition—not even a “birthday almanac” to support it. Men faithful to the Lord must cry aloud to those churches enmeshed in Babylon, “Come out her, my people, and be ye clean.”

From the foregoing it is clear that the early churches assembled “on the first day of the week to break bread.” There is a rule of interpretation which demands that a word must be taken in its ordinary connotation unless the context demands a special meaning. The ordinary meaning of day is the period of daylight. It may mean under certain contexts, however, the whole twenty-four period, or even less than the daylight period. That is its special usage, however. Then it follows that the breaking of bread may be at any part of the first day of the week. We learn from Pliny that the disciples came together early on a “stated” day, and then reassembled at night. We do not know if the disciples at Troas met once or twice on the first day of the week. If they met once, it was probably in the evening, and the word day should be given a wider signification than the ordinary “day.” That the supper is not limited to the night is obvious,
as Luke did not say "when upon the first night of the
week the disciples came together to break bread."

Modern usage of the words "breakfast," "dinner"
and "supper" has confused some good people. But
literally the words only mean to break-fast, to eat, to
sup. The word supper is derived from a sup, which is
the act of taking a morsel, or small bit, of liquid or
semi-liquid food into the mouth. The term supper
is especially appropriate for the Lord's feast, since in
its observance a "sup" of wine is taken. One can
break his fast at any hour of the day, hence eat break­
fast. What some people call supper, others call din­
er, which shows that modern usage is not consistent
with itself and the danger of inserting modern ideas of
eating into ancient feasts. Whenever on the first day
of the week faithful disciples properly eat and drink
in the memory of Christ it is the Lord's supper.

Finally, I should like to answer briefly the seven
questions propounded at the beginning of this study,
as follows:

1. The Lord's supper should be observed on the
first day of the week and only on the first day of the
week.

2. Paul did not observe the Lord's supper on Mon­
day, nor may any one else now so observe it.

3. Supper observance on "Maundy Thursday" is
of the apostasy and not of the apostles.

4. Early Christians assembled for the observance
of the supper every Lord's day and we are enjoined
not to forsake the assembling (Heb. 10:25).

5. The Bible says "the first day of the week"; it
does not say what part of the day, nor does it say the
first night of the week.

6. The connection between the Passover and the
Lord's supper is one purely of contrast, hence is the
probable reason that that time was chosen to institute
the Lord's supper, which belongs purely to the New
Covenant.
7. The term breaking of bread does not always refer to the Lord's supper. The context shows when it does or does not. The failure to observe this has confused some sincere but mistaken souls into daily communion.