1. THE “REASONS” FOR SUNDAY

In a Sunday Law Convention held in Washington, D. C., some years ago, it was said more than once that the reasons for Sunday and its observance should be definitely stated and made plain. That is true. Abundantly as the case permits, and often, these ‘reasons’ should be told, and always made plain. It is our purpose in these pages to be occupied with the statement and restatement of the Sabbath truth, the reasons for the Sabbath of the Lord, and for the Sunday and its observance. And as the Sunday-law people so much desire that the “reasons” for the Sunday shall be stated and made plain, we shall do it as fully and as plainly as possible.

This is important also because when there is such a widespread and persistent campaign carried on to have laws enacted to compel all the people to observe Sunday, the people should know the reasons for it. To begin with, then, by its chief and most dependable speaker, this very Sunday Law Convention itself has given this plain word to all: “There is no clear Biblical authority—no command—for it.”

There being no Biblical command or clear authority for it, then plainly there cannot be any Biblical reason for it. And then all the reasons for it that there can be, will be just such “reasons” as men may invent or trump up. And just such are all the “reasons” that ever have been for it. Yet under the circumstances, it is worth while to cite and consider even these. About AD 120 “Ignatius” wrote: “Let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the Law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God.

“And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord’s day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days.”

Justin Martyr about AD 140 said that there were assemblings of Christians for prayers “on the day of the Sun, as it is called.” And the “reasons” that he gives for this are:
1. “Upon that day God made the world.”
2. “Christ rose from the dead.”
3. “Christ appeared to His disciples after His resurrection.”

In a Council held in 198 the subject was discussed, and the “reasons” developed were the following:
1. “Creation was begun on Sunday.”
2. “Light then appeared.”
3. “The Israelites then passed through the Red Sea.”
4. In Exodus 12:16 Moses commanded the Israelites to observe the first day.”
5. “In the Psalms it is said, ‘This is the day the Lord hath made, we will be glad and rejoice in it’.”
6. “The Lord then rose.”

In 305 the Bishop of Orleans produced for it this “reason:”

“The apostles wished this day to be no less honored than the Jewish Sabbath.”

In 416 Innocent I set forth as the “reason” why “Sunday ought to be observed a., a most festive day” that it was:

“On account of the joy it brought to the immediate followers of Christ.”

In 585 the Council of Macon set up this “reason” for it:

“This day is the substance that was shadowed to us in the seventh day in the law and the prophets.”

In a letter to the Roman people about 590 Pope Gregory produced the “argument” that “after Christ’s coming the precepts of the law which had been figuratively announced are not to be literally observed; that we receive in a spiritual sense what is written of the Sabbath; that Christ is our Sabbath.”

And this “reason:”
"We ought to abstain from worldly labor on Sunday, and be diligent in prayers, that we may expiate the shortcomings of the other six days."

In 680 the third Council of Constantinople evolved the following:
"Because-
1. On this day manna fell in the desert.
2. Christ was horn.
3. The star shone on the magi.
4. The five thousand were fed on the five loaves and the two fishes. “5. Christ was baptized by John in the Jordan.
6. He rose from the dead.
7. The Spirit descended on the disciples."

In 767 the Archbishop of York “argued” that we “should keep a spiritual Sabbath on Sunday,” for the “reason” that it: “Has been sanctified by the resurrection.”

In 797 the bishop of Orleans enjoined the observance of Sunday for the “reason” that:
1. God then gave us light.
2. The manna fell in the desert.
3. The Redeemer arose.
4. The Spirit descended on the disciples.”

In 829 the Second Council of Paris set forth as “reasons” for the observance of Sunday, that it was: “A custom has grown up among the Christians as a matter of religious observance, based on an accredited apostolic tradition, and certainly on the authority of the church, to honor Sunday-
1. In memory of the Lord’s resurrection.
2. In that day God gave light to the world.
3. The Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles.
4. As some doctors hold, the manna fell from heaven.
5. Respect for Sunday has died out in a considerable portion of Christendom.
6. Many of the assembled fathers have seen with their own eyes some people who were engaged in farm work on Sunday struck dead by lightning; others stricken with lockjaw; and others again consumed with fire, so that nothing remained of flesh or bones save the ashes.
7. Other Fathers, though they had not witnessed such occurrences, had heard of them.
8. Such miracles show that the Deity is offended at the desecration of so great a day.
9. To dishonor the day is inconsistent with Christianity.
10. Such dishonor involves danger to the soul of the desecrator.”

There are the “reasons” supplied by the men who originated and made the Sunday: and they never have been improved upon.

Now let anybody honestly look over and consider any and every one of these “reasons” and find if he can any real or sound reason-
1. For anybody’s observance of it in any way or for any intelligent purpose.
2. For anybody’s requiring another person to observe it.
3. For anybody’s attempt by law to compel everybody to observe it under penalty of fine and imprisonment: of fine all the way from fifty to ten thousand dollars, and “and,” not “or” imprisonment any length of time up to a year and six months.

All over and all through all these “arguments” and “reasons” there is manifest the conscious lack of any real ground or authority for what was being pleaded. Consequently there is a wild and general grabbing for anything that could be made to do service.

Even when professedly drawn from Scripture, and even if facts in themselves the “reasons” are utterly empty and groundless as reasons. For instance- That the creation was begun on Sunday; That light then appeared; That the manna fell from heaven; and That Christ appeared to the disciples.

The truth is that creation was no more begun on Sunday than it was continued on the other five following days. Light no more appeared on that day than that it continued afterward; the manna no more fell from heaven on that day than it equally fell every other day except the Sabbath. And Christ no more appeared to the disciples on that day than He appeared to them the following thirty-nine days “being seen of them forty days.”

Some of the “reasons” are deliberate falsifications of plain Scripture: as In Exodus 12:16 Moses commanded the Israelites to observe the first day. In that place “the first day” is merely and only the first day of the period of “seven days” of the annual feast of unleavened bread, which first day may occur on
any day of the week and to, make it to be the first day of every week, is nothing short of a deliberate lie.

The “reason” that the “Holy Spirit descended on the disciples” is strictly akin to this one of “the first day” in Exodus 12:16: as anyone can demonstrate for himself-provided he is able to count fifty, and will take the Scriptures on that subject and will count the fifty days that Pentecost means.

Pentecost was not on a Sunday. And that these ecclesiastical tricksters knew this full well is indicated by the fact that it was six hundred and forty-nine years after the event, before even they had the face to proclaim it publicly. For, note that the first public ecclesiastical statement of it was in 680.

Some of the “reasons” are such sheer inventions, that neither the inventors nor anybody else could ever know if they were true: and even if true, could not mean anything on this subject. As for instance the Israelites then passed through the Red Sea; on that day Christ was born; on that day the star shone on the Magi. On that day the five thousand were fed; on that day Christ was baptized; that this “is the day the Lord hath made” of the Psalm. That the apostles wished this day to be no less honored than the Sabbath, when not one of them ever said or suggested any such thing.

Some of the “reasons” are nothing but lying appeals to the very superstition: as that people were struck by lightning, seized with lockjaw, and burnt to ashes “far from any fire.” And the very first one of them all is only an appeal to the carnal and pagan sense and practice of a festival after the observance of the Sabbath, in distinction and exaltation of their old day of the Sun as “the queen and chief of all the days.”

There is not here any denial of anybody’s right to keep Sunday if he wants to, and as he chooses. Everybody in the world has full right to keep Sunday for any “reason” or for no reason at all as all these others did. But there is fullest denial of anybody’s right for any “reason” what, ever to require or to compel anybody ever to observe it in any way or to any extent and much more by law to compel everybody to keep it or else incur a penalty of fine in any sum from fifty to ten thousand dollars, and imprisonment any length of time up to one and a half years.

And that Christ “arose from the dead on the first day of the week” is of the same piece as all the rest. This being found in the company of all the rest, is of itself strong evidence that it springs from the same source as all the rest. But that “reason” will he further considered in a later chapter.

2. THE LORD’S DAY

In His wisdom the Creator of man and the world, established only one day of rest in seven. And He definitely chose and fixed and blessed and sanctified “the seventh day” of the week as that day: making it definitely the Sabbath of the Lord, “for the man.”

From beginning to end of His book of instruction to the world, that day, the definite “seventh day” of the week-Saturday, or more definitely and accurately, from Friday sunset to Saturday sunset-is the only day of weekly rest. Nowhere in all His revelation to man is there any suggestion or hint of any such thing as two days of rest in the week. Everywhere there is just one, and that the definite and blessed “seventh day” – “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.”

In all the life of the Lord Jesus on earth there was just this one day as the day of rest—“the Sabbath day;” and this day He, as the divine example to man, observed unto God. Throughout the whole New Testament there stands just this one day and no more and no other as “the Sabbath,” the day of rest.

And this Sabbath day-Saturday, and “the first day of the week Sunday”, not only in the New Testament but throughout the Bible, are never the same day nor the same thing. They are as distinct as any other two days or things ever, in the Bible or anywhere else. And this is equally true for seven hundred years after the latest book in the Bible.

By the Bible, “the Lord’s day” of Revelation 1:10 is the Sabbath of the Lord, and not Sunday at all. And on the Bible ground, and The Reformation ground of “the Word of God, the Whole Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God,” “the Lord’s day in Revelation 1:10 cannot be an other than the all-time Sabbath of the Lord. Here are the simple formulae of the Bible truth, that will make this plain and easy to all even of the commonest understanding:

FIRST
A. “The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” Mark 2:28.
B. “The Seventh day is the Sabbath.” Exodus 20:10.
C. Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the Seventh day.
SECOND
A. The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.
B. The day of which He says that He is Lord, is the Lord’s clay.
C. Therefore, the seventh day is the Lord’s day.

THIRD
A. The seventh day is the Lord’s day.
B. John says: “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day.”
C. Therefore, John was in the Spirit on the seventh day.

FOURTH
A. The day of which He says that He is Lord, is the Lord’s day.
B. He says that He is Lord of “the Sabbath day.” Matthew 12:8.
C. Therefore, “the Sabbath day” is “the Lord’s day.”

The second and third of these are dependent on the first. But as the A and the B of the first are both plain and positive statements of Scripture, the conclusion C is as certain as that those two Scriptures are true. Unless the Bible in some other place than Revelation 1:10 tells what day is the Lord’s day, nobody can ever certainly know what day of the week it is; for there only the single expression “the Lord’s day” is used.

But there is an obligation implied. The phrase is possessive—the Lord’s day. And Jesus said, “render unto God the things which are God’s.” The Word of God then must tell us what day is the Lord’s day, or else in this we can never render to God that which is His. Then also the Bible would not be a complete guide. The guide would have to be the Bible and what? And that would be no certain guide at all. And the Bible does tell, in the Word of God what day is His, thus: “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day.” Isaiah 58:13.

3. THE STORY OF TWO DAYS IN SEVEN

Soon after the close of the Bible record and the death of the last of the apostles, there arose this notion of two days in seven: one “as a festival,” for the festivity of social recreation and sports and games; the other as “the Sabbath” for worship.

There, however, the order was the reverse of that which is now the order considered compulsory by the Roman Catholic and professed Protestant Sunday Law agitators: then Sunday was the “festival” day of sports and games and the like, while the Sabbath was still the day of worship.

The first definite statement of this fact in writing is that by “Ignatius,” thus: Let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God. “And after the observance as the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord’s day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days.”

But now there had become rife the “falling away” of 2 Thessalonians 2:3; Acts 20:29-30; Revelation 2:4-5. The native heathen brought with them to the name and profession of Christian, many, and always more and more, of their heathen practices.

The chief of these was the Sun-day. In their “voluntary humility” and will-worship (Colossians 2:18, 23), these gave Sunday to the Lord. And since what is freely given to a person is his, it was perfectly easy and logical for these to assert that the Sun-day that they had given to the Lord was now the Lord’s day! For hadn’t they given it to Him? Therefore wasn’t it His?

In the nature of the case it is a long story through the eighteen hundred years in which was wrought the complete reversal of that original form of the two days in seven, to the form in which it is now espoused by Roman Catholic and Protestant groups in these days of the five day week.

Except in a considerable book it would be impossible to give the story in detail of the nearly two hundred distinct acts of ecclesiastics, councils, popes, emperors, kings, parliaments, that were requisite to the accomplishment of the fact and the purpose involved. But the high peaks can be touched, the distinctive periods can be marked, the decisive acts and facts can be definitely given; and the story be so connectedly
told, that the whole course will be clear all the way.

**FIRST PERIOD: THE SABBATH AND SUNDAY**

The period of about two hundred years from Ignatius to Constantine is covered by what is called the “Apostolic Constitutions.” These “Constitutions” are not any constitutions in any legal or proper meaning of the word. All that they ever were was but a series of ecclesiastical provisions “designed to furnish a complete system for the clergy. Of the laity they say scarcely a word.” That is, a complete system for the clergy to put upon the laity.

In these “Constitutions” throughout there is plain distinction maintained, both as to facts and principle, between the Sabbath and the first day of the week. Thus: “Keep the Sabbath and the Lord’s day festival: because the former is the memorial of creation, and the other of the resurrection.”

There are not less than a dozen other statements on the same subject; all equally explicit, and all keeping up the same clear distinction between the days. Thus originally the Sunday was set up, not displacing the Sabbath, but along with it; itself neither having nor claiming any Sabbath character, but only that of a day of festivity. Note this fact in both the quotations above given. They both specifically say “keep the Sabbath;” and keep it as the Sabbath, “the memorial of creation,” “after a spiritual manner,” “admiring the workmanship of God.”

This is yet more emphatic in connection with the quotation as from Ignatius, from the fact that by many eminent scholars this writing is held to be a forgery. As evidence in the matter here being related, its value is in the record as such and does not depend upon who wrote it. It was written by some one who was interested in exalting Sunday as “the queen and chief of all the days.”

If it be genuinely of the real Ignatius it proves that the Sabbath was being observed by those whom he would have to receive the Sunday as this “queen and chief;” also that the observance of the Sabbath was so fixed in their religious life that he did not so much as even hint at their accepting the Sunday in place of the Sabbath, but on the contrary actually said, “Let every one of you keep the Sabbath:” and “after the observance of the Sabbath,” then keep the Sunday “as a festival.”

If it he a forgery, then it certifies that “the observance of the Sabbath” was so universal and so fixed in the Christian life of the time, that even an ecclesiastical trickster in the very practice of his chicanery could not dare to question it or offer Sunday as a substitute for it. but could only offer the Sunday as an additional day.

**SECOND PERIOD: SUNDAY DISPLACING THE SABBATH**

Throughout the foregoing period there was no claim of any Sabbath character for the Sunday. There was no claim nor suggestion that it was or that it should be a rest day in refraining from work; but only that it should be “a festival.” The first suggestion of the idea of any abstaining from work on Sunday, was by the Bishop of Orleans, in AD 305. In a dissertation on the term “Lord’s day” as applied to Sunday, he set forth that Christians “should abstain from work” on that day, since “the apostles wished this day to be no less honored than the Jewish Sabbath.”

Very shortly after this there came, if it was not already working, that dark intrigue between the bishops and Constantine in which the ecclesiastics traded to Constantine their influence and power in politics and the State, for his in religion and the church. One of the very first results of this intrigue was that in response to the pressure of the ecclesiastical combine Constantine gave to the Sunday the support of imperial law.

The first step, AD 314, was an ecclesiastical imperial law suspending work in the courts and other offices of the government. The second, 321, extended the prohibition of work to include mechanics and the people who dwelt in towns “judges, townspeople, and such as work at trades;” while those engaged in agriculture could “freely and lawfully continue their pursuits!” In 386 “civil” transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden; with any disregard of the law to be “adjudged not only infamous but sacrilegious!”

Still all this time the Sabbath was observed by all the church, as the following facts make unquestionable: In 336 under imperial order Arius must be received again to full and regular fellowship in the church on a day of public worship. The day that he presented himself for admittance “happened to be a Sabbath (Saturday) on which day as well as on Sunday public worship was held at Constantinople.”—Neander.

Arius was refused admittance that day. Then his partisans declared that the next day-Sunday-they would force their way into the great church and compel his admittance. In 364 was the Council of
Laodicea. That Council enacted—

“Canon 16. On Sabbath, the Gospels and other portions of the Scripture shall be read aloud” (in
the church assemblies.)

“Canon 49. During Lent the bread shall not be offered, except on Sabbath and Sunday!”

“Canon 51. During Lent no feasts of the martyrs shall be celebrated; but the holy martyrs shall he
commemorated on the Sabbaths and Sundays of Lent.”

In and by this Council there was taken the first definite step to have the Sunday crowd out the
Sabbath, as follows:

“Canon 29. Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Sabbath, but shall work on that day; but the
Lord’s day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall if possible, do no work on that day.
If, however, they shall be found judaizing, they shall be accursed from Christ.”

This Canon while expressing the wish and disposition of those who enacted it was ineffectual in
practice even in the church for more than two hundred years. In 373 Athanasius, the great champion of
orthodoxy said: “We are assembled on the day of the Sabbath, not because we are infected with Judaism ...
but we approach the Sabbath to adore Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath.”

In 416 Pope Innocent I officially recognized the fact of the general observance of the Sabbath in
the church equally with the Sunday, by a letter in which he commanded: “The Sabbath should be observed
as a fast-day,” because “it shares the sadness and the joy of Sunday; and the Apostles were in great
affliction on that day.”

ROME CEASES TO OBSERVE SABBATH

However, between the time of that letter of Pope Innocent’s and 439, the observance of the
Sabbath “ceased” in the church at Rome and the church at Alexandria-Babylon and Egypt. Innocent died in
417; and between that year and 440 there were four Popes. In this time Socrates wrote his Ecclesiastical
History, reaching to the year 439, in which he says: “Almost all churches throughout the world celebrate
the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week. Yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome have
ceased to do this.” “I mean Saturday and Lord’s day in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in
the churches.”

Sozomen came next with his Ecclesiastical History carried down to the year 460, in which he says:
“The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well
as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria!”

By the plain facts of record, therefore, from the accession of Constantine to the close of the
bishopric of Innocent I both days were observed by those of the church at Rome, and everywhere else by
those who were in communion with the church at Rome.

Between 417 and 439 the church at Rome and the church at Alexandria ceased to do this.” Still the
observance of both days continued in “almost all churches throughout the world” that were in communion
with the church at Rome.

At the same time, however, the spirit of “Canon 29” of the Council of Laodicea was constantly
growing to put down and out the Sabbath, and to exalt the Sunday: the Sabbath made more and more a fast-
day and a day of church “affliction,” and fasting on Sunday made “anathema” and that day made more and
more the church favored day, with “masses” ordered to be “specially celebrated” on Sunday in 506.

THIRD PERIOD: SUNDAY EXCLUDING SABBATH

In 585 a Council at Macon in Gaul took the first definite step toward making Sunday a Sabbath in
place of The Sabbath. That Council declared of Sunday: “It is the day of perpetual rest” (of Hebrews fourth
chapter). “This is showed to us in the seventh day in the law and the prophets.”

And any disregarding it should incur the cumulative penalty of, first “the wrath of God,” and
secondly, “the unappeasable anger of the clergy.” In 602 Pope Gregory “the Great” put Rome a step further
forward toward the making of Sunday a Sabbath to the exclusion of The Sabbath. He wrote:

“It has come to my ears that certain men of perverse spirit have sown among you some things that
are wrong and opposed to the holy faith, so as to forbid any work being done on the Sabbath day. What
shall I call these but preachers of anti-Christ?”

He said that such teaching “would Judaize the people;” that “Christ is our Sabbath:” and that we
ought to abstain from worldly labor, and he diligent in prayer on Sunday, that we may expiate the
shortcomings of the other six days.”

In 596 Augustine wrote from Britain to Pope Gregory, that the Christians whom he found in
Britain were “given to judaizing” and “were ignorant of the holy sacraments and festivals of the church.”

That is to say: They observed the Sabbath and were ignorant of Sunday observance. In 664 Oswald, king of Northumberland, coached from Rome, ordered Sunday observance. And the Sabbath-keepers, led by “Colman the Culdee, rather than to submit, retired to Iona and then to Ireland:” where in their successors they continued till well into the nineteenth century, at least. In the time between 732 and 769 another step was taken in the making of Sunday a Sabbath to the exclusion of The Sabbath.

The archbishop of York made a compilation of “Selections from the Canons” in which there was taught that “the Sabbath was sanctified because of its reference to the suffering of Christ and His rest in the grave;” and that we “should keep a spiritual Sabbath on Sunday which has been sanctified by the resurrection.”

Still against all these things the Sabbath was observed in that church. For in 791 the Council of Friuli, in Italy, spoke of “the Sabbath” as the day observed “by the Jews and our rustics.” Not simply rustics, nor the rustics, but “our rustics:” which tells us that the Sabbath was still observed in the Roman church. However, that Council took the widest stride that had yet ever been made toward exalting Sunday to be the Sabbath. The Council declared that Sunday is “the Sabbath of the Lord” to which reference is made in Exodus 25:2, in the words: “Whosoever does work therein shall be put to death.” That is the first place and time in all the history of the world that Sunday is called “the Sabbath of the Lord.”

Yet even then Sunday was not held to be the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment; but only “the Sabbath of the Lord” to the exclusion of The Sabbath of the Lord. Twenty-two years afterward, still nearer approach was made to having the Sunday to be the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment: though even not yet quite in positive assertion. In 813 the Council of Rheims decreed that “according to the Lord’s Commandment” no one should “do any servile work on Sunday.”

In 829 the sixth Council of Paris set forth that “the pagans set apart certain days in honor of their gods;” that the Jews, whose manners were of a worldly sort “kept the Sabbath in a worldly fashion;” and that a custom had grown up among Christians, as a matter of religious observance, based upon an accredited apostolic tradition, and certainly on the authority of the church, to honor Sunday:

1. In memory of the Lord’s resurrection;
2. It was on that day that God gave light to the world;
3. The Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles;
4. As some doctors hold, the manna fell from heaven.

“These and other things of similar character plainly show that this day is more to be respected than others.”

Pope Nicholas 1, 858-867, declared that Sabbath keeping “is the doctrine of antichrist;” but Sunday keeping “is obligatory.” In 1069 the Christians of Scotland were still keeping only the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment: “Literally upon the seventh day of the week.” In that year Princess Margaret of England became the wife of the king of Scotland. “Her religion was of the newest Roman type.” She wrought “changes in the church of Scotland from the primitive type which down to her time it had exhibited.”

Among these changes was “the abolition” of the old practice of observing Saturday (Sabbath) not Sunday, as the day of rest from labor,” and “the prohibition of labor on the Lord’s day.” For which, and other such work, she was made a Roman saint. In the sixteenth century The Reformation prevailed so mightily that the General Council of Trent had to be called by the church of Rome to consider her situation. The strongest ground of the Protestants was their insistence that “the Bible, and the Bible only, is the true standard of faith and morals,” as against Rome’s claim of “the Bible and, tradition” as the true standard.

When the Council had assembled the Pope’s legates wrote to him that there was “strong tendency to set aside tradition altogether and to make Scripture the sole standard of appeal.” This was dangerous to Rome; for with her, “tradition” means not merely antiquity but “continuing inspiration” which is but another form of expressing “the infallibility” of the church. Something was urgently needed and must be had to save the day for Rome.

And this is what was done: At the opening of the session, January 18, 1562, “the archbishop of Rheggio made a speech in which he openly declared that tradition stands higher than the Bible.” The following is what he gave as the proof of it:

“This very authority of the church is most of all glorified by the Holy Scriptures.

“By the same authority, the church, the legal precepts of the Lord contained in the Holy Scriptures have ceased. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been merged in the Lord’s day.

“This day and similar institutions have not ceased in consequence of the preaching of Christ (for
He says that He did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it -

“But yet they have been changed, and that solely by the authority of the church.

“For this reason alone the authority of the church cannot be bound to the authority of the Scriptures, because the former has changed the Sabbath into Sunday-not by the commandment of Christ, but solely on her own authority.

“Now if this authority should be done away with (which would please the heretics very much), who would there be to testify for the truth and confound the obstinancy of the heretics?” There was no escape from this by the Protestants. For in their own confession of faith not long before they had clearly admitted that the observance of the Lord’s day had been appointed by “the church” only.

In this they had confessed that they held not “the Bible, and the Bible alone,” but clearly “the Bible and the authority of the church,” which is but the Bible and tradition, with the tradition above the Bible: which is Rome’s own ground. This confirmed the archbishop’s conclusion, “destroyed the last illusion,” unified the Council on “the Bible and tradition” and saved Rome to herself. Then by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, 1567, Rome at last makes Sunday to be the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. And here is how was turned this crowning trick of the original delusion of “two days in seven.”

“The proper meaning of the Commandment tends to this: That a man give himself up at some fixed time, so that, disengaged from bodily labor and business, he may piously worship and adore God.”

And as that church had made Sunday that particularly “fixed time,” there you have it! And thus Sunday was made the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment! And there is the crowning trick as well as the design and continuous purpose in that original and long-continued play of the delusion of “two days in seven.” And from that day to this, in all cities and nations there has been everlasting pressure by law more and more law, and yet ever more law, to compel all people to honor and observe the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment of God in observance of the Sunday of the mystery of iniquity; false Protestants even outdoing Romanists in this very thing, and these days working hand in hand together.

THE SECRET

The plain result of the invention and venture of two days in seven was completely to supplant the Sabbath of the Lord and utterly exclude it from its place in the law and purpose of God. And though there were more than a hundred separate acts, canons, decrees, etc., each one of which was essential to accomplish it, and all apparently disconnected and many of them many years apart, yet when the whole story is drawn out and read together it is as straight all the way and as direct from the first step to the final as if a directing mind and purpose had intelligently been held over it at the beginning and all the way through.

And there is the secret of this thing: there was such a mind and Purpose-just that purpose. Let me illustrate this, in the contrast of a parallel:

The Bible, in its structure, covers a period of about sixteen hundred years. It is composed of sixty-six books written promiscuously all the way from the beginning to the end of the period. These books just as they now stand as books, were written by more than thirty separate men scattered through the sixteen hundred years. No two of these men wrote together or collaborated the books that they produced. Each one in his day and way wrote what he had to tell. From the first to the last each one wrote his story just as if there were no other writer in the world. Yet the sixty six books thus written promiscuously through the sixteen hundred years tell as straightforward and connected a story as if only one mind had indited it directly from the first word to the last. And there is the secret of it: one Mind did indite it from the first word to the last. And that one mind is the Mind of God manifest through the Holy Spirit and Spirit of Truth and Righteousness unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

This “two-days-in-seven” story covers a period of about fourteen hundred years. From first to final it is composed of more than a hundred separate ecclesiastical acts, canons, decrees, and laws and orders of kings, etc. No two of these were in collusion: each one was itself done in its time and place, sometimes with only a few years between, often with many Years between.

Yet when these many separated and promiscuously scattered items through the fourteen hundred years are set down in order of their succession and read together from first to final, there is told one plain story as connected and direct as if one mind had lived through the whole fourteen hundred years and had shaped the story from the first step to the final one; and the final one clearly the culmination of a purpose- and just that purpose in the first step. And there is the secret of it: one mind did live through that whole period and did shape the story from the first step to the final one, with that culmination the direct purpose at
the beginning.

That story is but one of the threads of the purple and scarlet and gold of the revelation of the mystery of iniquity. The mystery of iniquity is the revelation of Satan through the man of sin. The mind of the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, is the mind of Satan. The one mind reaching over the fourteen hundred years of this story of the two days in seven to its culmination in the Sunday supplanting the Sabbath of the Lord in the law and purpose of God—that one mind is the mind of Satan, that purpose is the purpose of Satan.

There is no other mind revealed in the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity. 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, 7-8; Revelation 12:9; 13:1-4. There is no other mind that reaches actively over a period of fourteen hundred years, that works everlastingly in opposition to God as in this scheme and story of the two days in seven in particular and in the man of sin in general. And that mind has not stopped working that trick of the two days in seven.

That trick was originally played on the professed Sabbath-keepers expressly to get them to straddle with the error and to compromise with the author of it, so that when the time would come, even though it be little by little and that final be long delayed, the spirit of compromise would still reign and it be easy to go with the tide of popularity and power.

THE TRUE WITNESSES

But thank the Lord, also as in the beginning of that age-lasting trick and scheme of two days in seven and all the way along there were true Christians observing the Sabbath of the Lord and of His Christ who never did and never would compromise, and never for a moment would entertain any scintilla of righteousness or propriety in the additional day “given to the Lord” by any trick or force of “the power from beneath;” but always stood straight with God and true to His truth.

So now in this time of the culmination of the whole thing and of all things, again there are and will be Christians who will observe the Sabbath of the Lord and of His Christ, and who never will compromise with that age-lasting palpable trick and clearly exposed scheme of “giving Sunday to the Lord” and of “two days in seven.”

These in this time will stand straight with God and His truth. They will not put Satan’s crowning error on an equality with God’s crowning truth to the honoring of Satan equally with God. And as before and always these true and faithful witnesses will be persecuted by the straddlers and the compromisers as by all the others of that realm. “But he that endures to the end, the same shall be saved.”

THE SUM

The sum of the whole story is this: When in His own wisdom and of His own will the Lord chose and instituted a day as his own, one day was enough. That day—the Lord’s own chosen and ordained Sabbath day—through the trick of two days in seven the man of sin took from Him and “cast down to the ground” and “stamped upon,” and “on his own authority” gave to the Lord the Sunday to be the Lord’s day—the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment and of God’s eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Yet all the time the Lord had but one day—His own chosen and established one day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Though by the straddling compromise many did profess to give Him both days, yet when the real pressure came all of these yielded to only the one day of the man of sin. And this yielding was already near when they were willing to straddle and to compromise. No observer of the Sabbath of the Lord ever did, and no one ever can, observe the two days in truth. The Sabbath is wholly spiritual: the Sabbath—the rest—of the Lord thy God.

The observance of the Sabbath is wholly spiritual. It is wholly unto God who is Spirit, and in the Spirit and truth of God. Any compromise even in spirit, in heart, or wish, is just then and in itself an abandonment of the Sabbath in truth: and after that, all that remain., is the mere form of the law and of Godliness. By the power of the Spirit of truth the Sabbath of the Lord and of His Christ, His own chosen and ordained day, is to be rescued from the place where the man of sin has cast it, and restored to the Lord and to men as the Lord’s own one true day. And thus by right the Lord comes into His own again. By His own will and word He has again and forever His own originally chosen and instituted one day.

But now by the cooperation of Rome and Protestant organizations, false catholic and false Protestant, “the Lord is again to have two days. The “gift” of the institution of the man of sin is to be the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, and The Sabbath of the Lord is to be the festival day in preparation for the observance of the institution of the man of sin as “the day for worship.”
For worship of whom? And so at last is to be fulfilled the bad ambition of the usurper who “thought” to exalt and oppose himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he as God sits in the temple of God showing himself that he is God. Will you help the “power from beneath” to reach that iniquitous goal? You will, or you will not. And there is no middle ground. For it is written:

“Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shall thou serve.” Matthew 4:10. A mighty conflict for supremacy is waging between the temporal powers. But a mightier far is waging between the spiritual powers.

4. INDEPENDENT OF GOD

In our last chapter there were given the unquestionable facts that demonstrate that one mind was steadily and directly engaged for fourteen hundred years, through the Roman church, in getting Sunday into the Fourth Commandment as the Sabbath of the Lord and of that Commandment. And it is plain that this persistent mind is the mind of Satan and could not possibly be any other. Now attention is called to the consideration that when Satan would spend that much time and effort to get the Sabbath of the Lord out of its place and meaning in the law and purpose of God,

Then that certainly is convincing evidence that in the Sabbath of the Lord as in the law and purpose of God there is something which Satan is concerned in getting out of the sight, and away from the knowledge of men. And when in the Sabbath of the Lord there is that which caused Satan so persistently to spend so much time and effort to put it out of the sight and knowledge of men. Then this should be convincing evidence to every person, and to every Christian above all, that in the Sabbath of the Lord there is that which is of supreme importance to him, and which he can well count worthy of his most considerate attention. This is why we deal with the subject.

When the manifestation of “the man of sin,” “the mystery of iniquity,” is so largely wrapped up in getting Sunday into the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, and in compelling all people, heathen and Christian alike, by every means and every force available, to accept it and observe it as the Sabbath of the Lord. Then it is not only perfectly fitting, but highly necessary, that there should be made known the manifestation of the Man of Righteousness, the Mystery of God, as wrapped up in The Sabbath of the Lord in its own place. When Sunday observance as the Sabbath is constantly urged upon all people everywhere and by every means, no apology can ever be in order anywhere for the fullest possible telling of what The Sabbath of the Lord really is as in the Fourth Commandment and everywhere else in the word of God.

SABBATH FIRST EVERYWHERE

The facts have been cited which show that for more than a thousand years after the ascension of Christ, in every land the Sabbath of the Lord was originally observed by Christians; and that till as late as AD 416 the Sunday was celebrated in addition to the Sabbath by almost all the churches throughout the world.

It was in the churches in Rome and Alexandria-spiritual Babylon and Egypt-that the observance of the Sabbath first “ceased” among people and churches claiming to be Christian. And from there this cessation gradually spread as the power of Rome grew. For wherever that power came, and to the extent that it could be exerted, the observance of the Sabbath was caused to cease and to be crushed out. But it never was entirely excluded. Always there have been faithful and true witnesses for God against Rome. All the power of federation and confederation of both Romanism and Puritanism could not stop it. And now all the power of federation and confederation of both Romanism and false Protestantism combined, and with all the Power of all the nations in their hands. cannot cause it to cease.

WHO IS SOVEREIGN?

By the whole record on this question it is certain that both the church of Rome and the Protestant organizations have assumed the power and exercised the authority to change the law of the Most High God, from His thought, and word to their own. And they both deny the right of any one to observe that Law as the Most High God Himself has spoken it; and seek to compel everyone to accept it and observe it as they have changed it.

And how could even they more fully manifest the spirit of exaltation above God and of independence of Him? For is it ever the province of the -subject to change the law and supplant the
authority of the sovereign, unless the subject is ready to assert independence of the sovereign? It is a
recognized principle in law and governmental procedure, and regarded in history, that for a subject or
subordinate community to re-enact, especially with changes, a law made by the supreme authority for the
governing of the subject community, is “tantamount to declaration of independence.”

An illustration: In 1698, Ireland was a possession of Britain. The English colonists in Ireland were
the ruling power there, and had a parliament—Lords and Commons—of their own: a sort of home rule. This
local parliament, “the Irish Lords and Commons, had presumed not only to reenact an English Act passed
expressly for the purpose of binding them, but to reenact it with alterations. “The alterations were indeed
small; but the alteration of even a letter was tantamount to a declaration of independence.

“The colony of Ireland was emphatically a dependency: a dependency not merely by the common
law of the realm, but by the nature of things. It was absurd to claim independence for a community which
could not cease to be dependent without ceasing to exist.” -Macaulay. The law of God—the Ten
Commandments—was enacted expressly for the purpose of binding the persons of the church of Rome and
the Protestant churches, equally with all other people. “For the kingdom is the Lord’s; and He is Governor
among the nations.” Psalm 22:28; “And His Kingdom rules over all.” Psalm 103:19.

DEPENDENCIES

The church of Rome and the Protestant churches are each dependencies. They are dependencies in
the nature of things. They are such dependencies that they could not cease to be dependent without ceasing
to exist. Therefore their alteration of the law of God, by putting Sunday the first day of the week into the
Fourth Commandment which says that the Seventh day is the Sabbath, and their readiness to compel all
people by law and force to accept and obey their alteration of that Law and Commandment, is nothing less
than a declaration of their independence of God.

For what could be more absurd than this fluke by people and things that cannot cease to be
dependent without ceasing to exist? And it is now a present and very pertinent question for all people to
decide: Whether they will be loyal and obedient to the law and government of the most High God, as He
Himself has declared and written His own Law, or Whether they will recognize and follow as valid this
absurd assertion of independence by people and things that can cease to be dependent only by ceasing to
exist?

THE REAL ISSUE

It is in the view of this very principle of law and government that the Lord Jesus, the truly loyal,
said: “Think not that I am come to destroy the Law. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass
one jot or tittle shall in nowise pass from the Law.” Matthew 5:17-18. Also this is the principle involved in
the prophecy of Daniel 7 that tells of a power that would come into the world, that would—
“Speak great words against the Most High, and
“Shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and
“Shall think to change the times and the law.” Verse 25, ASV.

There are the two ways, and the respective leaders in the two ways: and there is no other way.
Accordingly on the question of Sabbath or Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment of the Law
of the Most High, the real issue is the simple but mighty one of Loyalty to God, or Independence of God.

THE RESURRECTION NOT ON SUNDAY

In our first chapter there were reprinted and reviewed the “reasons” that through the ages have
been offered for the observance of Sunday. And sober examination showed that not a single one of them is
any reason at all; but that all of them are empty inventions, falsifications of Scripture, and falsifications of
both facts and Scripture.

One of these “reasons” had to be carried over to this chapter for consideration: that is, the “reason”
that on that day “Christ rose from the dead. And it was then remarked that this “reason” is of the same
piece as all the rest: that its being found in the company of all the others is of itself strong evidence that it
springs from the same source as all the others.

Now this “reason” will be examined for just what may he in it, and for just what it is worth. And
this is needed: and particularly just now, when there is being made the greatest possible campaign to have
the “strict observance” of Sunday enforced upon all by law, and more law, and still more law.
First of all, then, let the truth be stated that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all alike say that “early” and “very early” on the first day of the week; and even as early as the “dusk toward the first day of the week,” the women came to the sepulchre only to find that Jesus was already risen and gone.

Certainly in that there is neither statement nor suggestion that He arose on that day.

MATTHEW

The word by Matthew is: “In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, the women came to the sepulchre, and He was gone.

The ASV here reads: “Now late on the Sabbath day as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.”

The New Testament, a literal, word for word interlinear reading is: “Now late on the Sabbath as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week.”

And in all of that there is neither statement nor evidence that the Lord arose on the first day of the week. Instead of that the plain word is: In the end of the Sabbath,” “Late on the Sabbath day,” and “on Sabbath as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week,” the women came to the sepulchre and He was already risen and gone.

All that is here told, occurred “on the Sabbath,” 9ate on the Sab. bath,” “as it began to dawn,” or “was getting dusk,” toward the first day of the week. It all occurred “on the Sabbath,” and the Lord was then risen - and gone. It is perfectly certain, then, that He did not rise on the first day of the week.

MARK

The word by Mark is: “And when the Sabbath was past, -’Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint Him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.” And they found the sepulchre vacant, except for the angel who told them that the Lord was risen and gone.

In the ASV, the only variation from this is: “Very early on the first day of the week, they came to the tomb when the sun was risen.”

The New Testament interlinear reading is: “And very early on the first day of the week they came to the tomb, the sun having risen.”

LUKE

The word by Luke is: “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spice which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in and found not the body of Jesus.”

The ASV reads: “But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared. And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. And they entered in and found not the body of Jesus.”

The New Testament interlinear is: “But on the first day of the week at early dawn they came to the tomb bringing the aromatics which they had prepared, and some other with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb; and having entered they found not the body of the Lord Jesus.”

JOHN

The word by John is: “The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, while it was yet
dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.”

The ASV is: “Now on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, while it was yet dark, unto the tomb, and seeth the stone taken from the tomb.”

The New New Testament interlinear: “But on the first day of the week Mary the Magdalene comes early it being still dark to the tomb, and sees the stone taken away from the tomb.”

In all of this that is said by the four Evangelists, there is not a word that says or implies that the Lord arose on the first day of the week. All that is there said of the first day of the week or relating to it, is that on the first day of the week -the women came to the tomb and found not the body of the Lord Jesus because He was risen and gone.

All that is said is of what the women did, and what they found, on the first day of the week: with not a word of anything that Jesus did. And one of them says plainly, “on the Sabbath as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week,” when the women came He was even then already risen and gone.

Of all the persons mentioned who came “early” and “very early” the first day of the week to the tomb, not one of them was there early enough to find the Lord Jesus there, or to find Him rising; but only to find Him already risen and gone.
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Nobody was ever able to get to the tomb of Christ early enough on the first day of the week to find the Lord Jesus there or to find Him rising. And that nobody ever could have got to that tomb early enough on the ‘ie certain first day of the week to find Him there, or to find Him rising is m. by the word written by Matthew, that:

“Late on Sabbath as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week, came Mary the Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre;” and the angel said to them “He is not here, for He is risen.”

By the unanimous voice of these Scriptures of the four Evangelists, it is perfectly certain that the Lord Jesus did not rise from the dead on the first day of the week.

The truth of all this is witnessed by the unerring testimony of the heavens, as follows:

NAVAL DEPARTMENT
U. S. NAVAL OBSERVATORY
Washington, D. C.

September 17, 1920 Sir:

In reply to your letter of September 14, you are informed that the first full moon after the vernal equinox of A.D. 31, occurred on Tuesday March 27, at 11 A.M. Julian Calendar. By direction of the Superintendent, U. S. Naval Observatory.

Very Respectfully,
W. S. EICHELBERGER,
Captain, (Math.) U. S. Navy,
Director Nautical Almanac

Mr. Russell F. Barton, Waterbury, Vt.

The full moon being at 11 A.M. on Tuesday, that night was the Passover Supper, and Wednesday the Passover Day, on which “Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us,” in the Crucifixion.

Three days and three nights from then brings us exactly to the time, “late on the Sabbath, as it began to grow dusk toward the first day of the week,” when Matthew says that He was risen.

There is just one other Scripture that speaks on this subject. It is Mark 16:9, which reads thus: “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.’
The ASV: “Now when He was risen early on the first day of the week He appeared to Mary Magdalene.”

The New New Testament, interlinear: “Now having risen early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary the Magdalene.”
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“How Reatest Thou”

Upon this, the sole question is, Shall this passage be made to contradict the evidence of all four of the others, or shall it be allowed to stand in perfect harmony with the unanimous voice of them all?

Either of these two things can be done with the passage, and this without moving or changing a single word or letter. Which shall be done?

In view of the list of “reasons” for Sunday observance which have been invented and reprinted in our first chapter, it is very easy to see which of these two things would be done by those who made all these other forced and crooked uses of Scripture and of things that are not Scripture. Inevitably those persons would make the use of it that would support their purpose to distinguish the Sunday: and would not stop for any such consideration as that thus the passage would be made to contradict the unanimous evidence of all the others. As our first chapter shows they were engaged in just that kind of business.

But with all who would care for only the truth of the matter, it would be perfectly easy to allow the passage to stand and read in full harmony with the unanimous evidence of the four others.

Here is how it can be made to contradict the evidence of all the others: “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

Here is how it can be allowed to stand exactly as it was written and to read in perfect harmony with the unanimous evidence of all the others: “Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

The writers of the Scriptures, and all other writers in those times, and even for hundreds of years after, used no punctuation. The Introduction to the New New Testament, interlinear, says: “There is no authority anywhere for the punctuation.”

This passage, Mark 16:9, the New New Testament prints thus: “Now having risen early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary the Magdalene, from whom He had cast out seven demons.”

When there is no authority anywhere for the punctuation, it never can be correct to apply or to follow a punctuation that makes a passage of Scripture contradict the evidence of all the other passages on the same subject: as is none when a comma is placed after the word “week” in Mark 16:9.

The TRUE WAY

And it never can be anything else than perfectly correct and right to punctuate and to read Mark 16:9 in the way that will allow it to stand and to tell what it was written to tell in perfect harmony with the unanimous evidence of all the other passages on the same subject.

And this true way is plainly thus. “Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

25 That tells the truth according to the whole word of God on the subject.

The other falsifies the word according to the whole list of papal “reasons” for the recognition and observance of Sunday.
The Council of Trent seems to have been conscious of the inherent and fatal weakness of the structure of those many fallacies and falsities of the “reasons” for Sunday as the Sabbath; for there these “reasons” were all absolutely abandoned as if they had never been heard of; and all claim in behalf of Sunday was put absolutely on the naked “authority of the church:” „solely on her own authority.”

This was consistent too, even though it be the consistency of iniquity. For when from beginning to end the whole list of “arguments” and “reasons” that had been invented for the support of Sunday observance was but one solid string of fallacies and falsities and lies outright, then all the authority for it, after all, that there could be was only the authority of the church that could manufacture such an array of fallacies and falsities and lies out. right, and maintain an institution that was so constructed.

it is true that practically the whole of Christendom accepts and con. tinues the most of that list of papal “arguments” and “reasons” for Sunday observance. It is equally true that the word of God says to Rome: “By thy sorceries were all nations deceived:” and says to everybody else: “The inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.” Revelation 14:8; 17:2; 18:3; 18:23; 19:2.

It is time to sober up: with the pure water of the Word and Spirit of Life.

Sunday-sacredness is the most stupendous lie in the world.

NOTE 1

Some there are, members of a Sabbath keeping denomination, who object to the teaching in this chapter: insisting that the crucifixion was on Friday instead of Wednesday, and so the resurrection on Sunday.

This note is in answer to these and to all ot-tl–ers of that denomination who might think that our position is wrong. . In their own denominational standard book, The Desire of Ages, chapter 62, paragraph 3, is this word:

“The Saviour had reached Bethany only six days before the Passover, and according to His custom had sought rest at the home of Lazarus. The crowds of travelers, who passed on to the city, spread the tidings that He was on His way to Jerusalem and that He would rest over the Sabbath at Bethany. Among the people there was great enthusiasm. Many flocked to Bethany,” etc.

And in chapter 63, paragraph 3, stands the following:

“It was on the first day of the week that Christ made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Multitudes who had flocked to see Him at Bethany, now accompanied Him eager to witness His reception. Many people were on their way to the city to keep the passover, and these joined the multitude attending Jesus.”

Now there is Friday, the day that He “had reached Bethany;” and Sabbath, the day He rested at Bethany; and “the first day of the week,” on which He “made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem;” Friday, Sabbath, and Sunday, in direct succession.

And that Friday was “six days before the passover.” And this is exactly according to the Scripture. John 12A.

But it is simply and mathematically impossible to have Friday to be “six days before the passover,” and also to have the passover to be the next Friday: with its Sabbath to be the fifteenth, and Sunday the sixteenth, the day of the wave,sheaf. There are more than six days from Friday to Friday.

According to the position of these objectors, the fourteenth was Friday and Jesus died that day as the Passover Lamb. But Desire of Ages says that the Friday before was “six days before the passover:” and there is no possible way by which anybody can get two Fridays inside of seven days.

And not till two Fridays can be got inside of seven days, can Friday be the day of the crucifixion
and Sunday the day of the resurrection.

Also objection has been made to what I said as to the “full moon” the night beginning the Wednesday of the crucifixion. But in Desire of Ages, Chapter 74, first paragraph, and second sentence, there is this word:

“The passover moon, broad and full, shone from a cloudless sky,” upon Gethsemane as Jesus was praying there.

That “passover moon,” had become “broad and full” on Tuesday the thirteenth at 11 A.M., and could shine “broad and full” only on the night following. And with the moon “broad and full” on what would be our Tuesday night—the night beginning Wednesday—it could not possibly shine on what would be our Thursday night—the night beginning Friday.

Thus the crucifixion on Wednesday is put beyond all ground of doubt or fair question by the truth and the fact that “six days before the passover” was Friday, and this witnessed by the testimony of the heavens that the Passover moon became “broad and full” the following night while He was in Gethsemane whence He was taken and led about unto His crucifixion that very day, as “Christ our passover sacrificed for us.”

NOTE 2

In the Ferndale, Mich., Enterprise of March 23, 1921, we find the following:

Highland Park, Mich.

“To the Editor: Will you kindly assist me in the solution of a mathematical problem? As “Good Friday” approaches, doubtless you will have the leisure. Sometime this summer I wish to leave on a vacation and be gone ‘three days and three nights.’ I wish to leave Friday evening and be gone exactly the time specified and return ‘in the end of the Sabbath as it begins to dawn toward the first day of the week.’ “Can you suggest a solution to my problem?”

Respectfully,
Fred R. Hall.
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“The above problem, being considered a theological one, was handed to Rev. W. H. W-, pastor of the Evangelical Church, for solution, and his answer was as follows:

The above communication indicates a befogged mind.’

The problem there presented is exactly the problem that is presented by all the churches (that still hold to Friday crucifixion) in their claim that when Jesus went on a journey of “three days and three nights” to death and the tomb, He did it by starting Friday evening and returning “in the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn or grow dusk toward the first day of the week.”

It is evident that this is what the querist had in mind in presenting to the editor his problem. Now if Mr. Hall’s going on a vacation of “three days and three nights,” and leaving on Friday evening and being gone exactly the time specified, and returning “in the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week”—if the problem of how he is to accomplish that feat indicates a befogged mind, then what does that say of the mind that presents through the churches to all the people that identical problem in the journey of Jesus of “three days and three nights” to the tomb by starting Friday evening and returning Saturday evening as it was getting dusk toward Sunday?

Unquestionably the problem %indicates a befogged mind.” But how can that fog be in the mind of Mr. Hall when the great and wide, spreading celebration of “Good Friday” by the churches forced upon his attention this very problem?

And when the clergy have done that, and continue annually to rub it in, is it fair for them to flout
as the indication of “a befogged mind,” an innocent inquiry on the problem which they themselves have made and which they force upon the attention of the people every year!

The problem presented does indicate a befogged mind. But not in the inquirer.

NOTE 3

Question: “If the body of Jesus was entombed Wednesday evening, why did the women wait over both Thursday and Friday without coming with their sweet spices for anointing, and not come till “in the end of the Sabbath?” Would there not have been danger of decay having begun by that time?”

There are two facts recorded, that answer the two questions:

1. They could be sure that there was no danger of decay having begun because of the “about an hundred pound weight of myrrh and aloes” with which Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus had enswathed the body “in linen clothes” “as the manner of the Jews is to bury.” John 19:38-40.

2. They could know that it would be perfectly useless to go to the tomb earlier than they did: because of the Roman Seal and the Roman guard that had been set on the tomb till the end of three days. Matthew 27:62-66.

And the seal and the guard were there we know till “in the end of the Sabbath,” “late on the Sabbath day,” when the angel of the Lord descended from Heaven and rolled back the stone, “and for fear of him the keepers did shake and become as dead men.” Matthew 28:1,4.

The Scripture record is straight, consistent, and complete, when you take it all. Study the Bible.

NOTE 4

Some try to have the resurrection of the Lord and Pentecost both on the first day of the week because the wave-sheaf of the firstfruits and the fiftieth day afterward were both “on the morrow after the Sabbath.” Leviticus 23:11,16.

But the morrow after the sabbath, was not the morrow after the Sabbath of the Lord; but the morrow after the feast-day Sabbath of the first day of the feast of unleavened bread.

These were annual celebrations, and so could not be always on the first day of the week-the morrow after the Sabbath of the Lord. The wavesheaf offering was on the sixteenth day of the month always: and the Pentecost was fifty days from the sixteenth day of the month always.

The fourteenth day of the first month was the Lord’s passover: and was variable as to the day of the week, as is every annual celebration.

The fifteenth day of the first month, was the first day of the feast of unleavened bread and a sabbath—“an holy convocation” with “no servile work therein.”

Then the sixteenth day of this first month—the morrow after the sabbath of the first day of the feast of unleavened bread—was the day of the wave, sheaf. But this was not the morrow after the Sabbath of the Lord, unless when the sixteenth day of this month happened to come on the Sabbath: once n seven years. And then it was not the morrow after the Sabbath of the Lord because it was the Sabbath of the Lord: but because it was the sixteenth day of the first month and the first day of the feast of unleavened bread and a feast-day sabbath.

And so the count went on for seven weeks to the fiftieth day from that sixteenth day of the first month—the morrow after the feast-day sabbath of the fifteenth day of the first month, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread.

Accordingly the Jewish Bible reads: “And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the first day of rest, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the waving, seven weeks shall there be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh week shall ye number fifty days.” Leviticus 23:15. It was called “the feast of weeks,” as well as Pentecost.

VI
A LITTLE BIBLE STUDY
In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.”

ASV (American Standard Version): “Now late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.”

New New Testament, interlinear: “Now late on Sabbath as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week.”

There are the three readings of Matthew 28A, telling when the first women—“Mary Magdalene and the other Mary”—came to the sepulchre of the Lord Jesus, and the angel of the Lord said to them, “He is not here: He is risen, as He said.” Matthew 28:6.

Now when was it when those two women came there? What does the Scripture say?

Answer: “In the end of the Sabbath.” “Tate on the Sabbath day.” “Late on Sabbath.”

Whether it was “in the end” of the day, or “late on” the day or whatever part of the day, that they came there? What day was it?

Answer: “The Sabbath,” “the Sabbath day ... . Sabbath,” “in the Sab. bath,” “on the Sabbath day,” “on Sabbath.”

Beyond all question, then, the word of the Inspiration of God says, and so fixes it, that the day when those two women came there was “the Sabbath ... . the Sabbath day.” It was “in” the Sabbath day and “on” the Sabbath day when they came: though it was “in the end of the Sabbath” and “late on the Sabbath day.” But whether late or early, it was “in the Sabbath” and “on the Sabbath day” when they came. That never can be denied.

And when they got there, “in” and “on” “the Sabbath day,” the angel of the Lord said to them, “I know that ye seek Jesus which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said.”

Therefore, when the word of God says that it was “in” the Sabbath and “on the Sabbath day” when those women came to the sepulchre: and when at the same time “in” the Sabbath and “on” the Sabbath day the angel of the Lord said to them, ‘We is not here: for He is risen, as He said,”

Then can anybody possibly have any difficulty in knowing that it was “in” the Sabbath and “on” the Sabbath day when the Lord Jesus arose from the dead?

And how did His resurrection stand related to the first day of the week?

Answer: “In the end of the Sabbath,” Tate on the Sabbath day,” “as it began to dawn,” “as it was getting dusk, toward the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary.”

“In the end of the Sabbath” and “late on the Sabbath day,” is that in or on the first day of the week?

“The beginning to dawn toward, the getting dusk toward, the first day of the week.” is that in or on the first day of the week?

Is the beginning toward a day, the same as in or on that day?

Nobody in the world can honestly answer “Yes” to these questions,

And even if somebody should dishonestly do it, not even by that could he find the resurrection of the Lord Jesus there; for at that point he would meet the word of the angel of the Lord, “We is not here: for He is risen, as He said.”

Therefore, according to the sure word of God, nobody was ever able to get to the sepulchre of Christ early enough in or on the first day of the week to find Him there or to find Him rising—but only to find Him already risen and gone.

And nobody ever was, or ever can be, able to get to the first day of the week early enough to find
it to be the resurrection day of the Lord Jesus.

Indeed, nobody was able to get to that sepulchre so near to “the end of the Sabbath,” or so late on
the Sabbath day” as to find Him there: but even then only to meet the word of the angel, ‘We is not here:
for He is risen, as He said.’

And so certainly must Mark 16:9, to tell the truth, be read, “Now when Jesus was risen, early the
first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

ANOTHER LITTLE BIBLE STUDY

By Mark the word stands written: “And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they
came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away
the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

“And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away. for it was very great.
“And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on
the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted.
And E’c said unto them, Be not affrighted. Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which
was crucified, He is risen. He is not here. Behold the place where they
laid Him.”

When was it that those women came to the sepulchre? Answer: “The first day of the week.”
What time was it in the first day of the week that they came? Answer: ‘Very early in the morning
at the rising of the sun.”

What was their inquiry as they went? Answer: Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of
the sepulchre?

What was the answer to their query? Answer: “They saw that the stone was rolled away.”
Whom did they find in the sepulchre? Answer: “Entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young
man sitting on the right side, clothed in 1 long white garment.”

What did he tell them? Answer: “Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified. He is risen. He
is not here. Behold where they laid Him.”

Does that record say that Jesus arose on the first day of the week? Answer . . .

What does it say of the first day of the week? Answer: ---Very early in the morning of the first day
of the week” the women came to the sepulchre and found it open and a young man sitting, therein who told
them “He is risen. He is not here.”

Is there not a considerable difference between that and saying that He arose on the first day of
the week?

Then by that record can anybody truthfully say that He arose on the first day of the week?

The word by Luke is, “upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto
the sepulchre . . . and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.

“And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And . . . beholdc! two men stood
by them in shining garments; and . . . they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is
not here. He is risen.”

When does that record say that the women came to the sepulchre? Answer: “Upon the first day of
the week.”

What time on the first day of the week? Answer: “Very early in the morning.”

When they arrived there what did they find? Answer: “They found the stone rolled away from
the sepulchre,” and the sepulchre open, so that “they entered in.”

Did they find the body of Jesus? Answer: “They found not the body of the Lord Jesus.”
Whom did they find? “Two men in shining garments.”
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What did these men say? Answer: “Why seek ye the Living among the dead? He is not here; but is risen.”
Did they say that He had risen on the first day of the week?

What does it say that occurred on the first day of the week? Answer: That the women came to the sepulchre, and the “two men” said “He is not here; but is risen.”

Is there not a material difference between that, and saying that He arose from the dead on the first day of the week?

Then in the record by Luke can anybody find anything by which he can truthfully say that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week?
The word by John is: “The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.” John 20:1.

Does that say that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week?

Does it say a single thing about Jesus.

What does it say of the first day of the week, and whom does it mention? Answer: “The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark.”

Is there not a vast difference between that, and saying that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week?

Then from the record by John can anybody say by the word of truth, that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week?
The word by Matthew is, “In the end of the Sabbath,” “late on the Sabbath day.” ASV., “as it began to dawn toward,” “as it was getting dusk toward,” the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.

“And behold! there was a great earthquake; for the angel of the Lord descended from Heaven and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and become as dead men.

“And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead. Matthew 28:1-7.

What day was it that this occurred? Answer: “The Sabbath,” “on the Sabbath day.”

What time “in the Sabbath” or “on the Sabbath day” did it occur? Answer: “In the end of the Sabbath,” “late on the Sabbath day.”

Whom did they meet there? Answer: “The angel of the Lord” who had rolled back the stone and was sitting on it.

What did he say to them? Answer: “I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen as He said.”

Does this record say that Jesus rose from the dead on the first day of the week?

Is there a single word in it about Jesus, till the angel speaks it to tell them that he knew that -they were seeking Jesus, and that He was not therebut was risen?

It is evident that there were several and separate comings of the women; even of some of the same women: to the sepulchre. Note the respective statements:

In Matthew: “The angel of the Lord descended from Heaven, and came and rolled back the stone
from the door, and sat upon it:” one angel, sitting upon the stone. 28:2,5.

In Mark: “Entering into the sepulchre, they saw a (one) young man sitting on the right side clothed in a long white garment.” 163.


In John: “She stooped down and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the foot, where the body of Jesus had lain.” 20:11,12.

We may not be able clearly to distinguish each one of these throughout; but that it is so; relieves much of the difficulty that many have in placing the events as the four records run.

By these four records, the word of truth tells plainly that:
1. On the first day of the week, “at the rising of the sun,” the Lord was risen and not there. Mark 16:2,6.
2. The first day of the week, “very early in the morning” He was not there, but had risen. Luke 24:1,6.
3. The first day of the week, “when it was yet dark,” the stone was taken away and the sepulchre was empty. John 20:1-2.
4. “In the end of the Sabbath,” 9ate on the Sabbath day,” “as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week,” the stone was found rolled back and Jesus not there, for He had risen. Matthew 28:1,2,6.

There, from “at the risin. of the sun” the morning of the first day of the week, clear back through th; night unto 9ate on the Sabbath day” before, the whole time is covered and exhausted without a single word to the effect that the Lord Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week.

And this series of statements of the word of Truth, covering all the night of the first day of the week, back from sunrise of the first day of the week to the “getting dusV “on the Sabbath” “toward the first day of the weeV -

All of this absolutely excludes all true thought of His having risen on the first day of the week; and so definitely corrects the reading of Mark 16:9 to this:

“Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene.”

That tells the truth according to all the four full records and all the facts: and that is the truth of the case.

And again it can be said, and with greater eiriphasis and assurance, that whether on account of the “resurrection of the Lord Jesus” or on any other account, Sunday-sacredness is the most stupendous lie in the world.

VIII
THE TRUE SABBATH

In this time of the widespread and persistent demand by the church of Rome, aided and abetted by professed Protestants that the Sunday shall he observed as “the Sabbath,” by force of law upon all the people, it is only proper that for The Sabbath itself there should be something said.

The fundamental and peculiarly distinctive principles of all that is Protestant in truth, of the Reformation that put into the world the word Protestant, are just these three:
1. The Word of God. 1 The whole Word of God.
3. Nothing but the Word of God.

Upon these principles how stand the respective claims of the Sabbath and the Sunday?

First, The Word of God:
There is the Word of God for the Sabbath.
There is no word of God for the Sunday.
Secondly, The Whole Word of God:
The whole Word from beginning to end is for the Sabbath.
From beginning to end there is no word of God for the Sunday.

Thirdly, Nothing but the Word of God:
With nothing but the Word of God, the Sabbath stands in its full glory and majesty.
With nothing but the Word of God, the Sunday has no standing at all.

Another of the peculiarly distinctive principles of all that is Protestant is Righteousness, the Righteousness of God, by Faith: “By the obedience of One shall many he made righteous.” Romans 5:19.
It is only by the obedience of Christ that any soul can ever he made righteous with the Righteousness of God: and none but the Righteousness of God can ever avail.
There is obedience of Christ His whole lifetime to Sabbath observance, to supply every soul with the Righteousness of God in that. And so Sabbath observance can be, and it is, altogether of the works of God and of the Righteousness of God which is by faith.

There is absolutely no obedience of Christ in Sunday observance, ever to make any soul righteous in that. And so Sunday observance has to be, and it is, altogether of man’s own works and never can be of faith. And “whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.” Romans 14:23.

Accordingly Sunday observance never can he of the Reformation, never can he Protestant, never can be Christian: while on every principle Sabbath observance is required by the Reformation, by all that is Protestant, and by all that is Christian.

Take the Christian principle that all duty is commanded: “When ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do,” Luke 17:10.
No man can ever do more than his duty; and all duty is commanded.

Sabbath observance is distinctly commanded by God, and throughout all the Word is emphasized. But nowhere and not in any way from God is Sunday observance commanded. To do it is to do what was never commanded of God, and so is to do more than duty.

To be able to do more than duty, by doing what is not commanded, would enable man to balance up on his failures to do in all things what is commanded, and so to save himself.

And this is precisely the doctrine and the principle of Sunday observance: as set forth by Pope Gregory in 602. He said that we ought to abstain from worldly labor and be diligent in prayer on Sunday, “that we may expiate the shortcomings of the other six days.”

And there, in the papal system and essentially of it, is exactly where Sunday observance belongs as its native home. and not in any sense with the Reformation nor with Christianity.

IX
THE CHRISTIAN’S SABBATH

It stands written: “There remaineth therefore a rest-keeping the Sabbath (margin),-to the people of God.” Hebrews 4:9.
ASV: “There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God.”

Syriac Version: “Therefore it is established that the people of God are to have a Sabbath.”

This keeping of Sabbath that “remaineth,” this Sabbath that remaineth to be kept is the Sabbath of “the seventh day.” Verse 4.

It is the same day in which God rested when He finished His work at the foundation of the world. There it was “established” for mankind to enter into, and ever since it has “remained” for the same purpose. Verses 3-6.

It was there for the first Adam to enter into, but he failed to enter into it.

It remained for Israel to enter into when they were brought out of Egypt in God’s purpose to fulfill His oath to Abraham. Hebrews 3:7-11, 16,19; Acts 7:17; Genesis 50:24-25.

Israel failed to enter into it then, and it remained for them to enter into it in the days of David,
when God would fulfill through Solomon and in the One greater than Solomon, His oath unto David. But again Israel failed to enter into it: even Solomon himself taking the lead away from God. Yet still that rest of God, that “keeping of a Sabbath,” remained to the people of God.
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Then came the Lord Jesus “The Man” of God’s eternal purpose, “The last Adam,” “The Seed of Abraham,” and “The Son of David,” and He did not fail. He entered into God’s rest in the keeping of the Sabbath, which from the foundation of the world had remained for that purpose: and He entered into God’s rest in “the world to come,” of which God’s rest in the Sabbath is the beginning and foretaste “to the people of God.”

And He showed the way, He consecrated the way, He is the Way, into God’s rest in this wild world of sin, and through God’s rest in this world into God’s rest in the world to come.

In entering into this rest we cease from our own works “As God did from His.” Hebrews 4:10. In ceasing from His own works “God did rest the seventh day.” Hebrews 4:4. In ceasing from our own works to enter into His rest, we cannot do it “as God did” without doing it as He did and entering into His “rest the seventh day.”

Not to cease from our works on the seventh day “as God did from His,” but to cease some other day, is not to do “as God did:” but is to do as somebody else did.

By the plain Word of God, therefore, “There remaineth the keeping of the Sabbath to the people of God;” and this Sabbath is “the seventh day” on which “God did rest from all His works.”

The life of Jesus is the Way for all mankind, and the Way of all Christians. It is the life of Jesus that saves sinners. Romans 5:10. It is the life of Jesus that is to be manifested in Christians: even “in our mortal flesh” while we are in this body. 2 Corinthians 4:10-11; Galatians 2:20; Colossians 1:27; Romans 5:19.

The Sabbath of the Lord in the very spirit and truth of it, and in the perfect spirit and truth of the keeping of it, is essentially of the life of Jesus. For Jesus kept the Sabbath in spirit and in truth, and in His own beauty of holiness, during His whole life on earth.

Therefore the Sabbath and the keeping of it belongs essentially in the life of every Christian. Without this, the life of the believer is unlike the life of Jesus. And wherein any life is unlike the life of Jesus, just to that extent it comes short of being the true Christian life. Wherefore the life of Jesus in the believer never can be perfected without the keeping of the Sabbath here.

X

THE SABBATH OF THE LORD

What is the Sabbath of the Lord? What is its purpose to men? What is its meaning to the universe? The word “Sabbath” is Hebrew, and in English is rest.

As “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God” it is “the rest of the Lord thy God.”
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Thus the Sabbath is God’s rest, not man’s. It is God’s rest for man: not man’s rest for himself.

For man to keep the Sabbath, is for him to have and keep God’s rest.

IT IS SPIRITUAL REST
God is Spirit. His rest is only spiritual rest.

To keep the Sabbath is to find and keep spiritual rest-God’s rest on the Sabbath day.

IT IS ETERNAL REST
God is “the eternal God.” His rest is only eternal rest.

In the Sabbath day for man, God has put His own rest, which is eternal rest, to be to the man in time the foretaste and earnest of God’s rest in eternity that waits for man, and to refresh and revive and cheer man on his way through this world of time to the world of eternity “the world to come.”

23
FOR THE MAN

Jesus said, “The Sabbath was made for man.” Mark 2:27.

Strictly and literally what Jesus said is this: “The Sabbath was made for the man.”

The phrase “the man” is the exact translation in Greek and English of the Hebrew word “Adam.”

This is confirmed beyond question and made plain to the commonest understanding by a comparison of the Septuagint, the King James and the Revised versions of Genesis 1:27 to 5:2.

In the Hebrew of that portion of Scripture the word “Adam” is used twenty-five times.

In the Septuagint or Greek translation the word “Adam” is carried over eighteen times, is translated “the man” six times, and “man” once.

In the KJV the word “Adam” is carried over thirteen times, is translated “the man” eight times, and “man” four times: with margin “Adam” once, and “man” once.

This makes it perfectly plain that the phrase “the man” is strictly and preferably the translation of the word “Adam.”

Therefore, what Jesus really said in Mark 2:27 is, “The Sabbath was made for Adam.”

And it was made for Adam-“the man”-while he was yet God’s man: that is, “the man” of God’s “eternal purpose” concerning mankind and the world.

The “eternal purpose” was “pursued in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Ephesians 3:11. Thus Christ was then the “Surety” of that purpose it should be accomplished...

Therefore, when the first Adam failed and threw all away, it was only the effecting of the original purpose when Christ took that Adam’s place, and Himself, as “the last Adam,” carried through the “eternal purpose” that was invested in the first Adam.

‘When the first Adam failed, he ceased to be “the man” of “the eternal purpose.” He was no more the true Adam, and never will be.

When Christ as “the last Adam” took the place that had been lost by the first Adam, He then became “the man” or the original “eternal purpose.” And thus He became the only true Adam that is or ever will be: the eternal Adam of “the eternal purpose,” of which originally He was the Surety.

The Sabbath was made for the Adam-“the man”-of God’s eternal purpose. It was made for that Adam while he was yet in God’s eternal purpose. Therefore, the Sabbath is inseparable of God’s eternal purpose. and so is an eternal thing.

The Sabbath was made for the Adam-“the man”-of God’s eternal purpose. Both in the surety and in the fact, Christ is that Adam. There, fore, the Sabbath was made for Christ: and is as eternal as is He in the effecting of that purpose.

The Adam for whom as God’s man the Sabbath was made, was the head and fountain of the mankind who in God’s eternal purpose should be the inhabitants of this earth.

Christ only, as “the last Adam,” is the One who as God’s man is in surety and in fact the Head and Fountain of the mankind who in God’s eternal purpose shall inhabit this earth.

Therefore, the Sabbath was made for Christ, and in Him for all who in that eternal purpose will be His: that is, for all Christians.

“There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest (a sabbatismos, the keeping of Sabbath) to the people of God “ Hebrews 4:9.

Are you, or will you be, of “the people of God?”
"For unto the angels hath He not put in subjection th,2 world to come, whereof we speak.

"For one in a certain place testified, saying, what is man that thou are mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him?

"Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownest him with glory and honor and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.

"For in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus." Hebrews 2:5,9.

Unto man God put in subjection the world. And that world which God put in subjection to the man, was "the world to come."

That man threw down to "this present evil world," both himself and that "world to come."

But there was that other Man, “the last Adarn,” who stepped into the place and purpose which God had for that man who threw all down. And this other Man brings back to God’s eternal purpose both man and the world, and thus makes eternally sure “the world to come."

And though “we see not yet all things put under Him,” we do see Him; and we see Him at the right hand of God “waiting till His enemies be made His footstool.”

Thus the Sabbath was made for The Man to whom is put in subjection “the world to come.” Thus it was made for the people and the world, of “the world to come.”

Whosoever is not of “the world to come” cannot keep the Sabbath. But “ye are not of the world; for I have chosen you out of the world.” “Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.” John 15:19; 17:16.

Accordingly, in Christ and in Him only is to be found the Sabbath of the Lord as it is in the truth of God’s thought and purpose.

This forever fixes as the truth of God, that the Sabbath of the Lord”the seventh day”-is the only true day of rest or of worship, or of refraining from labor, for Christians: for whatsoever will be of “the world to come.”

It is written: “Hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.” Exekiel 20:20.

It is a sign by which “ye may know.”

It is therefore a way to knowledge.

That one thing alone, even if that were all that there were to the Sabbath would be enough to make it of definite worth and eternal standing.

Note: It is not a sign “between Me and you,”” only that I am;” but that “ye may know that I am.”

It is not a sign, only that I am the Lord;” but that “ye may know that I am the Lord.”

It is not a sign, only that “I am the Lord your God;” but that “ye may know that I am the Lord your God.”

Therefore, to the person who hallows it, the Sabbath of the Lord is a sign by which he knows God, and knows that God is his God by personal acquaintance.

Yet “no man knoweth the Father, save the Son and He to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.” Matthew 11:27.

When it is the truth that no one knows God except as He *is revealed in Christ;
And when the Sabbath is a sign by which he who hallows it may know that the Father is the Lord his God;
Then it follows that the certain truth of that Scripture is just this-
“Hallow My Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I, as I am revealed in Christ Jesus the Lord, am the Lord your God.”

And this “is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent.” John 173.

And so the Sabbath of the Lord is the God, given sign by which may be found the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, that is not only the very certainty of life eternal but is itself life eternal.

Should not that be inducement enough to any man, to “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy?”

XI
THE SABBATH OF THE LORD IN CHRIST

The first of all things that God is in Christ, to anybody or to anything, is Creator: for “without Him was not anything made that was made.” John 1:1

But sin undid all of that.

And now the first of all things that God is in Christ to the sinner who believes in Him, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, is Creator: for “We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordain A that we should walk in them.” Ephesians 2: 10.

REST

Next, in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is Rest: for “we which have believed do enter into rest;” and “he that is entered into His Rest, hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His.” Hebrews 4:9,10.

The sinner——“the old man”——longing to cease from the shortcomings of his own works, and to “do better,” labors hard and long to do the good that he knows; and so to find rest of heart and soul and spirit in good works accomplished.

But at in vain. He never does any moral or spiritual thing so well but that he himself can see that it should have been done better.

In nothing short of perfection of conduct can any soul ever find rest of heart and spirit. And never in all his most careful and painstaking endeavor can he present to himself perfection of conduct.

Therefore, never upon his own works can he find rest. In the discouragement of this ever harassing experience he cries, “01 wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” Romans 7:14,21.

To every such one the divine answer is 1 thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord” there is deliverance forevermore; for in Him God speaks to every soul, “Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Matthew 11:28.

The sinner accepts the heavenly invitation, and believes on Him. Instantly by the divine power of the creative Spirit, God creates. him anew in Christ Jesus unto the very righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ-unto the very works of God which He hath before ordained that we should walk in them; but which we all missed and turned to our own way and to works of “our own righteousness” which is but “filthy rags.”
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Entering by the new creation into the works of God in Christ, the believer enters in to the rest of God in Christ. And the Rest of God is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. “My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.”

The rest is His whose is the work. ‘rne work is God’s; for it is nothing less than work of creation. And the rest is His, for it is rest only on perfect work; and only God’s work is perfect.

The work is the gift of God through the new creation, and the rest is the gift of God through and upon the same new creation.

Thus the first and fundamental essential to God’s rest in Christ, is God’s work of the new creation in Christ.

If there be no new creation in Christ, there cannot be any rest in Christ.

By entering through God’s new creation in Christ Jesus, into the good works of the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, the believer “ceases from his own works as God did from His” and enters into God’s rest as God did. “And God did rest the seventh day from all His works.” Hebrews 4:34, 9-10.
Thus the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord is as truly the gift of God by faith of Jesus Christ, as is the righteousness of God: and both come in and by the new creation of the sinner “unto righteousness and true holiness”

And so, to the believer in Jesus, the Sabbath—the rest-of the Lord thy God is the reminder, the memorial, of the Creator in His new creation of the Christian, as really as it is of the original creation of the universe.

BLESSING

Next in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is Blessing: for “God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you in turning away everyone of you from his iniquities;” And “He hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.” Acts 3:26; Ephesians 1:1. The blessing of God in Christ to the believer is not only in saving him, turning him away, from committing sin, it is in turning his back upon it so that he goes in the opposite direction—in the way of righteousness instead of the way of sin.

And this is made plain and certain in His word and service of the Sanctuary: for He says that His purpose there is “to finish transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in—everlasting righteousness.” Daniel 9:24.

And God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you in—turning away every one of you from his iniquities to just that glorious *extent.

That in your life transgression is finished, so that there is no more of it there:
That in your life there is made an end of sins, so that you are done with them:

That in your life reconciliation for iniquity is accomplished, so that you are free from it all:
And that everlasting righteousness is brought into your life, there to abide and to reign forevermore.

That is the blessing that God is in Christ to every believer in Jesus; and that is just the blessing that God is in the Sabbath to every soul who through the faith of Christ and the Spirit of God hallows the Sabbath of the Lord.

Accordingly He says, “Hallow my Sabbaths, and reverence my Sanctuary.”

HOLINESS

Next in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is Holiness for, when in His blessing to us in His Son Jesus He has finished transgression and made an end of sins and has made reconciliation for iniquity and has brought in everlasting righteousness, this is “unto holiness.” Romans 6:19, 22.

SANCTIFICATION

Next in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is Sanctification: for, to the preacher of the Gospel He says: I send thee to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may obtain forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Me.” Acts 26:18.

THE PARALLEL

Thus in the revelation of God in the Sabbath to man, and in the revelation of God in Christ to man, there stands this perfect parallel.
In the Sabbath He is: In Christ He is:
Creator, Creator,
Rest, Rest,
Blessing, Blessing,
Holiness, Holiness,
Sanctification, Sanctification.

And in perfect demonstration that certifies—
That in the Sabbath of the Lord, God has put the very reflection and impress of Himself as He is revealed in Christ;
That in Christ He has fully expressed what in the Sabbath He seeks to be to men;
That only in the faith of Christ is the Sabbath fully found, and only in the Sabbath of the Lord as it is in Spirit and in truth is Christ truly and fully found;
And thus each is the complement of the other forevermore, in the faith and life of Christians and in their knowledge and service and worship of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He bath sent.

AN APOSTOLIC TREATISE ON THE SABBATH

"There remaineth therefore a keeping the Sabbath to the people of God." Hebrews 4:9 margin.

It is easy to discover that this keeping the Sabbath that remains to the people of God is the same Sabbath keeping that there was before; the same Sabbath keeping that God pointed out in the wilderness; the same Sabbath keeping as that of the Fourth Commandment of the decalog; the same Sabbath keeping that was given to Adam; identical with the creation Sabbath; and the same Sabbath keeping that there was at creation, and onward.

In order to find the full thought of Hebrews 4, it is essential that Hebrew 3 shall be studied in connection therewith.

Sabbath is rest. The Sabbath of the Lord is the rest of the Lord. And the Sabbath day of the Lord is the rest day of the Lord. The word of the Lord is, "The seventh day is the Sabbath (the Test) of the Lord thy God." It is not man’s rest, it is God’s rest. And so it is written, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . and rested the seventh day. Exodus 20:11. "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made." Genesis 2:2. And "He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into My rest." Hebrews 4:43.

Thus in Hebrews 4 the subject is the same precisely as in Genesis 2:2,3 and in Exodus 20:8, the Fourth Commandment. That subject is the Sabbath of the Lord, God’s rest of the seventh day, and being addressed directly to Christians, and in the New Testament, too, it is definite instruction to Christians as to the true Christian observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day. And this subject in the fourth chapter of Hebrews is simply the continuation of the same subject from the third chapter of Hebrews; and that subject is God’s rest of the seventh day. This shows that the Sabbath cif the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, and its observance, are distinctly treated in the greater part of at least two chapters in the New Testament, and are there addressed directly to Christians.

Let us study the third and fourth chapters of Hebrews, and see what is there taught in the Word of God.

In exhorting Christians to faithfulness, thus it is written,

"As the Holy Ghost saith, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted Me, proved Me, and saw My works forty years. Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do always err in their heart; and they have not known My ways. So I sware in My wrath, They shall not enter into MY REST.

"Wherefore take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called Today; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end; while it is said, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

"For some, when they had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out Of Egypt by Moses. But with whom He grieved forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware He that they should not enter into HIS REST, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.
LET US therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For WE WHICH HAVE BELIEVED DO enter into rest, as He said. As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into my rest (they shall not enter into My rest-ASV): although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise. And God did rest the SEVENTH DAY from all His works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into My rest (They shall not enter into My rest-ASV).

Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief: again, He limiteth a certain day, saying in David, Today, after so long a time; as it is said, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus (Joshua, margin) had given them rest, then would He not after, ward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore A REST (The keeping of a Sabbath, margin) to the people of God. For he that is entered into His rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His.” Hebrews 3:7; 4: 1-10.

Now note carefully the story as it is thus told:-

It is GOD’S REST into which, by the Holy Ghost, men are exhorted to enter today “while it is called Today.”

This rest was prepared at the foundation of the world. For that “the works were finished from the foundation of the world,” is proved by the fact that God “spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works.” That this rest of the seventh day is God’s rest into which men are to enter, is proved by the further fact that “in this place again” He spoke of the seventh day on this wise, “They shall not enter into my REST.”

God’s rest is eternal rest. When God made man, He made him that he might enter into and enjoy God’s eternal rest, with God. However, this could he only upon the man’s personal choice, freely made. The Lord therefore placed him on a season of probation. And in this probation, God prepared for the man, and gave to the man, the introduction to, yes the very beginning of, this eternal rest, in order that in his probation the man might choose and enjoy God’s rest with God.

When God’s rest was prepared for man at the foundation of the world, it was in the seventh-day Sabbath that it was prepared. For the seventh day is the Sabbath, the rest, of the Lord thy God, and “the Sabbath was made for man.”

50, the seventh day being the Sabbath; The Sabbath being God’s rest, and the Sabbath, being made for man at the foundation of the world; it is certainly true that it is in the Sabbath that God’s rest was prepared for man at the foundation of the world.

The works were finished from the foundation of the world. When the works were finished, the rest was prepared; for then “God did rest ... from all His works.” The rest was prepared in the seventh day; “for God did rest the seventh day from all His works.” This rest of God’s was at that time prepared for man; for the seventh day is the rest of the Lord thy God; and the rest was made for man.

But through unbelief, the man failed to enter into God’s rest. He did not abide in God’s work, and so he could not enter into God’s rest. Through unbelief he entered into Satan’s works, and so missed God’s rest. God’s rest never can accompany Satan’s works; God’s rest accompanies only God’s work.

Then, though the man had failed, the rest remained. And in the offering of Jesus Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, to the man was given again the opportunity to believe and so find God’s rest, -the opportunity to believe, and so to forsake Satan’s works and find God’s work; and, finding God’s work, so also to find God’s rest.

God’s work is found only in Christ. God’s work is righteousness, “even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Romans 3:22.23. Accordingly it is written, “This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent.” John 6:29.

No man can find God’s rest, who has not first found God’s work, for “he that is entered into His (God’s) rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His.” Hebrews 4:10. And the only way in which any man can cease from his own works is by finding God’s work: and God’s work is found only in Christ BY FAITH. Accordingly it is not only written, “This is the work of God that ye believe;” but also, “Come unto Me, all ye that tabor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Matthew 11:28; Hebrew 4:1 Thus the Sabbath of the Lord is the very seal of righteousness by faith in Christ.
And so God’s rest still remained till the time of the promise drew nigh, which God had sworn to Abraham and his Seed, which is Christ (Acts 7:17; Galatians 3:16); till the time when God would deliver His people from Egypt, from the world of sin: then He called Israel to enter into His rest, into this rest which He had prepared for man at the foundation of the world; but into which, man, through unbelief, had failed to enter, and which yet remained for the people of God. For it is written: “Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habitation.” “Thou shalt bring them in and plant them in the mountain of Thine inheritance, in the place, 0 Lord, which Thou hast made for THEE to dwell in, in the sanctuary, 0 Lord, which Thy hands have established,” Exodus 15:13,17; Hebrews 8:1-2; 9:11,24.

And so God called Israel to enter into His rest, to enjoy and observe His Sabbath. For the Sabbath is the Lord’s, it is God’s rest; and “tho seventh day is the Sabbath.”

But Israel also failed to enter into God’s rest; Israel would not BELIEVE, and so could not enter in. For I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into My rest.” But “to whom sware He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.”

What did Israel not keep the Sabbath?—No; how could they, when they did not believe? But did they not rest on the seventh day?—Oh, yes, they rested on the seventh day; but for all that they did not keep the Sabbath. There is a great difference between resting on the seventh day, and keeping the Sabbath. A person may rest on the seventh day all his life, and yet never keep the Sabbath. The seventh day is not the Sabbath because it is the seventh day. The seventh day is the Sabbath because GOD MADE IT THE SABBATH.

The Sabbath of the Lord is God’s rest. only he who finds God’s rest finds the true Sabbath; and only he who keeps God’s rest can truly keep the Sabbath. True Sabbathkeeping depends altogether upon whether a person finds God’s rest, instead of his own, on the seventh day. Israel rested on the seventh day, it is true; but it was only their own rest that they found and entered into, on the Sabbath day; because they did not believe in Christ, that, by finding in Him God’s work, they might also find in Him God’s rest, which they might keep. They “saw” His “works forty yearr,” but they “believed not,” and entered not into His works; and so could not enter into His rest.

God’s rest is spiritual; Only he who is spiritual can enter into it, and only he who is of FAITH is spiritual: therefore only he who is of faith can enter into God’s rest; only he who is of faith can keep the Sabbath of the Lord. And, though it is true that a person might rest on the seventh day all his life without once truly observing, the Sabbath, yet he cannot truly observe the Sabbath without resting on the seventh day; for “God did rest the seventh day,” and it is in the seventh day that God’s rest is found.

But Israel did not believe, and so could not enter into God’s rest; “howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses,” but with the vast majority it was so. And thus Israel, like man at first, through unbelief missed God’s rest, which was prepared at the foundation of the world, and which had waited so long for men to enter. And the vast majority of the Jews in the day when Jesus was on earth in the flesh, did the same. But the Christian Sabbath-keepers, to whom the book of Hebrews was written, knew what a fearful mistake Israel had made. And so do the Christian Sabbath-keepers of today know it.

Yet though Israel failed to enter into God’s rest— that REST did not fail: it still remains, and waits for men to enter it. Though Israel failed to discern in the seventh day God’s rest, and so missed it; that rest, that Sabbath, of the seventh day did not vanish away: it still, even today, “remaineth,” and waits for man to enter into it. For “seeing . . . that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief: again, He limireth a certain day, saying in David, Today, after so long a time; . . . today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.” “There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God;” and this rest is God’s rest, which Adam missed, and which Israel missed; but which, in the Lord’s mercy, still remains for all people to enter, and for God’s people to enjoy.

This rest that remains is the Sabbath; for the margin of the verse gives the literal Greek: “There remaineth therefore a keeping of a Sabbath to the people of God.” And this Sabbath which remains is the creation seventh-day Sabbath; for in this place it is written, in direct connection:

“He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did ,rest from all His works. And in this place again (He spoke of the seventh day on this wise). They shall not enter into My rest.” Then seeing
that some must enter into that rest, and seeing that man at the beginning, and Israel at the time of the promise and at the time of Christ in the flesh, did not enter in, there remains therefore to the people of God this same Sabbath, which is “the seventh day!”

Again: It is written that there “remaineth . . . a rest”-the keeping of a Sabbath--“to the people of God. Now that which remains is some, thing left over, something continued of what was before. But the only Sabbath that there was before, in which was God’s rest, was the creation seventh-day Sabbath,-Saturday. And as there remains a Sabbath; as whatever remains is something continued of what was before; and as the seventh-day Sabbath is the only Sabbath that there was before, in which was God’s rest; it is therefore the very certainty of truth that the Sabbath which remaineth is the Sabbath of the seventh day; for “God did rest the seventh day.”

Yet again: Whatever remains is something left over, something continued, of what was before. The remainder is not the beginning of a thing. “That which remaineth” cannot correctly be spoken of anything newly begun, of something only just now being set up. Now the most extreme claim for the origin of Sunday, the first day of the week, as a “day of rest,” or “the Christian Sabbath,” is that it was in “the primitive church” “in the apostolic times.” Therefore as, according to their own claim, that time was but the beginning of Sunday observance as a day of rest; and as what remains is something left over, something continued, of what was before, it is the very certainty of truth that this “rest,” this “keeping of a Sabbath,” that “remaineth to the people of God,” is NOT the rest of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, which, according to their own claim, was just then having its beginning; but IS the rest of the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, commonly called Saturday, which was prepared at the foundation of the world, which waited for Israel to enter in, and which, thank the Lord yet “REMAINETH to the people of God.”

Does any one say, “The Sabbath was abolished?”—God sayeth it remaineth.

Does any one say, “The Sabbath of the seventh day was changed in the days of the apostles, and by the apostles?”—m-The Word of God, written in the days of the apostles, and by an apostle, declares that it “REMAINETH.”

Does any one say that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is not for Christians?-The Word of God, with direct reference to the keeping of the Sabbath, “the seventh day” on which “God rested,” says that it “remaineth” “to the people of God.” Are not Christians the people of God? As certainly therefore as Christians are the people of God, so certainly the keeping of the Sabbath, “the seventh day,” God’s rest, “remaineth!” to Christians. The Word of the Lord says so. Whether “Christians” will have it or not, that is for them to say; but the Lord says it “remaineth” to them. Why should “Christians” refuse to have it remain? When God says it “remaineth” “to the people of God,” how can they refuse to have it remain, and still be the people of God?

And this “rest,” this “Sabbath,” of the seventh day, which “remaineth,” is God’s rest, is God’s Sabbath; for “He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day . . . And in this place again (He spoke of the seventh day on this wise), they shall enter into My rest.”

God is the eternal God. His rest is, therefore, eternal rest. And the seventh day is the rest, the Sabbath, of the Lord thy God. Therefore, the Sabbath, the rest of the seventh day, being God’s rest, is eternal rest.

It was prepared for man to enter into and enjoy, at the foundation of the world. Through unbelief the man failed to enter into it. It waited till the time which God had sworn to Abraham; yet through unbelief, the people then failed to enter in. It waited then till the day of Christ in the flesh; and still through unbelief, the people then failed to enter in. And still, “today,” it remains; for “some must enter therein.” “Wherefore as the Holy (3host saith . . . Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called Today; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.” For He has
limited a certain day, saying, still, “Today, after so long a time; . . . TODAY if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.”

It is the indisputable truth that in the greater part of at least two chapters of our New Testament there is an explicit treatise on the Sabbath, the seventh day, and the obligation of God’s people to observe it, covering all time “from the foundation of the world” unto “today, while it is called Today.”

Yet, sad to say, even today, as at the foundation of the world, as at the time of the coming out of Egypt of old, and as in the days of Christ in the flesh, the great mass of God’s professed people still will not hear His voice, but harden their hearts and tempt Him, and grieve Him, and do err in their heart, and have not known His ways: and thus still by their unbelief He is compelled to swear in His wrath, “They shall not enter into My rest,” this blessed rest which from the foundation of the world has remained, and still remains, to the people of God.

How long shall it be before God’s people will believe Him? Come, brethren, come, all God’s people everywhere, “Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it . . . . Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.” Let us enter into God’s rest, that holy rest of the blessed seventh day. For God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it; because that in it He had rested.

Why should Christians, professing to be “followers of God,” refuse to do on the seventh day what God did on the seventh day, simply because it is the seventh day? They are all willing to rest — yea, they are not only willing to rest, but also to compel everybody else to rest; but they are not willing to enter into God’s rest. Is that loyalty? Is that the way of God which they choose? or is it their own way? “Take heed, brethren, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.”

APPENDIX A

“GOOD FRIDAY”

The recognition and Romish observance of the Romish “Good Friday” is steadily being pushed upon the people and nation of the United States.

This nation was founded upon the principle of the total exclusion of religion from all recognition or cognizance of the civil power, expressly in order that neither the nation nor the people should be “led back to the church of Rome.”

Yet this principle and the provisions of the Constitution that was established to guard it are being purposely disregarded and systematically overridden by the churches. And of the chief means of this offensive thing, and one of the most rapidly growing, is through the myth of “Good Friday.”

The set movement for this was begun in 1918 by the Holy Name Society of Detroit, in asking the other churches to join with them in its observance; they also asked that the business houses be closed, four thousand of which complied.

Then in 1920 the city government of Detroit, by proclamation of the Mayor, entered upon the promotion of it; and of business places “sixteen thousand locked their doors,” and “all street cars stopped for one minute at noon.”

And in 1921 a Detroit paper gave the following account.

“Practically all business houses will be closed Good Friday, March 25, from 12 noon to 3 P.M., the Tre Ore period, in commemoration of the three hours of agony Christ endured on the cross before He died.”
At the request of the Holy Name Society and the Detroit Council of Churches, John C. Lodge, acting mayor, will issue a proclamation asking all places of business to close and citizens to join in the religious celebrations which are being planned by all churches.

Catholic churches will have special services during the three hour period. Many Episcopal churches will be open for special observance of the occasion. The Detroit Council of Churches has arranged for about 20 union meetings in Protestant churches in this period.

The most central will he in the Detroit Opera House on the Campus where the Rev. Dr. M. S. Rice will speak. Lutherans will hold meetings in the Garrick and New Detroit Theatres. Full three hour meetings will be held in most of the large Protestant churches on Woodward Avenue.

Detroit is known as the first city in the country to celebrate in this way. The Rev. Dr. M. C. Pearson, executive secretary of the Detroit Council of Churches, says Detroit’s example will be followed this year in about 12 cities.

According to Councilman William, P. Bradley, president of the Detroit Diocesan Union of the Detroit Holy Name Society, 27,000 business places are expected to close this year. All the big downtown stores will do so. The Michigan Motion Picture Exhibitors Association, to which belong most of the large motion picture theatres in Detroit will throw on the screen an announcement of closing.

City and county offices will close, Mr. Bradley says, as will the Detroit Stock Exchange. The Retail Merchants Association of Detroit this week voted unanimously to ask all members to close their places of business.

Note in the above that it was “Councilman Wm. P. Bradley, President of the Detroit Diocesan Union of the Detroit Holy Name Society” who gave the assurance that the twenty-five thousand business places were expected to close this year as well as that “city and county offices will close.”

That reveals the fact that members of the Roman Catholic Church and of her church societies when elected to public office, make use of their position in that office to promote the religion of Rome and to give official public recognition to that church and to use public influence and authority to spread the observances and worship of that church.

Yet each one of these on taking office gives his oath that he will support the Constitution of the United States, that forbids every such thing as that. But what does any one of those care for either the Constitution or his oath in the presence of opportunity to force upon the people the observances and worship of that church?

The proclamation of the acting Mayor is the following.

Our citizens will recall that one year ago a civic proclamation was made asking that there be a cessation of trading on Good Friday between the hours of 12 and 3 o’clock. Throughout the nation, Detroit’s example was warmly commended.

The leaders of the Christian Churches again are asking for an observance of Good Friday, March 25, and from 12 to 3 p.m. The churches of both Protestant and Catholic denominations will be open for devotion.

On behalf of the clergy I wish to seek the cooperation of the business public in an appropriate observance of those hours of meditation. The spirituality of our community must necessarily be marked by the degree of observance of this request from our spiritual leaders.

It is therefore my earnest wish that every reasonable effort be made to lay aside business and attend devotional services in the houses of worship.

JOHN C. LODGE, Acting Mayor.”

Please note the expressions “a civic proclamation” “on behalf of the clergy,” and “the spirituality of our community must necessarily be marked by the degree of observance of this request from our spiritual leaders.”
If that does not express the complete union of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, with the ecclesiastical dominating, then how could such a thing be expressed?

And note the confusion of ideas as well as of things in “a civic proclamation” for the religious “observance” of an ecclesiastical institution.

There is nothing about it that is truly “civic.” It was “asked for” by “the leaders of the Christian Churches.” It was issued “on behalf of the clergy” and because “the spirituality of our community must necessarily be marked by the degree of observance of this request from our spiritual leaders.”

1. Are “the leaders of the Christian Churches” “civic” officials?
2. Is “the clergy” a “civic” body?
3. Is “the spirituality of our community” a matter of “civic” consideration and “civic” control?

If so then this might be a civic proclamation. And in that case, where is there any church in that city? And where any separation of church and state? Any separation of the civil and the ecclesiastical?

If not, if these are not civic, but all are religious and ecclesiastical and this proclamation be the expression for them of their religious wish and their church will and purpose, and it is in promotion and extension of “the spirituality” that “must necessarily” be marked and measured by the degree of observance in response to the wish and will and purpose of these “spiritual leaders,” then in or about this proclamation there is not any suggestion or savor of anything civic: all is absolutely religious; and in issuing it the acting Mayor acted as Pontifex Maximus—the official head of the religion of the city of Detroit. And that was exactly fitting in the case, because it is the Roman religion of which he thus was the acting Roman Pontifex Maximus.

Of the places outside of Detroit where this “Good Friday” observance was imposed, is the village of Durand. Of this thing in that place, the Durand Express tells the following:

“Good Friday observance in Durand, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce, takes place tomorrow afternoon. A splendid program has been arranged, and the invitation is to the entire public to participate in the same. Each church in town will be represented in the service.

“The Chamber of Commerce proper will hold its usual noon-day meeting in the Moose Hall, this being at 12 o’clock and for members only. At 1:30 o’clock the members will go in a body to the opera house. There will be no school tomorrow afternoon, and it is expected that a large crowd will gather at the given hour for the Good Friday observance.”

Here also the President of the village already was, or else suddenly became, Pontifex Maximus of the Roman religion of Durand and indulged the following proclamation:

“Benefits, mental, moral, financial, social and spiritual, have been conferred upon us, not only as a commonwealth but as a community, resulting from the faith we possess in a common religion.

“When Christopher Columbus discovered the western hemisphere, he planted the cross upon it as the emblem of the Christian religion. Later the Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores in search of religious liberty and a second time a religious ceremony was held in which the cross was planted upon the ocean sands, this time within the territory of what became the thirteen original colonies. The Magna Charta recognized the claims of Christianity: so also do the Constitutions of the United States and of the State of Michigan. We are a Christian nation and a Christian community. We are proud of our six churches, all of which are Christian. We have no temples to any other gods.

“Our churches have combined in asking for a community observance of Good Friday, between the hours of 12:00 and 3:00 o’clock and the Chamber of Commerce has recognized the petition.

“Therefore, I, Delbert M. Trumble, President of the village of Durand, do hereby proclaim Friday, March 25, 1921, between the hours of 12:00 and 3:00 p.m., a civic holiday in the village, and ask, so far as it can be done, all business places close for these three hours, and that all residents join the religious observance to be held at the Opera House at 1:30.

(Signed) D. M. TRUMBLE
President of the Village of Durand, Mich.”

This too proclaims a “civic holiday” for a “religious observance” on request of the “combined
“...and for a bunch of “reasons,” every one of which is religious only.

And where did he get the notion that the Pilgrims in “religious ceremony planted the cross upon the ocean sands?” Does not everybody know that if anybody had appeared with a cross among those Pilgrims, he with his cross would most likely have been pitched into the sea.

Yet this “Good Friday” campaign is a very serious matter. It may easily be that it will be spread over the whole nation, and rapidly: and that whoever will not conform, who will not go with the crowd in that Romish ceremony and worship, will be subjected to scrutiny and question, and to boycott and persecution.

In one village, in a meeting of the village association, the vote to commit the village to this observance was unanimous, except for the vote of one lone little woman.

Of course she was immediately distinguished in that whole community. Yet to be so distinguished is a high and noble and everlasting honor. Thank the Lord.

And thank the Lord that in that community, or any other, there was even one solitary person ready to stand up and be counted in witness and protest against the recognition of Romish inventions and the imposing of Roman ceremonies upon all the people by public influence that can easily and soon become by public power.

By the papal lies of “Good Friday” and “Good Easter” and “Good Sunday” the Roman Church with the aid of mawkish ‘Protestant Churches,” is fast drawing this whole nation into her worship.

It is not true that the Lord was either crucified on Friday or that He rose on Sunday. The ready and almost universal recognition and acceptance of these falsities in and by the public or the institutions of the world is evidence enough that they are not of the truth. If they were really the truth of God or of Christ, not one of them would have any place at all in the recognition or the acceptance of the people of this world. Instead, all would be despised and rejected and persecuted by all of these.
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APPENDIX 8
A LAME DEFENSE

The Lord’s Day Alliance once incurred such an unwelcome cotoriery, that the Board of Managers found it necessary to issue a Statement in defense of the Alliance and its “American Sabbath.”

And like the usual defense and explanation of the “American Sabbath,” it put more falsity in less space than can ever be done on any other subject. The Statement says:

1. “The Lord’s Day Alliance believes that the American Sabbath is a civil as well as a divine institution.”

Suppose that the Alliance does believe that, which is not true, what right has the Alliance to impose upon all the people of the United States its belief, by law, and governmental force?

This would he wholly un-American and anti-Christian, even if what it believes were true: and much more when it is all false.

The “American Sabbath,” or any other Sabbath, is not and never can be, a civil as well as a divine institution. As certainly as it is divine, it can not be civil. As certainly as it is divine, it is that in itself, and never can be less: as it would have to be to be civil.

No. As certainly as a thing is divine, or religious, or ecclesiastical, it is that in itself: and the adoption of it by the civil power does not in any sense make that thing civil. Such action only sets up the civil power as divine or religious or ecclesiastical-or rather as all three of these at once. The adoption of that thing by the civil power, does not give to the thing a new character: the thing still holds its native character, and the civil power, in adopting it, assumes that native character of the divine, or religious, or ecclesiastical thing.

And that Alliance knows this. The Alliance does not intend, it does not even pretend, that its Sunday observance shall be enforced civilly, but religiously only. All the terms of its proposed Sunday legislation provide for religious observance only. Its speakers proclaim that the day “shall be observed as a religious day;” that “the holiday shall be a holy day.”

By its own words and avowed purposes, everybody can know that the Alliance knows that its “civil” as well as “divine” and religious “Sabbath” is utterly false and a fraud.

2. “It is . . . ordained by Moral Law, which is of perpetual obligation.”

Never was the Sunday institution, never was any Sunday observance, ordained by Moral Law.
And even if it were, or ever had been, it never could be in the province of earthly government to enforce its observance. Earthly government is civil, not moral. It has to do only with civics, not morals.

Moral government and law covers man’s relations and duties to God, in the things of the heart, the soul, the spirit.

Civil government and law covers only man’s relations to his fellow man, in the things of outward action, and rights and wrongs: not right and wrong.

Only by the Inquisition can men rule in the field of morals. And then their rule there is not moral, but the most immoral that is conceivable. It is not the rule of God, but only of the devil. “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s: and unto God the things that are God’s.”

The Alliance claims that the day, whose observance it demands and would enforce is “the Lord’s.” If it be the Lord’s Day, then by the word of the Lord Himself it must be rendered to the Lord and not to Caesar. And when the Alliance demands and compels its being rendered to Caesar, then in that the Alliance makes Caesar its god.

3. “It believes that Christ, in freeing the Sabbath from the narrow and technical interpretations of the Jews, strengthened and spiritualized the Holy Day.” Yes, He did. But that day was not Sunday. The Jews never put any narrow and technical interpretations on the Sunday.

It was the Sabbath Day—the seventh day—that the Jews treated that way. It was the Sabbath Day that Jesus freed from all of that, and that He strengthened and spiritualized. The Sabbath Day was, and is, that Holy Day.

And “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.” That is the day that God blessed, made holy, and set apart to His holy purposes and to holy uses by man.

God never set apart any Sabbath institution: He set apart “the seventh day,” to be held and kept as the Sabbath Day. Apart from the Sabbath Day there is no Sabbath institution. He never commanded anybody to remember the Sabbath institution, nor to remember the Sabbath as an institution: He commands everybody to “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy,” because He made it holy.

But this Alliance sweeps away all of that, and takes up an absolutely heathen day and thing, and by governmental law and force would compel all the people to accept and observe it as the Lord’s and a “holy day!” For wilful arrogance, fraud, and profanity, how could that be beaten? 4. When it was the Sabbath that the Jews knew and had to do with, that Christ freed from the narrow and technical interpretations of the Jews; and when that was the Holy Day that He strengthened and spiritualized; then how in the world does this Alliance get Sunday to be that day, when forever it is another and utterly foreign day?

Here is how: “The change from the seventh to the first day of the week added new life and significance to the divine institution. Thus not.

55 only was the day of the Resurrection celebrated, but the Sabbath was cleansed from the superstitious littleness of the Pharisees by which its free sanctities had been obscured.”

But

a. Neither by the Resurrection nor at the time of the Resurrection was there any change from the seventh to the first day of the week. And neither by Christ nor by His authority was there ever any such change. It was only by the “man of SW” who would “think to change the times and the law of the Most High.”Daniel 7:25; 2 Thessalonians 2:34.

b. And even if there had been that change, how could a “change from the seventh to the first day
of the week” “add new life and significance to the divine institution” that the Jews knew and had to do with, which was the Sabbath of the seventh day.

And when that “change from the seventh to the first day of the week” added new life and significance to the divine institution that was there thousands of years before that “change,” then why do these people entirely abandon that divine institution that was there first, and to which the new life and significance were given, and take up another day to which neither life nor significance was ever truly given?

And that is how the Lord’s Day Alliance gets Sunday to be the Sabbath and the Sabbath to be Sunday: that is, gets the first day to be the seventh day of the week and the seventh day to be the first day of the week; and in their thimblerigging do really get the will of Rome to be the “law of God.”

APPENDIX C

SUNDAY AND SUNDAY LAWS

The churches, both Catholic and Protestant, a new combination not known in years gone by, are in great activity to press upon all the people prescribed laws to compel the observance of Sunday.

This requires that some attention be given to the consideration of the merits of the Sunday, of Sunday in the law, and of Sunday-laws.

It is easy for anybody to know that there is not a claim made, nor a “reason” given for the Sunday, for Sunday in the law, or for Sunday-laws— that is not a falsity and a fraud:

And such falsity and fraud, that those who make the claim or offer the “reason,” cannot he held to be ignorant of it.

For, first they claim and offer, the Fourth Commandment as the basis of Sunday as the Sabbath, and the authority for its observance.

Sunday is claimed to be the Sabbath of this Commandment, when the plain wording, and every thought, of that Commandment is to the contrary.

Sunday is the first day of the week. And the plain word of the Fourth Commandment is “the seventh day is the Sabbath.”

And this truth that the seventh day is the Sabbath, inheres in the facts further stated in the Fourth Commandment -
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“For in six days the Lord made Heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it.”

There, in the perfectly plain word, is given the truth, the ground, and the fact, of the Sabbath and the origin of it. And not by any possibility, in truth or in honesty, can any of it refer or apply in any way to the first day.

In a Sunday-law meeting, the night of November 13, 1921, a minister publicly read in the Bible the first chapter of Genesis and to the end of verse three of the second chapter—all in behalf of Sunday and laws to enforce its observance as the Sabbath.

But can any man in honesty claim or present the implication that “the seventh day” in Genesis 2:2-3 was the first day? Or that by any honest possibility it could ever have any reference whatever to the first day of the week?

And Genesis first chapter to the end of verse three of the second chapter, is the ground of the Fourth Commandment.

The Fourth Commandment is but a restatement, in brief, of the facts of Genesis first chapter to the end of verse three of the second chapter. Read it:

“Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.”

And in all that therein is said, there is not a single feature, nor fact— nor word, nor thought, nor hint, that can ever in honesty be applied in behalf of the first day of the week as the Sabbath.

Therefore plainly that claim and presentation in behalf of the first day of the week being the Sabbath, is a falsity and a fraud.

A DODGE
This they dodge by presenting the additional falsity and fraud that the word “the seventh day” “means” the “seventh part of time;” and then from that another one, that it “means” “one day in seven.”

But they are not consistent even in their falsities. For they will not allow this “one day in seven” falsity and fraud to be applied by anybody in any but their own way. For they will have it to be “the seventh part of time” and “one day in seven,” only provided that this “seventh part of time” and “one day in seven,” shall always he specifically and exclusively the Sunday.

Here is the record: “We have no objection to reading the Commandment, Remember that you keep holy one day in seven.”

That was the unanimous declaration of the Federal (now National) Council of Churches-more than thirty churches-in regular convention. Then upon that, in the same hour in the same convention, and by a member of the council, the following resolution was offered:

“It is not our intention that anything shall be done to interfere with the convictions of those brethren represented with us in his council who conscientiously observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week as a day for rest and worship.”

Instantly upon the reading of this and the motion that it be adopted, there was manifested the most energetic protest, and the most decided opposition, and from the most members, that found any place in all the proceedings of the convention from beginning to end.

One exclaimed, “I trust that the resolution as proposed be not accepted.”

Another, emphatically, “I hope that this resolution will he voted down.”

Others, “It will not pass.”

And when the vote came, the resolution was overwhelmingly rejected with a loud and resounding “No-o-o-o-o!!”

These facts demonstrate that those people know that they do not mean any such thing as “one seventh part of time,” nor “one day in seven” as the meaning of the Fourth Commandment, as they profess and present:

But that they mean plainly and flatly just Sunday as the sabbath in place of The Sabbath. And these facts also demonstrate that they know that their invention and use of their plea of “one seventh part of time” and ,lone day in seven,” is solely a piece of sleight to cover their conscious trick of sliding in Sunday as the sabbath in place of The Sabbath.

SUNDAY RESURRECTION

And upon all this false use of the Fourth Commandment, they pile up the further false plea for Sunday being the Sabbath of that Commandment that “Jesus arose from the dead on Sunday.” Whereas the truth is that Jesus did not rise on Sunday.

The Scripture says: In the end of the Sabbath,” (KJV) late on the Sabbath day” (ASV), the women came to the sepulchre and found that He was already risen and gone. Matthew 28A.

But it is not surprising that they will not allow this to be true, when they will not allow the other plain Scriptures to be true. It is all of a piece.

And Sunday, commemorating the resurrection, by being the Sabbath of the Lord that commemorates the creation!

Sunday to commemorate the resurrection, by having it to he the sunday that commemorates the creation that was more than four thousand years before the resurrection

SUNDAY IN THE LAW

The Lord Himself established the universal Right of Dissent. He declares, If any man hear my word and believeth not, I judge him not.” John 12:47.

The churches profess to recognize this principle, and profess to hold that any man has full right to
dissent from church doctrine, church creeds, church discipline, and all churches and all their ways.

They profess the principle of the religious liberty of every man, to be religious or not religious, to be of the church or not of the church, as in his OYM mind he may choose. This is all summed up in the Right of Dissent. All the churches profess to recognize and to hold this principle. Yet in their advocating Sunday legislation they deny the principle and sweep away the Right.

Sunday is entirely a church institution. The Sunday keeping churches all insist that it is “the Lord’s Day” and “the Christian sabbath.” As certainly as it is this, every person who is not a Christian, not only has Divine Right to dissent from its observance, but literally has no right to observe it: any more than to observe Christian baptism or the Lord’s Supper. And those churches profess to recognize this right.

Then these same churches deliberately demand and secure laws to compel non-Christians to observe this church institution which they claim to be “the Christian sabbath.”

Knowing and professing to recognize the Right of Dissent from church institutions and church discipline they put their church institution into the law of the State, and then insist that “the law must be observed.” And by this ecclesiastical trick they subvert the Divine Right of Dissent: for no man has any right to dissent from any proper law of the State.

But that subterfuge cannot destroy that Right. The Divine Right of Dissent forever abides because it is Divine. And this conclusively proves that no Sunday law can ever be a proper law: because everybody, in the world has native and Divine Right to dissent from it and disregard it when it is only of the church; and its character as a church institution is not changed by putting it into the law. It is still and always is a church institution only.

It is fully recognized that without Sunday in the law, everybody in the world has native and Divine Right to disregard it equally with every other church institution. And with Sunday in the law everybody has still the same native and Divine Right to dissent from it and disregard it, because it is still the same church institution.

It is a church institution before it is put into the law; and it is the same church institution after it is put into the law. And the State in enforcing it is enforcing obedience to the church will, and it is enforcing church discipline. And the State has no right, any more than has the church, to enforce by law obedience to the church will or conformity to church discipline. The State has no right to join the church.

Yet the Sunday law advocates insist that it has been in the law so long and so universally, that it now has a rightful place in the law, simply as the law.

But when it was first put in the law, it was the same church institution. And it was as a church institution that it was put into the law.

It was put in the law, at the time when the church itself was put in the Law. And it was the chief means, and meanness, by which the church was put into the law. The plain word of the history is -

“There had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory . . . which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way.”

“This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims.”--Neander.

Then the historian traces the Sunday laws from the first one in 314 A.D. to 425 A.D. and then without any break he says -

“Then the church received help from the State, for the furtherance of her ends.”

The church began with “the determination” to do it: she did it: and “in this way” she did it.

And in putting it in the law, Constantine did not act as Caesar the official head of the State; but as Pontifex Maximus—the official head of religion.

And thus, both at once, the Sunday and the church were put in the law. And always Sunday in the law means the church in the law. It never was by right in the law: and it never can be by right in the law. And nobody can plead for Sunday in the law, without pleading for the church in the law: the church subordinating “the secular to itself in a false and outward way.”
Thus Sunday as of right in the law is a falsity and a fraud.

CHURCH AND STATE

But in the planting of the nation of the United States, there was an awaking to the baneful thing of the church in the law, the church “subordinating the secular to itself.”

Also, and better still, there was an awaking to the truth of the Divine and Christian principle of the total separation of the church and the State. And upon this Divine and Christian principle this nation was founded, and this has been recognized the world over as distinctively The American Principle, and by it this nation “the classical land of Religious Liberty.”

And the Sunday law advocates profess to recognize and to hold this principle of the separation of the church and State. But as in every other feature of their claims for Sunday laws, in this they play false to the principle and work upon the State and the people a conscious fraud.

In itself, and of itself, Sunday legislation is the union of church and State.

The Sunday itself was originated by the church, never by a State. Sunday legislation was originated by the church, not by the State; by the bishops, not by the Emperor.

The bishops brought it to Constantine, in their petition for the closing of public offices on that day. And that which forever fixes it as wholly of the church, brought to the State for adoption by the State from the church, is the fact that at the same time, and in the same petition and transaction, Friday, equally with the Sunday, was included in the same law, “because on it He was crucified;” and both to He observed in order “that God should be served with prayers and supplications.”--Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book 1, chap. 8.

Later Friday was dropped from the law, and the Sunday still held: and always held from the church in the law, and was always enforced by the State in subordination to the church, and as the tool of the church.

And this continued through all the reign of the papacy, and the union of church and State in all the nations of Europe; and was carried to America in the union of church and State in all the colonies here - except in blessed little Rhode Island, which justly repudiated it in the ever worthy word of Roger Williams:-

“Any church that uses the arm of the civil power to enforce its claims is not a church of Jesus Christ.”

“The magistrate may not punish the breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense that is a breach of The First Table.”

“The people are the origin of all free power in government. But they are not invested by Jesus Christ with power to rule in His Church. Therefore they cannot give any such power to the magistrate.

“Thus magistrates are but the agents of the people or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred: since conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic.

“And to introduce the civil sword into the Kingdom of Christ is to confound Heaven and earth, and lay all upon heaps of confusion. This is to pluck up the root and foundation of all common society in the civil State of the world, and to reduce the world to the first chaos and confusion.

“The ecclesiastical should be totally separated from the civil power: and the church and the magistracy should each act within its appropriate sphere.”

Sunday is wholly of the church. But the church cannot enforce its observance: and of all things not upon those who are not of the church. The church depends upon the State for its enforcement. And when she obtains and uses the State to enforce it, in the nature of things this is the union of church and State.

No State ever had the Sunday, except from the church. And the State having the Sunday only by the church, in the enforcement of it enforces only a church ordinance and a church institution, and so becomes only the tool of the church. In so doing the State joins the church. And beyond all honest denial, this is the union of church and State.

Thus for certain, it never can honestly be denied that Sunday legislation is in itself the union of church and State.

But the American Principle, fundamental and Constitutional, is the total separation of church and
The church in urging Sunday laws overrides and sweeps away this principle. The State in enacting and enforcing Sunday laws, does the same.

The principle is Christian as well as American and Constitutional. And whoever is Christian and whoever is American, has Divine Right and has Constitutional Right utterly and forever to disrespect and disregard Sunday in every phase and in every feature that can ever be claimed for it. Thus Sunday laws enforced as of the State, are a falsity and a fraud.

NEITHER GOD NOR CAESAR

In all the universe there are but Two Powers to whom any responsible person owes anything. These are God and Caesar, civil government. And these, and men’s relation to them, the Lord distinguishes thus:

“Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”

These are the Two. They are distinct: each in his place and realm. There is that which belongs to Caesar. This is to. he rendered unto him, and not to anybody else. It does not belong to anybody else—not even to God.

There is that which belongs to God. This is to be rendered unto Him, and not to anybody else. It does not belong to anybody else.

This is not to be rendered to Caesar. It is not to be rendered to God by Caesar.

These are totally distinct. Their realms are totally distinct. The obligations and the character of the obligations are totally distinct: so that they cannot both be rendered to the same person or authority.

That to God is religious only, of the world to come, and of the heart, soul, spirit and conscience.

That to Caesar, is civil only, of this world only, and of the body and bodily things and of outward relations.

These Two cover and include all relations of all men: and the sovereign word is:

“Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”

Now Sunday and Sunday observance come from neither God nor Caesar; but only from the church by Pontifex Maximus: neither of which is either God or Caesar.

Yet God and Caesar are the two powers only to whom any man can rightly owe or render anything.

There is not between these two by right any third power, that is neither God nor Caesar but claiming to be both God and Caesar and exacting what is due to both: as has been the pretension of the church of Rome for more than sixteen hundred years, and as is every other church in the law.

And thus not being from either God or Caesar, but only from that interloper that is neither God nor Caesar, neither the Sunday nor Sunday laws can ever at right require, receive, or claim any obedience or any recognition or any allegiance of anybody in the world.