



## THE LORDS DAY

### THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH

#### A DEFENCE OF THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH

*(Introduction)*

Of all the questions engaging the attention of the Christian world, there is none that is of greater moment or of more vital importance to the child of God than the question of the "Lord's Day," the Christian Sabbath.


There is scarcely another subject within the lids of the Bible which is so plainly and so clearly dealt with, yet, notwithstanding, there is no subject which is more controverted than is this one.

Most professing Christians regard Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Lord's Day. Others observe the seventh day-the day which God originally appointed. But which is the day that we ought to keep?

By many it is thought to be a matter of little moment, so long as one day is observed. But only as we view this question from the standpoint of the word of God shall we be able to understand and fully sense the importance of the issue involved. And however much we may seek to avoid the question, the time is fast approaching when every Protestant will be forced to face it and make a very definite decision with respect to it.

It is not merely the question of "which day." It is the question of whether we give our allegiance to an earthly power or the God of Heaven and Jesus Christ. It is a question in which our eternal interests are at stake; and with the object of earnestly endeavouring to open the eyes of the true people of God to the real situation these pages are penned, and into the hands of whomsoever they may fall, may they receive the earnest and prayerful consideration that such an important matter demands.

*F L Sharp*



**THE LORD'S DAY THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH**

**A DEFENCE OF THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH**

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Thus reads the first verse in the first chapter of the Heaven- inspired Book.

Following this statement is the record of each of the six days' work of creation. On the sixth day God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." (Genesis 1:26) Here we learn that God was not alone in the work of creation. Someone else was associated with Him, and someone, too, who was in the image of God, for God said, "Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness.

Who was this associate? Paul tells us it was Christ. In Hebrews 1:1-3 he says, "God, who at sundry times and in diverse manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, BY WHOM ALSO HE MADE THE WORLDS; who being the brightness of His glory, and the EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON, and upholding all things by the word of His power, etc.."

Again in the epistle to the Colossians, we read that Christ "is the image of the invisible God." and "BY HIM WERE ALL THINGS CREATED, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: ALL THINGS WERE CREATED BY HIM, and for Him." (Colossians 1:15-16.)

Then, as if to sum up these statements, John says, "All things were made by Him, and WITHOUT HIM WAS NOT ANYTHING MADE THAT WAS MADE." (John 1:3)

We see from these Scriptures that Christ was not only the express image of the Father, and the associate of God in the work of creation, but He was, in fact Creator-the active agent in that work.

**THE PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST**

It is supposed by some, however that Christ had no existence before His advent into this world, but such a theory finds no support in the Bible. That He did exist at creation-" in the beginning" -the Scriptures just noticed make very manifest and leave no room for doubt. But as further evidence we will notice what Christ Himself says regarding this. "And now O Father, glorify Thou Me with thine own self with the glory that I had WITH THEE BEFORE THE WORLD WAS." (John 17:5) And again, "Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, BEFORE ABRAHAM WAS, I AM." (John 8:58) see also John 10:32-33 and John 3:13.

Thus according to Christ' s own testimony He had an existence not only prior to Abraham' s day, but He was with the Father "before the world was."

And still the evidence is not exhausted. We have another witness, even the Father Himself. speaking through the prophet Micah, He says, "Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth HAVE BEEN FROM OLD, FROM EVERLASTING." Or, as the marginal note says, FROM THE DAYS OF ETERNITY." (Micah 5:2)

To those who accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, such definite statements will be quite sufficient to remove any doubt that they may possibly have had in their minds in respect to this; while, on the other hand, those who deny such evidence not only reject Christ' s own words and the testimony of the Father, but they virtually deny Christ' s divinity, making Him but a man and an impostor at that.

### **CHRIST AS GOD**

Then another objection arises in the minds of some, i.e. that Christ was not God, He is, nevertheless, referred to in the Scriptures as God. It was prophesied of Him, "His name shall be called..... the mighty God." (Isaiah 9:6) And Paul says that He "being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God." (Philipians 2:6) Then above all this we have the Fathers own testimony as related by Paul in Hebrews 1:8, "But unto the Son He saith, Thy throne O God, is forever and ever."

That Christ should be addressed as God is quite in harmony with the statement made in Genesis 1:1 where we are told that "God created the heaven and the earth." From the reading of this verse one might very naturally conclude that there was but one person engaged in the work of creation, yet the fact is, that the original word - Elohim - which here is translated God, is, as Dr.. Adam Clarke remarks, "certainly the plural form of EL OR ELOAH, and being in the plural it implies, of course, a plurality of Persons; and is this not confirmed in Genesis 1:26 where God said "let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness?"

Thus we see that Christ, who is called God, did exist in the beginning, "before the world was," and was in fact, the creator of the heaven and the earth, and without whom "was not anything made that was made."

With this fact fully established we now read that, "On the seventh day God ended the work which He had made." (Genesis 2:2) Who, we ask, was it that rested? Was it not Christ, the one whom the Scriptures plainly declare to be the creator of all things? Then resting, as He did, on the seventh day, the seventh day became Christ' s restingday, Christ' s Sabbath, (for Sabbath means rest). "Therefore," Christ truly says, "the Son of man is Lord (i.e. owner or master) also of the Sabbath." (Mark 2:28)

Which day, then, is the Lords Day-the Christian Sabbath? It surely can be none other than the seventh day, the day we call Saturday, the day upon which Christ rested, and of which He claims to be Lord and Master; and when John said, "I was in the spirit on the Lord' s Day (Revelation 1:10) he must have undoubtedly referred to the seventh day of the week. The present time is spoken of as the Christian dispensation, but in the light of the scripture brought under our notice, the Christian dispensation began at creation, and has actually been such all through the ages.

But in view of the distinction which is commonly made, we might incidentally note here that the works of creation "were finished," the day following-the seventh day-was the day of rest. Likewise,

when Christ exclaimed upon the cross "It is finished" thus declaring that His personal work on earth in connection with the plan of redemption was finished, the day following—the seventh day—was also the day of rest, and was observed by Christ's disciples according to the commandment." (Luke 23:56) and since the cross is held to be the dividing line between the old dispensation and the new, the seventh-day Sabbath having been observed by the earliest Christians immediately after the crucifixion, it stands out as the Sabbath of the so called new dispensation. It is the Christian Sabbath.

At no time during the history of His church on earth has the Lord claimed any other day than the seventh. At Sinai, in the fourth commandment, He calls it "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." (Exodus 20:10) About 800 years later through the prophet Isaiah, He speaks of it as "my holy day." (Isaiah 58:13) Nor has He, under the gospel relinquished His claim, for in the New Testament—which some claim to be the New covenant—He claims, very definitely, as we have already seen in Mark 2:28, to be Lord and Master of the Sabbath.

### **THE SABBATH NOT JEWISH**

Many, however delight in stigmatizing it "that old Jewish Sabbath." But why so? It is no more Jewish than is the first day of the week. The Sabbath was in existence 2300 years before there was a Jew upon the earth. But if the Sabbath was Jewish, and it's being Jewish would be considered a sufficient reason for rejecting it, then, to be consistent, we must reject both Christ and salvation, for Christ was a Jew, and He said also that "salvation is of the Jews;" moreover the greater part of the scripture was penned by Jewish writers. Then why not reject them also?

But so far from being Jewish or the Sabbath of the Jews, it is plainly declared to be "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It did not belong to men, but to the Lord. Truly, it was made for man, for his benefit, not, however, for the Jew man merely, but for ALL mankind of whatever nationality. By referring to Leviticus 24:22 and Numbers 15:16, 29-31, it will be seen that under the Levitical dispensation, "The stranger" was also subject to the same laws as was Israel, thus demonstrating the fact that the law of God was not imposed upon Israel only, but was intended for all nations, Jew and Gentile alike. Furthermore, in Isaiah 56:6-7 there is a very definite promise of salvation made to "the sons of the stranger" who "join themselves to the Lord to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it." Was the Sabbath Jewish then? was it made for the Jews only? With Paul, we might exclaim, "Is He the God of the Jews only?" Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." (Romans 3:30)

Then seeing that He is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles, and, too, that the Gentiles were to be subject to His law, and further, that the conditions upon which the stranger would be brought to God's "holy mountain," was keeping the Sabbath from polluting it, and taking "hold of my covenant," clearly the Sabbath was not for the Jews only but for the Gentiles, for all who would enter his service.

Respecting this other writers say—

**"The Sabbath was made for man, not for the Hebrews, but for all men."—Pillars of Truth, page 88.**

**"Christ ..... says, ' The Sabbath was made for man;' i.e. not for Israel only, but for universal man." Bible Cyclopedia.**

**"The Sabbath was made for man, not for the Jews or the Gentiles, but for the species, for all mankind, even to the end of the world." Pulpit Cyclopedia.**

**" ' The Sabbath was made for man' not as may be a Jew a Christian, but as a man, a creature bound to love, worship, and obey his God and Maker, and on his trial for eternity." Watson' s Theological Dictionary.**

**"As at the close of creation the seventh day was thus set apart by the Most High as a day of rest, without limitation to age or country, the observance of it is obligatory upon the whole human race, to whom, in the wisdom of Providence, it may be communicated." Professor Gro. Bush in notes on Genesis 2:3, Vol. 1 pp. 48, 49.**

### **SUNDAY NOT THE LORD'S DAY**

Now, we have seen from the Scriptures, that in three distinct periods of this world' s history, the Lord has laid claim to the seventh day as His holy day, but not once can it be found that He ever claimed the first day for any purpose whatever; that day is classed among the six working days given to man. (Ezekiel 46: 1) But men under the delusion that they are honouring Christ by commemorating His resurrection, and, too, without sufficient reason. To claim that John referred to the first day of the week when he said, "I was in the spirit on the Lord' s Day," is to assume something that has never yet been proved, and, which moreover, cannot be proved.

It is a mistaken idea that because the first day of the week is now regarded as the "Lord' s Day" it was so designated, by, and known to, the apostles. The appellation "Lord' s Day" as applied to Sunday, the first day of the week, did not emanate from the apostles, but from one of the early "fathers"- Tertullian, who wrote about AD 200. He was the first writer who applied the term "Lord' s Day" to Sunday, and this was about 100 years after John penned the expression in the book of Revelation. It was not till the year AD 325 that the title "Lord' s Day" was authoritatively bestowed upon Sunday, and it was done by Pope Sylvester. Before Tertullian' s use of the title, at the end of the second century, all evidence goes to show that Sunday was not so known.

Justin Martyr, one of the earliest apologists of Christianity, and who wrote about AD 147, when referring to the practice of the early Christians meeting together for worship, says, it was "upon the day called SUNDAY. He does not make use of the term "Lord' s Day." had he known the day as such he would undoubtedly have so expressed it.

Another writer, who has dug deeply into this question, remarks,- "There is not a single instance where we have found the first day under the title ' Lord' s Day' directly associated with the Lord' s resurrection, in all the church fathers until near the close of the second century." "The variety of name by which the day is referred to during this time is remarkable, but it is never called the "Lord' s Day,' nor is it ever designated by any sacred name." -Andrews' History of the Sabbath.

That the apostle John did not regard the first day as the "Lord' s Day," or even as a sacred day, is clear from the fact that while in his gospel he had occasion to mention the first day of the week twice, in neither instance does he use the expression "Lords Day." And this is all the more marked from the fact that he wrote his gospel after his return from Patmos, would it not also have been the "Lord' s Day" when he returned from his exile? Is it possible that he has forgotten so soon? And in making reference to the first day after such a vision on Patmos, would he not have given it its new title and upheld its sacredness, if it had been the Lords design to so honour the day? But the fact is, he did not. Then there is but one conclusion with respect to the expression in Revelation 1:10, and that is, that John did not have reference to the first day of the week, but to the seventh day Sabbath. And this is the conclusion that other writers have been forced to, for instance, W.B. Taylor (Editor of the Publications of the Smithsonian Institution and Author of various Scientific works) who, though an opponent of Sabbath observance, whom making reference to the term "Lord' s Day" of Revelation 1:10, found himself obliged to make the following admission,-

**"If a current day was intended, the only day bearing this definition in either the Old or New Testaments, is Saturday, the seventh day of the week." Obligation of the Sabbath, page 296.**

But to continue our investigation. Not only do we find Christ identified with the work of creation, but we also see Him as Israel' s Leader and Lawgiver.

#### **CHRIST AS ISRAEL'S LEADER**

When the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, we read that "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them by the way; and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light." (Exodus 13:21) By comparing this scripture with Paul' s statement in 1 Corinthians 10:4, we learn that "the Lord" who "went before them" as the Leader was none other than Christ, for Paul says, "they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them (margin "went with them") and that Rock was Christ." We find too, that the Psalmist, when referring to Israel' s Leader as they journeyed through the wilderness, speaks of Him as "God, the God of Israel." (Psalms 68:7-8)

But while the Psalmist speaks of Him as God, we do not overlook Luke' s statement in the Acts of the Apostles, where he says, "This is he (Moses) that was in the Church in the wilderness with the Angel which spake to him in the Mt. Sinai." (Acts 7:38) While it would appear from this statement that the one who spoke to Moses at Sinai was but an Angel, it does not by any means do away with the fact that it was Christ. In Exodus 14:19 it will be seen that the one who lead Israel in the pillar of cloud and fire (and whom Paul definitely states to be Christ) is designated "the Angel of God;" and again He is referred to as "mine Angel" in Exodus 23:20-23. Yes, the Angel who spoke with Moses at Sinai, was without doubt Christ Himself.

And now, having in our investigation thus far, seen that Christ was the Creator (John 1:3, Hebrews 1:10); that by Him "all things consist" (Colossians 1:17), and are upheld "by the word of His power" (Hebrews 1:3); that it was Christ who lead Israel through the wilderness in the pillar of cloud and fire (1Corinthians 10:1-4); and also He "who spake .... in the Mount Sinai" (Acts 7:38) we should now be prepared to find Him identified as the Lawgiver.

**CHRIST AS LAW GIVER**

In the confession of the Levites, as recorded by Nehemiah, (Nehemiah 9:6,12) we read, "Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein (compare John 1:3, Hebrews 1:10) and Thou preservest them all (Compare Colossians 1:17) and all the host of heaven worshippeth Thee" (compare Hebrews 1:6) ...."Moreover, Thou leddest them in the day by a cloudy pillar; and in the night by a pillar of fire, to give them light, etc.." (compare 1Corinthians 10:1-4).

In the light of the Scriptures already examined, there can be no question but that Christ is the One referred to here. And now the inspired penman continues, "Thou camest down upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgements, and true laws, good statutes, and commandments: and madest known unto them Thy holy Sabbath, and commandest them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses Thy servant." (Nehemiah 9:13,14)

Thus do we find that the one who is spoken of as leading Israel in the pillar of cloud and fire is also the one who on Sinai gave the law; and as Christ was their leader in that pillar of fire it was He who spoke the law and made known to them His Sabbath, the seventh-day-the day upon which He himself rested "from all His work which He had made."

**THE IMMUTIBILITY OF THE LAW**

And now with regard to the Commandments called "good" (Nehemiah 9:13) which Christ gave. All Bible students will doubtless freely admit that the commandments spoken on Sinai were the ten precepts of the Decalogue, and these, the Scriptures make very clear, were intended to be, and in fact are of perpetual obligation without alteration or change. In Ecclesiastes 3:14 we read, "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever nothing can be put to it nor anything taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him." We ask, were the ten commandments the act of God of Christ? this can only be answered in the affirmative. Then, lawfully, "nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it." Then why add the first day, taking away the seventh, adopting the pagan festival, "the venerable day of the sun" -in place of the divinely appointed Christian Sabbath-the seventh day of the week?

But further, the Lord says, "My covenant will I not break, nor ALTER THE THING THAT HAS GONE OUT OF MY LIPS." (Psalms 89:34) Now, what was God' s Christ' s covenant? "And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." (Deuteronomy 4:13) And what left God' s Christ' s lips at Sinai in the hearing of Israel? The ten commandments. "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and He added no more. And He wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." (Deuteronomy 5:22)

Now, when the Lord declares that He will not alter the thing that has gone out of His lips, and we are further instructed that what He doeth it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it: -can there possibly be any change made in the Sabbath of the Lord? No, positively, no. "ALL His commandments are sure. they stand fast forever and ever." (Psalms 111:7,8) Plainly, the Lord never intended that there should ever be any change or alteration in His law.

But if anyone had the right or authority to make alteration or change in it, it would surely have been Christ, the Law-giver, for none but the Law-giver can change a law. No law enacted by Parliament can be set aside or altered except by another enactment by that same body. And no more can the law given by Christ be altered except by Him. But when He came to this earth in the flesh He said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am come not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," or as the R.V. expressed it, "till all things be accomplished." (Matthew 5: 17, 18) But heaven and earth have not yet passed away nor have all things been fulfilled or accomplished, therefore, not one jot or one tittle of the law has been abrogated or changed. No, the law of God, as spoken by Christ on Sinai, still remains intact and must do till the end of time.

In view of these Scriptures, the question may arise in the minds of some, why then has the ceremonial law gone if no alteration in what God has spoken is permissible? To this we would reply that that law was of a temporary nature, and was ordained only "till the seed should come" (Galatians 3: 19) or "imposed on them until the time of reformation." (Hebrews 9: 10) The ceremonies and sacrifices were all types which pointed forward to Christ and His work, and just as type met antitype the type automatically ceased to be, having fulfilled its purpose, consequently, the Scriptures to which we refer would not apply to the ceremonial law in the same sense as to the moral law. So long as the ceremonial law was in force nothing of its provisions could be altered or abrogated, but when the time came that it had served its purpose and the Seed had come to which it pointed, the Scriptures quoted would not be a hindrance to its abolition. But as regards to the moral law-the Ten Commandments-those by their very nature are of perpetual and everlasting obligation and in respect of which the Scriptures quoted show very definitely that they can never be altered or abrogated.

But there is yet another evidence of the perpetuity of the law of God which confronts the Christian Church and to which we will here refer. In Revelation 11: 19 we read, "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament."

In this vision, John evidently saw the great original which was shown to Moses as "the pattern" according to which he was to construct the ark for the earthly sanctuary. (Exodus 25:9,40) The ark in the earthly sanctuary was called "the ark of the testimony" (Exodus 25:22) and the testimony was the tables of stone (Exodus 25: 16; 31: 18) upon which were written the Ten Commandments. And seeing that the ark in the earthly tabernacle was termed the "ark of the testimony" because it contained the tables of testimony, there can be no other conclusion than that the "ark of His testament" as seen in heaven by John, also contains the tables of the testimony or the law of the Ten Commandments.

Thus, while men on earth may talk of the law having been abolished, or the day of rest changed, this vision given to John, shows that in heaven the original still exists, and gives force to the words of Christ, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," (Matthew 5: 18) and also to the words of the Psalmist, "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven," (Psalms 119:89) and "All His commandments are sure. They stand fast (or, margin, "are established") for ever and ever." (Psalms 111:7,8)

That some religious leaders fully recognise both the importance of God' s law and its immutability, we quote the following as examples,-

When delivering his presidential address at the opening of the synod (April 1932) Dr.. G.H. Cranswick, the Anglican Bishop of Gippsland, Victoria, Australia, made the following statement:

**"Many people regard the Ten Commandments as being old fashioned. They forgot that in them they had God' s permanent legislation for order in the home**

**and in the state. If they were but observed, they should need no reformatories, no police, no divorce courts, no unemployment measures, no arbitration courts, no labour unions. That may be thought to be Utopian; nevertheless, it was truth that had been justified at the bar of history times without number."**

Then we take the following from a sermon preached by C.M. Gordon at a church of Christ Conference in Victoria, Australia, and which was published in the "Australian Christian" of June 4, 1908:

**"The reign of Christ is a reign of law. Law is an essential feature of all government, human and divine. The kingdom of our Master is entered by submission to law, and the enjoyment of its privileges is conditioned upon obedience to law. What mean, then those Scriptures which affirm that by deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified, and that Christ took the law out of the way nailing it to the cross? From such passages, some have apparently derived the impression that Sinai, as symbolizing law, has disappeared as effectively as if some Hercules had plucked it up by the roots and hurled it into the midst of the sea, and that the reign of Christ is more of a reign of license than of law. In other words, we are told that grace has supplanted law. This is not so. The Siniatic covenant has been abolished only in its ceremonial and temporary features and as an experimental system of justification; its moral elements are incorporated and perpetuated in Christianity."**

**"The moral law, written on perishable tables of stone and confirmed by the thunders of Sinai, is now written on the imperishable tables of the heart and confirmed by the thunders of Calvary. The grace that came by Jesus Christ does not destroy the moral aspect of that law which was delivered to Israel through Moses, but fulfills it, reconfirms it, and re-enforces it by new motives, sublimer sanctions, and added insistence. Therefore, no subject of the government of Christ dare continue in sin that grace may abound. Grace thunders against sin as loudly, or even more loudly, than does law. The difference between law and grace is this: The law has no mercy; grace has mercy. The law discovers the disease, but has no remedy. The law has no Saviour; grace provides the Saviour. . . But never let it be forgotten that, while we cannot be saved by law without grace, no more can we be saved by grace without law; while we cannot be saved by morality without Christianity. In Christianity a wonderful thing has taken place: justice and mercy have celebrated their nuptials; law and grace have kissed each other; Sinai and Calvary have embraced each other."**

This is sound instruction and is in full accord with the principles of truth and sets out the true relationship of law and grace. Grace certainly "does not destroy the moral aspect of the law" but, on the other hand, there is every evidence that "its moral elements are incorporated and perpetuated in Christianity." This is made manifest, not only in the teachings of Christ, but also in the lives of every true follower of the Master. There can be no such thing as moral principles changing. Men' s ideas concerning them may change, but that which was theft or murder or adultery in ages gone by is also the same today and while men may talk glibly of the law having been abolished, let another person defraud them, steal their goods or money, or attempt to murder them, and we soon get the undeniable evidence that they do believe that the moral principles contained in God' s law still hold good and are binding today.

**THE FULFILLING OF THE LAW**

It is urged by many that Christ fulfilled the law, and having done this abolished it. But let us see. If it was Christ' s intention to abolish the law, why, we ask, did He in such plain language declare that "till heaven and earth pass, on jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Did He, in the one breath, declare both its abolition and its perpetuity? Impossible.

We know of course, that Christ did fulfil the law, but let us see how absurdly inconsistent such a position appears when we interpret the word "fulfill" to mean abolish. If fulfill in one scripture means abolish, must it not also have the same meaning in other Scriptures where it is found. Then let us see the effect of applying that meaning to "fulfill" where we shall find it, and in place of the word "fulfill" we will insert "abolish."

***Matthew 3:15. "Jesus answering said unto him, suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to (fulfill) abolish all righteousness."***

***Colossians 1:25. "Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for, you to (fulfill) abolish the law of God."***

***Galatians 6:2. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so (fulfill) abolish the law of Christ."***

***Acts 13:22. "I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine heart, which shall (fulfill) abolish all my will."***

***Galatians 5:16. "This I say then, walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not (fulfill) abolish the lusts of the flesh."***

Thus if "fulfill" is interpreted to mean "abolish," then righteousness would be a thing of the past; the word of God would be of no value to us now; and the law of Christ (even the supposed new law which some assert has taken the place of the Ten Commandments) would also be gone, and all God' s will would have been abolished nearly 3000 years ago when David fulfilled it; while the meaning of walking in the Spirit, in common with all the other scriptures just quoted, would be so perverted as to make it appear the very opposite of what was intended to convey.

The absurdity of such an interpretation is thus made very apparent, and all who are honestly seeking for truth must candidly admit that at least this interpretation will no longer hold good.

The Scriptures, however, give us at least one meaning of the word fulfill. We find it in the marginal reading of Colossians 1:25." It is fully to preach," While, if we take the meaning as given in the Dictionary it is, "To carry into effect; to execute; to perform; to continue to the end." And this is undoubtedly what Christ meant to convey. He came to carry into effect that law which was being perverted by the Pharisees; He came to demonstrate its holy principles in His life, and to perform it as an example for us, showing mankind how it should be kept, and also declaring, in harmony with Psalms 117:1,2 that it would continue to the end of time.

Let them then, beware of endeavouring to make void the law of God or any part of it, and especially the Sabbath of Jehovah-for is it not that one thing that they war against so desperately, and are so determined to get rid of? But notwithstanding all the opposition, the specious arguments, the misapplication and misinterpretation of the scripture, the law (Sabbath and all) will stand firm to the end of time. Were it otherwise, Christ' s words would not be true, nor would the Bible be reliable.

It is most remarkable, however, to note what great stress men will lay upon the fact that Christ fulfilled the law, and urge this as a very decided reason why they should not now observe it, yet, to the plainer and more explicit declarations of Christ, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" they will deliberately shut their eyes and ignore.

Then another position is taken by some that while the law was abolished at the cross, nine of its precepts were reinstated by the apostles, the fourth or Sabbath precept, however being omitted. The Scriptures given in one publication in support of this contention are as follows:-

**1. Ephesians 4:4-6. "There is. . . one God. "Written about AD 63.**

**1 John 5:21. "Little children keep yourselves from idols. "Written about AD 96.**

**2. 1Corinthians 10:14. "Wherefore my dearly beloved flee from idolatry." Written about AD 58.**

**Romans 1:25. "Worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." Written about AD 58.**

**3. James 5:12. "But above all things. . . swear not." Written about AD 61.**

**4. ABOLISHED.**

**5. Ephesians 6:1 "Children obey your parents." Written about AD 63.**

**6. 1 John 3:15 "Whoso hateth his brother is a murderer" Written about AD 96.**

**7. Hebrews 13:4 "Marriage is honourable. . . but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge" Written about AD 63.**

**8. Romans 2:21 "Thou that preachest a man should not steal. . . dost thou steal?" Written about AD 58.**

**Ephesians 4:28" Let him that stole steal no more" Written about AD 63.**

**9. Colossians 3:9 "Lie not one to another" Written about AD 63**

**Ephesians 4:25 "Wherefore put away lying" Written about AD 63**

**2 Timothy 3:3 "Without natural affection, truce-breakers" etc. Written about AD 66**

**10. Ephesians 5:3 "But fornication . . . covetousness let it not be" Written about AD 63.**

**Colossians 3:5 "Mortify therefore your members . . . and covetousness" Written about AD 63.**

These are the Scriptures given as warrant for the reinstatement of the nine precepts. But as we examine them closely it will be seen that none of them are of the nature of a direct command but are merely a reiteration of, or reference to, the law which the various writers evidently understood to be in force at the time they wrote. But seeing that it is claimed that they are of the nature of a reenactment, we must perforce deal with them and show the falsity of such a claim.

When Christ spoke the law on Sinai, the ten precepts were given as one compact law of "Ten Words" in proper order, but in the alleged reinstatement of the nine precepts we are not informed how or by whose authority the reinstatement was made. According to the Scriptures given it would appear to have been made piecemeal, through several writers, at different times, and in most irregular fashion.

Now, if the law was abolished at the cross, then it ceased to operate in AD 31. In the alleged reinstatement we find, according to the Scriptures given, that the first precepts to be reinforced were the second and eighth, and Paul is quoted as the medium for these, by his statements to the Romans and the Corinthians, and which statements were written about AD 58. Let it be observed then, (in the light of what is contended for the reinstatement of the nine precepts) that from AD 31 (when the law was supposed to have been abolished) till AD 58 -a period of twenty-seven years-men must have been free during all those years to commit any acts of lawlessness they chose, as under the circumstances, there were no laws whatever to deter them or regulate their actions. Then for three years those two laws only must have been in force, i.e. until AD 61 when James reintroduces the third precept. Two years later, in AD 63, the first, fifth, seventh, ninth, and tenth precepts were supposedly reinstated, again through Paul. If this were true, then all during these thirty-two years there was no law whatever forbidding the taking of life, for the sixth precept "Thou shalt not kill" had not been mentioned, nor was it until another thirty-three years had passed, when it fell to the lot of John to announce its restoration in AD 96, when he wrote his first epistle. The Sabbath, we are told did not come in again, but was abolished entirely. And this is the kind of argument that men will advance in order to rid themselves of the obligation to keep the Sabbath of Jehovah.

Now James says, "There is ONE Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy" (James 4: 12); but in connection with so-called reaffirming of the nine precepts, three appear-Paul, James and John. Will those who advance such an argument explain then how there comes to be three, and none of whom possess the qualification of being able to save? Also can they give any reason why those nine precepts were reenacted piecemeal and in such an irregular manner, instead of being given one compact law, and by "one Law-giver"? Then too, will they explain how it is that in AD 58, 5 years before the supposed reenactment of the tenth precept, Paul declared that he " had not known lust except the law had said ' thou shalt not covet' " (Romans 7:7)? How is it possible that that precept should convict Paul of sin if it were true that it had been abolished at the cross and was not reenacted till five years later than the time he wrote his epistle to the Romans?

Again according to the Scriptures given for the alleged reenactment of the law, the sixth precept "Thou shalt not kill" did not operate after its abolition in AD 31 until AD 96, yet in AD 61, thirty-five years before James says very definitely, "If thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a

transgressor of the law." (James 2:11) Is this not very conclusive evidence that the law against killing was in force, and that too, long before the so called reenactment? The fact is, the Scriptures given for the supposed reinstatement of the nine precepts, were not of the nature of a restoration at all, but were merely, references to the law of God which the writers well knew was still in force and binding upon men, never having been abolished.

Now the object and purpose of this line of argument is, it is plainly to be seen, the abolition of God' s Sabbath; and men would have us believe that it is the Lords own plan. But had it been the Lords plan to drop out the Sabbath at the time of the crucifixion while desiring to retain the other nine precepts, can we possibly suppose that He would have adopted such a clumsy method as the one we have just examined to give effect to such an important change? Certainly not. He would have given a direct command and in such a way that all would have understood. But the fact is, Christ never contemplated any such change. This is made apparent not only from Matthew 5: 17- 18, but also from the instruction He gave to His disciples when foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem. (Matthew 24:20) Knowing full well that the time for its destruction had not yet come, He counseled them to pray during the intervening years (about 40 years) that their flight from that city should not come on the Sabbath day.

Now while men profess themselves unable to find any scripture in the New Testament in support of the Sabbath of the fourth precept, Matthew 24:20 is one they will do well to ponder. Let them carefully note that this instruction was not given to the Jewish doctrines. If Christ had intended any change in the day of worship, would He have instructed them to pray such a prayer? What sense or reason would there be in instructing them to pray for years in the future, that their flight should not be on the Sabbath day, if it was His intention to abolish it at the cross (just a few days later) and in its place substitute the first day as the Lord' s day?

If no other scripture could be found in the Bible for the perpetuity of the Sabbath, this alone is sufficient evidence that Christ never contemplated changing the day of rest.

But while Sunday advocates would abolish the Sabbath of divine appointment, because of their professed inability to find any reinstating warrant for it under the gospel, where, we ask, is the divine warrant for Sunday observance? If under the gospel a direct command is thought necessary for the observance of the Sabbath, it surely is just as necessary to produce the divine warrant for the observance of Sunday. But it cannot be produced. If such a warrant could be found, how triumphantly would it be flaunted before God' s Sabbathkeepers. But it is not forthcoming. There is however, a divine warrant for Sabbath observance-the one given at Sinai which has never been abrogated.

### **THE LAW NAILED TO THE CROSS**

And now we will examine the contention that the law was nailed to the cross. As the basis of this theory, Colossians 2: 14- 17 is quoted "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinance that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross."

It is taken for granted by many that "the handwriting of ordinance" which was nailed to the cross, was the law of the Ten Commandments, but let us see if this claim is valid.

The first three of these ten precepts forbids, 1st, the worshipping of any other God than the God of heaven; 2nd, the setting up and worshipping of idols; 3rd, taking God' s name in vain.

Now, will any one contend that these are in any sense "against" or "contrary to" the followers of Christ, inimical to the best interests of any Christian? Do Christians desire to serve other Gods, to bow down to idols, or be at liberty to take God's name in vain? In all candor it must be admitted that these three precepts cannot possibly be regarded as being "against" or "contrary to" the true worshipper of the God of heaven.

Then shall we say that the fourth precept, above all, the one that provides one of the greatest blessings ever bestowed upon mankind, that of a blessed rest day every seventh-day-is "against" or "contrary to" any man? Is not rest something that is beneficial to man, and something that he really enjoys? In what respect can it possibly be urged that the Sabbath command is "against" or "contrary to" the Christian?

And what of the next precept, one which promises long life to those who will honour their parents? Who will assert that this is against one's best interests? And is it "against" a man to impose laws that forbid murder, theft, adultery, slander, or coveting? All such laws would certainly be "against" and "contrary to" all those who desire to do such wicked things, but seeing that the true Christian does not desire to do these things, it cannot be consistently urged that any of them are "against" or "contrary" to the man who is a Christian. Then seeing that the Ten Commandments are not "against" or "contrary to" "the saints and faithful brethren of Christ," they certainly cannot be the "handwriting of ordinances" which were taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, for it is expressly stated that that which was taken away and nailed to the cross was something that was "against" and was "contrary to" the Christian?

But another thought here, something for those to think about who take the position that the law was abolished at the cross and nine only of the ten precepts reinstated under the gospel.

We have seen from the Scriptures that that which was nailed to the cross and abolished, was something that was "against" and "contrary to" the Christian. Then if that which was nailed to the cross was the Ten Commandments, and they were nailed there because they were "against" and "contrary to" us, why were nine of the ten precepts brought back again or reenacted? Would they not be just as much "against" us and "contrary to" us after the reenactment as they were before their abolition?

That there was something that was nailed to the cross, or abolished at the crucifixion, we freely admit, but it was not the Ten Commandments. It was the Ceremonial or Mosaic law, or as Dr. Adam Clarke expresses it, "the ritual law which through the multitude of its sacrifices, ordinances, etc., was exceedingly burdensome to the Jewish people." These were the "handwriting of ordinance" that were nailed to the cross and done away with-the shadow of things to come-not the moral law. That never was a shadow, and especially is this true of the seventh-day Sabbath. that was established in Eden before the fall, before types and shadows were given or became necessary; consequently the Sabbath of the Lord-the seventh-day-never was a shadow, and not being a shadow could not be included in the Sabbath days which were "shadows of things to come" and which were nailed to the cross.

As evidence that this is recognized by others, we quote a statement made and published by a body known as "The New York Sabbath Committee", a body that for many years has been working for stricter Sunday laws. In the June-July issue 1931 of their official organ "The Bulletin" page 846 they say:-

**"A feeble and futile attempt has been made to identify the fourth commandment with the ceremonial law which perished with the Jewish nation. But no intelligent person can really believe any such thing. The Sabbath law existed long before the ceremonial law, and before the moral law was formulated on Mount Sinai. And besides, there is nothing ceremonial about it."**

As a further evidence that the Sabbath still exists and will continue throughout the ages, we find that it was made a memorial of creation. The Psalmist says, "He hath made His wonderful works to be remembered," (Psalms 111:4) or as Leesers Hebrew translation puts it, "He hath made a ' memorial' for His wonderful works." And what could be more wonderful than the work of creation? It was this that the Lord designed should be remembered, and as a memorial of which the Sabbath was instituted. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore (for this reason) the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." (Exodus 20:11) And this memorial the Psalmist tells us, is to endure "throughout all generations" (Psalms 135:13) But the generations have not yet ended, therefore the memorial of God' s creative power-the seventh-day Sabbath-still continues, and is as binding now as on the day it was proclaimed on Sinai.

At the National Evangelical Church Convention assembled in Milwaukee, Wis., October 21, 1930 according to the ' Philadelphia Ledger' of October 22, the following resolution was adopted:-

**"Man in his puny strength cannot rescind, annul, or repeal the Biblical law of the seventh day spent in rest and worship."**

Then away back in the eighteen eighties, there was in London an agitation over the opening of the museum on Sunday. Dr.. Donald Fraser, then Moderator of the English Presbyterian Synod, Preached a sermon on the topic, the sermon being printed as a booklet. with the title "The Lord' s Day." On page 9 of this booklet he flatly declared that there is no divine authority for any change of the day. Here is his statement:-

**"There is not the slightest evidence that our Lord or his apostles regarded or taught others to regard the first day of the week as the Sabbath. Change of the day! How can anyone suppose that the apostles would have taken it upon themselves to make a change in one of the ' Ten Words' of Mt. Sinai, violating the press declaration, ' The Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God' , and stranger still that this alteration was made by their official authority in the church, and yet it is never alluded to in any one of their writings, or in the book of Acts?"**

The London ' Christian World' (November 11, 1880) reported a meeting of the Presbyterian Synod in which Dr. Fraser was severely criticized for his statements: and while the Doctor was obliged to withdraw his booklet, he said that he could not modify his declaration, that there was no scriptural authority for the change of the day.

Another very candid statement published in the ' Christian Standard' and made by the Rev. Clark Barden, a minister and author, and an Ex-President of one of the western colleges of the disciples, is as follows:-

**"Others observe the first day, contending without a particle of evidence that the commandment has been changed from the seventh day to the first. Our preachers are by no means agreed in their teachings. They have no well-defined views on the subject, and are defeated when they attempt a defence of our practice of observing the first day, or a review of the arguments of the advocates of the seventh day. Nor are we alone in this. There is no clear, tenable teaching on this subject in our theological works commentaries or by any religious press. Advocates of the observance of the first day stultify themselves by taking contradictory and inconsistent positions."**

Thus are sincere and earnest Bible students constrained to admit the real truth concerning the total absence of any divine warrant for the change of the day of worship from the seventh to the first day of the week.

But we must notice some other fallacious theories upon which the supposed abolition of the law of God is based.

It is thought by some that with the passing away of the Old Covenant, the Ten Commandments have likewise gone. The Old Covenant having been made at Sinai, and the Ten Commandments having also been given there, it is supposed they were one and the same thing. But not so. While the Old Covenant was made at Sinai, the Ten Commandments were not instituted or made there. They were in existence long before the covenant was made at Sinai, and in fact, long before Israel existed. The Sabbath, the fourth precept, was instituted at creation (Genesis 2:1-3). Then we read in Genesis 26:5 That "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws," and this was over 400 years before Israel came to Sinai. Later on Israel was proved by God to see whether they would walk in His law or not (Exodus 16:5) and when they broke the Sabbath, the Lord said to Moses, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" (Exodus 16:22-30) This, too, was before Israel had reached Sinai.

Plainly then, the law was in existence long before the Old Covenant was made at Sinai. How then could the Old Covenant, which dates only from Sinai, be the law of God which was made and kept centuries before?

In making a covenant it requires the co-operation of two or more persons, and we find that the Old Covenant was made by God with the people (Deuteronomy 5:2-4; Jeremiah 31:32; Hebrews 8:9) Then the Old Covenant was something in which both God and the people had a part. But what part did the people have in making the Ten Commandments? None whatever. Then the Ten Commandments could not be the Old Covenant. As a further demonstration of this fact, we read in Hebrews 8:6-7 that the first or Old Covenant was faulty. But "The law of God is perfect" (Psalms 19:7). Again, the first covenant was transient and vanished away. (Hebrews 8:13). But once more, the Psalmist says, "All His commandments are sure, they stand fast for ever and ever" (Psalms 111:7-8). How then could the Old Covenant which was faulty and transient be the same thing as the law of God, which was perfect and everlasting?

The Old Covenant was made concerning the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments were the basis or subject matter of the Old Covenant. (Exodus 24:8) God' s part was to make of Israel "A peculiar treasure unto Me above all people," "A kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." (Exodus 19:5-6) Israel' s part was to obey God' s voice and keep His covenant. (verse 5) This Israel promised to do in the words, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." (verse 8)

Then another misapplied scripture with which we are at times confronted is that found in 2 Corinthians 3:7-8 where Paul says, "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"

Because the law of God, the Ten Commandments, was written and engraved in stones, some have concluded that the law was the "ministration of death." Let us examine this.

The law of Ten Commandments is given to us as the law of life; and Paul says "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good." Then he asks, "Was then that which is good made death

unto me?" and he answers "GOD FORBID." Then he explains. "But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." (Romans 7: 12- 13)

Now SIN is defined as "the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and the law of which sin is the transgression is shown by Paul to be the law of the Ten Commandments, for as he says, "I had not known sin but by the law, for I had not known lust except the law had said thou shalt not covet" (Romans 7:7). And the law against coveting is the tenth precept of the law of God. And inasmuch as that law is the law of righteousness, and it also being holy, just, and good, how can anyone suppose that the keeping of it would bring condemnation and the administering of death to the one who does keep it? The keeping of the law secures a person from the penalty. It is the breaking of the law, the transgression of it, that brings the penalty; for "The wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). Then the law of Ten Commandments cannot possibly be the "ministration of death."

And then, if the law has been abolished, what is left to point out sin, or to make sin "become exceeding sinful?" Absolutely nothing; for the scripture definitely states that "Sin is not imputed where there is no law" (Romans 5:13). And again, "Where there no law is, there is no transgression." (Romans 4:15). Thus it could not be made to appear "exceeding sinful" if the law, by which it was made to be so, is gone.

But again, if the law of God has been abolished, what law is referred to in (1 John 5:3; Revelation 12: 17; 14: 12; and 22: 14)?

Still again, if the lives of men are to be "judged by the law", as we read in (Romans 2:1-2 and James 2:9- 11), by what law will they be judged if the law of God has been abolished?

But now to come more directly to what "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones" really was. Thus far we have dealt with what it is not. In considering this we must be careful not to confuse the administration of the law with the law itself. Ministration or administration is defined by Greenfield as "Service performance by a minister." And in this third chapter of Second Corinthians Paul is really contrasting the service or administration under Moses with the administration under Jesus Christ.

Under Moses' administration the penalty for transgression was enforced without mercy. Under the Gospel dispensation or the administration of Christ, the penalty is not immediately enforced, but justice is tempered with mercy and the sinner is being given the opportunity to repent and reform.

In the change of administration from the human to the divine, the law itself was neither changed or abrogated, and Paul understood this quite well, for the same year in which he penned (2 Corinthians 3:7,8) he also wrote (Romans 3:31) which says, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." And again, that same year he declared before Festus "After the way which they (the Jews) call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." (Acts 24: 14) Both of these statements were made 30 years after the cross.

Did Paul then in his epistle to the Romans and in his defence before Festus so definitely confirm the perpetuity of the law, and then in the same year, by such an indefinite expression as that found in (2 Corinthians 3:7,8) infer its abolition? Never. And if thirty years after the cross Paul upheld the law in such clear and definite language, is it not evident that he knew nothing whatever of its having been abolished at the cross?

Now, while the law of God was written and engraven in the stones, there was another law which was also written and engraven in stones. The scripture brings to view two distinct laws viz: -

***The Moral-The law of God***

***The Ceremonial—The law of Moses***

***The Moral law was written by God Himself. See (Exodus 31:18; 32:15; and Deuteronomy 5:22). Written on tables of stone: (Deuteronomy 9:10; 4:13, Exodus 32:16). Placed IN the ark. (Deuteronomy 10:1-5.) Was everlasting. Eternal. (Psalm 111:7,8; Matthew 5:17,18.)***

***The Ceremonial law was written by Moses. (Deuteronomy 31:9,24; Exodus 24:4.) Written in a book. (Deuteronomy 31:24; Exodus 24:4,7.) Placed in the SIDE of the ark. (Deuteronomy 31:26.) Was temporary. To cease at the death of Christ. Abolished, (Hosea 2:11; Galatians 3:19; Hebrews 7:12; Ephesians 2:15; Colossians 2:14 to 17.)***

The distinction between these two laws was made by God Himself as we read in (2 Kings 21:8.) "Only if they will observe to do accordingly to all that I have commanded them, and according to all that my servant Moses commanded them.

With these facts before us we now call attention to two Scriptures which bring to view another law that was "written and engraven in stones" and which was finally "done away."

***"And Moses with the elders of Israel commanded the people saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day. And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass o Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaister them with plaister: And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, a land that floweth with milk and honey: as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee. Therefore it shall be when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in mount Ebal, and thou shalt plaister them with plaister. . . And THOU SHALT WRITE upon the stones ALL THE WORDS OF THIS LAW very plainly." (Deuteronomy 27:1-4,8.)***

Shortly after, when Joshua led the children of Israel into the promised land, this command was carried out.

***"Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God of Israel in mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lifted up an iron: and they offered thereon burnt offerings unto the Lord, and sacrificed peace offerings. And HE WROTE there UPON THE STONES a copy of THE LAW OF MOSES, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel. And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and CURSINGS, ACCORDING TO ALL THAT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW." (Joshua 8:30-32,34).***

Here then we have "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones." That which was written in the book of Moses was the judgments, being "the ministration of death" and having passed away.

### **NOT UNDER THE LAW BUT UNDER GRACE**

But another position that is very commonly taken is, that as Christians, we "are not under the law, but under grace." Let us, then, investigate this also.

The expression is found in (Romans 6: 14.) where Paul says, "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." In the same epistle Paul also says, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." (Romans 3: 19.)

Here then are two statements made by Paul, seemingly contradictory, one which says we "are not under the law", while the other places "all the world" "under the law." What can Paul mean? Does he really contradict himself? No, a little close examination will reveal the meaning.

The original Greek words which are translated "under the law" in (Romans 3: 19) are **\*en nomcs (en nomos)** while for the same expression in (Romans 6: 14) the words are **\*upo¢ nomcs (hupo nomos)**.

Now it does not require that a man be a Greek scholar in order to see that these two expressions are quite differently constructed. And does not the fact of their being different, indicate that they must also differ somewhat in their meaning?

Greek students tell us that "In (Romans 3: 19) the preposition **en (en)** being employed with reference to the law, it means ' the sphere in which a subject is concerned' . But in (Romans 6; 14.) the apostle uses **upo¢ (hupo)** the force of which is ' in the power of ' . See Bullinger' s "Critical Lexicon and Concordance", also Alexander' s GreekFrench Dictionary.

To be within "The sphere of" the law is quite a different thing to being "in the power of" the law. In whatever country we may find ourselves, we are within the sphere of, or subject

#### **\* The Greek is here copied from "Youngs" Concordance**

to, the law of that country; but we are not "in the power of" that law unless we transgress it. But should we transgress it, we are then in its power, or "under the law" as criminals.

So, while using those two expressions in reference to the law of God, Paul, in (Romans 3: 19), conveys to us very definitely the fact that "all the world" are under the jurisdiction of, or subject to, God' s law, while in (Romans 6: 14) those who "are not under the law, but under grace", are those who, having found forgiveness and cleansing through Christ, have been freed from the penalty of sin and are now under grace-divine favour.

To illustrate. -A man is arrested for murder; he is found guilty, and condemned to death. There are no extenuating circumstances and he has no claim whatever to mercy. Having broken the law, he is condemned by it, and it has its iron hand upon him. He is now "under the law" and not under grace, but rather under disgrace.

But the monarch or ruler of the land, out of his pity and compassion for him, grants him a free pardon, and releases him. This is an act of grace-unmerited favour that is conferred upon him. And having been pardoned, he is no longer "under the law" (that is, under its condemnation); the law no longer has its hand upon him. He is now "under grace." This illustrates what it means to be "under grace" and "not under the law."

But now, because he has been pardoned and released from the grip of the law, and is "under grace", is he at liberty again to murder with impunity, or disregard the law of the land? Of course he is not. He is still subject to the law and must obey it, or suffer the penalty of any fresh transgression. And so it is with the law of God.

Now the scripture says, "All have sinned"; that is, all have transgressed God' s law; "for sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). And because of this, all are under the law-under the condemnation of the law; and as "the wages of sin", or the wages of transgression of God' s law, "is death", the law determines that we shall die. "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). He died in our stead-paid the penalty for us. And having done this, and the claims of the law having been satisfied, we are freed from the penalty of our sins, freed from the grip of the law, are no longer under its condemnation, but are "under grace", under the unmerited favour of God.

Then because we have been pardoned and are no longer "under the law but under grace", are we at liberty to transgress or disregard God' s law any more than the man who being pardoned for his crime of murder is at liberty again to murder or disregard the law of the land? Let Paul answer. He says, "What then? Shall we sin (that is, again transgress God' s law) because we are not under the law (that is, under its condemnation), but under grace (the unmerited favour of God)? God forbid." NO INDEED. When God for Christ' s sake has pardoned our sins of the past, and brought us out from under the condemnation of the law, and placed us under His grace, we are most certainly still amenable to His law, and must respect and obey it just as truly as that pardoned criminal must obey the law of the land.

But the no-law-under-grace theorists deny this, and would have us believe that the law of God is a dead letter to us, and that we have nothing to do with it now. Then let all such note this. The grace which God bestows does not reign, or continue to rule by SIN, by the transgression or the abolition of God' s law; but it reigns, as Paul points out, by righteousness. (Romans 5:21).

But what is righteousness? "All thy commandments are righteousness" (Psalm 119:172), and "the people that know righteousness" are "the people in whose heart is my law." (Isaiah 51:7). And John says, "he that doeth righteousness (the standard of which is God' s law) is righteous." (1 John 3:7).

Thus, in order for grace to reign through righteousness there must be in our hearts, as there was in the heart of Christ (Psalm 40:7,8) a set purpose to honour and keep the law of Jehovah, Sabbath command and all.

But further, when men declare to the world that they are "not under the law", meaning that they are free from obedience to it, they manifestly declare that they are "not subject to the law of God", and not being subject to the law of God, they are, according to the inspired word, "carnally minded", and

"to be carnally minded is death", "because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God." (See Romans 8:6,7) And does this not mean that those who persist in maintaining such an attitude will be lost eternally?

Those, however who acknowledge that they are subject to God' s law, will keep it, every precept of it; and of them it is said, "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Revelation 22: 14).

And now with all this array of evidence, how can we longer question our duty? Listen to the appeal which Christ Himself makes to us. - "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14: 15).

Do we need to ask which are Christ' s commandments? Hardly! We have seen that the law spoken from Sinai is the law of Christ, and, let it be noted too, that it was commanded by Him "for our good always." (Deuteronomy 6:24). Do we love Christ? Let us show it by our obedience to His law. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." (John 14:21). But should anyone entertain any doubt as to whether or not this has reference to the ten precepts of the Decalogue, we will quote again, and this time from John' s first epistle which was written about sixtyfive years after the cross. "This is the Love of God, that we keep His commandments, and His commandments are not grievous." (1 John 5:3).

Thus, sixty-five years after the cross does John declare that it is by keeping of the commandments of God-the ten precepts given by Christ on Sinai-that we show our love to God. But had those commandments been done away with at the cross, where would be the force of such an appeal sixty-five years later? Is this not another indisputable proof that the ten precepts are still in full force and binding on the Christian church?

But can it be claimed that we keep the commandments of God while we do not observe the Sabbath of the fourth precept? Not according to the scripture; for James warns us very definitely that "Whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." (James 2: 10).

There are those, however, who declare that it is impossible for any man to keep the law of the Sabbath and following in the footsteps of the Pharisees of old, even go so far as to declare that Christ broke the Sabbath, and this too, in the face of Christ' s own declaration, "I have kept my Father' s commandments" (John 15: 10). But in making that statement do not all such unwittingly give evidence that they do not know Christ or His power? Under the New Covenant, Christ promises to write His law in our hearts (Jeremiah 31:33, Hebrews 8: 10), and more, He promises the power to enable us to keep that law, for He says, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you and CAUSE YOU TO WALK IN MY STATUTES, AND YE SHALL KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND DO THEM." (Ezekiel 36:26,27).

And herein is set out the "better promises" of the new covenant. In our own strength it is quite true that we cannot keep the law any more than could ancient Israel when they attempted it under the Old Covenant, but under the new covenant, with the divine help as promised by Christ, it is possible to do so, and like Paul, the true Christian can say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." (Phillipians 4: 13). With such "better promises" the keeping of God' s law will not be an impossibility.

Then, in declaring that Christ broke the Sabbath, how little do all such reverence the One whom they make a profession of serving. Did Christ, because He healed the sick on the Sabbath day, break

the Sabbath? To say so is to make Him a liar, for (to repeat) he distinctly declares "I have kept my Father's commandments" and those commandments included the Sabbath. In healing on the Sabbath He showed that it was lawful to do well on the Sabbath day, and that such acts of mercy were, in no sense, a desecration of those sacred hours.

### **THE SABBATH AT THE CLOSE OF THIS DISPENSATION**

That some will be found on this earth keeping the commandments of God just before the close of time, is shown by a statement found in (Revelation 14: 12). There we read that John, while wrapped in vision, was shown a company gathered out just before the coming of Christ, and of whom it was said, "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." And again, "The dragon was wrath with the woman and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus." (Revelation 12: 17). And these are not Jews, but Christians, for they have "the faith of Jesus" and "the testimony of Jesus."

Thus, while men declare that the keeping of the commandments of God is an impossibility, God's word pictures His remnant church on earth as a loyal commandment-keeping people. But more, the scripture shows that this feature will be the one outstanding characteristic of those who enter the heavenly city. The prophet Isaiah, in referring to the entrance of the redeemed into the New Jerusalem, says, "Open ye the gates that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in." (Isaiah 26:2). Those whose joy and privilege it will be to enter within those pearly gates, are here denominated a "righteous nation which keepeth the truth." But, what is truth? and what will constitute a righteous nation? These are questions far too important to be left to speculate upon, or even for men to define. Nor is this necessary, for Inspiration has defined the one and set the standard for the other. "Thy law is the truth." (Psalm 119: 142) "Thy Word is truth." (John 17: 17). Thus keeping the truth involves keeping God's law and His word. Then the Psalmist says, "All thy commandments are righteousness" (Psalm 119: 172), and John says "He that doeth righteousness is righteous" (1 John 3:7). So the righteous nation that enters the golden city, must first be found on earth observing the commandments of God. And this fact is again set out in the closing chapter of the Bible as the condition of entrance into the city. "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. (Revelation 22: 14).

With such Scriptures before us, can anyone deny that the keeping of the commandments of God is essential to salvation?

But we must notice further the statement of John in (Revelation 12: 17). "The dragon was wrath with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus."

The dragon referred to here is the Devil, (Revelation 12:9) while the woman represents the church (Jeremiah 6:2). A remnant is the last end of anything, or that which is left, while the seed has reference to the children or descendants. The testimony of Jesus is defined in (Revelation 19: 10) as the spirit of prophecy. Then, to paraphrase the text-The Devil was wrath with the church, and went to persecute its last remaining members, which keep the commandments of God and have the spirit of prophecy.

Thus is described the remnant of God's true church on earth-the church that is in existence just prior to the coming of Christ. It is represented as keeping the commandments of God and having the

spirit of prophecy, -but, upon whom the devil makes war. And the fact that the Devil does make war upon them is a prima facie evidence that they are the true servants of God, and not his servants.

But does he appear in person and openly come into conflict with these commandment keepers? No, he uses men as his agents. In (Revelation 2: 10) we find stated concerning the church in Smyrna, "Behold the Devil shall cast some of you into prison." But when this was fulfilled he used men to do his work; and so he uses men today when making war upon the remnant church which keep the commandments of God.

And are there any today who make war upon commandment-keepers, denouncing their preachers as "false prophets," "humbugs" etc., etc.. and their teachings as "a snare of the devil", "grotesque doctrines" etc.? There certainly are. And all because these servants of God are pointing out the true Sabbath of Jehovah, and endeavouring to open the eyes of the people to the fact that Sunday observance is not founded upon any divine precept, but merely upon a human enactment.

Let all those who participate in such work of oppression and who so bitterly denounce those who, as commandment-keepers, observe God' s own appointed Sabbath, beware, and understand, that in doing such work they are making war upon those whom God regards as His commandment-keepers, and are lending themselves to a work that is branded by the word of God as the Devil' s work.

It is the Devil' s work, too, to make men believe that they cannot keep God' s commandment. But in taking that position men simply charge God with folly, in that He gives to man a law which it is impossible to keep, and then holds over him a threat of eternal punishment if he transgresses it. Is that the character of the Christians' God? Those who know the God of heaven know Him to be a God of love, One who is "merciful, gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth", but also One who "will by no means clear the guilty." Then the men who talk so lightly about the impossibility of keeping God' s law or of its abolition, should pause a while and think soberly over this most vital question, ere it is too late.

John says, "He that saith I know Him, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him." "But whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected; hereby know we that we are in Him." (1 John 2:4- 5) And again, "Hereby do we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments." (verse 3) And those commandments still include the fourth precept, and it still reads "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy", and, we repeat, Sunday is not the Sabbath, nor is it the Lord' s day. A prominent writer says concerning this:

**"The commandment directs that the seventh day of the week and not the first is to be observed. It is a fallacy to reply that this distinction is unimportant, that if one day in seven is kept holy it matters not which day of the week that is. This suggestion implies a very inadequate conception of the nature of the commandments. If they are binding at all they are binding altogether. Those who are subject to them are not at liberty to say that some parts must be obeyed and others may be disregarded.**

**"In order to escape from this difficulty it has been sometimes suggested that at the commencement of the Christian dispensation there must have been some divine precept changing the day of the Sabbath, that either Christ or the Apostles changed the day. But where is there evidence of this? There is not an iota of such evidence in the New Testament, but there is cogent evidence to the contrary. The conduct of the pious women who refrained from anointing the body of Christ on the Sabbath day, ' because of the commandment' shows that after the crucifixion the ' commandment' to keep holy the seventh day was still in force. The walk of**

**the disciples to Emmaus and the journeyings of St. Paul and his companions on the first day of the week show that the Sabbath obligation had not been transferred to that day.**

**"Those who maintain the theory that the obligation of the Sabbath was transferred to the first day of the week cannot tell us by whose authority and at what time or in what manner the transfer was made.**

**"Besides, is it credible that if the command to change the day of the Sabbath had been given either by Christ or His apostles, we should not find some reference to it in the pages of the earliest Christian writers? We do not find in their writings the faintest allusion to such a command having been given." -"First Century of Christianity" pages 326,327 by Homersham Cox M.A.**

This is the verdict of an honest, unbiased mind. The writer was a judge in the County Courts of England, one who was accustomed to the weighing up of evidence. His testimony is clear and decided. In confirmation of his finding and, too, that he might not be considered singular in his conclusions, we will add what some other historians and writers have to say on the matter.

Dr.. E.T. Hiscox, author of "The Baptist Manual", says in a paper read before a New York Ministers' Conference held November 13, 1893,

**"There was and is a commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will be said, however, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week . . . Where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament, absolutely not."**

Sir William Domville (Church of England) in his "Examination of Six Texts", supplement, pages 6,7, says,-

**"Not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to His apostles."**

Further-

**"Centuries of the Christian era passed away before Sunday was observed by the Christian church as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the Sabbatical edict of Constantine in AD 321," -Ibid. page 291.**

Dr.. Cox, in his "Literature" Vol. 1. page 257, note, says,-

**"The early Fathers gave no support, direct or indirect, to the notion that the Sabbath had been transferred at all; but it is not surprising that those who wrote after the enactment of Constantine that Sunday should be kept as a Sabbath, were more apt to discover reasons for such an observance of it."**

The late Dr. R. W. Dale a leading Congregationalist Minister of England, in his "Ten Commandments" pages 106, 107, says,-

**"It is quite clear that, however rigidly or devoutly we may spend Sunday, we are not keeping the Sabbath. . . The Sabbath was founded on a specific, divine command. We can plead no such command for the observance of Sunday. . . There is not a single sentence in the New Testament to suggest that we incur any penalty by violating the supposed sanctity of Sunday."**

Chamber's Encyclopedia, art. 'Sabbath' .

**"By none of the Fathers before the fourth century is it (Sunday) identified with the Sabbath, nor is the duty of observing it grounded by them, either on the fourth commandment, or on the precept of Christ or His apostles."**

Neander's "Church History", Roses' translation, page 186.-

**"Perhaps at the end of the second century, a false application of this kind (transferring the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday) had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered labouring on Sunday as a sin."**

Dr. Coleman, "Ancient Christianity", chapter 26, sec. 2.-

**"Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church, but with a rigour and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discontinued." . . . "During the early ages of the church, it (Sunday) was never entitled ' the Sabbath' , this word being confined to the seventh day of the week, the Jewish Sabbath, which as we have already said, continued to be observed for several centuries by the converts to Christianity."**

"Antiquities of the Christian Church" Vol. 7. chap. 3, sec. 1. pages 52,53,-

**"The ancient Christians were very careful in the observance of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was the ancient Jewish Sabbath. Some observed it as a fast, others as a festival; but all unanimously agreed in keeping it as a more solemn day of religious worship and adoration. . . Athanasius likewise tells us that they held religious assemblies on the Sabbath, not because they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. Ephiaphianus says the same."**

Morer's "Dialogues on the Lord's Day" page 189, we read,

**"The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted that they derived this practice from the apostles themselves."**

Then the well known Scottish writer, Mr. Andrew Lang, in the first volume of his "History of Scotland" page 96, says of the early Celtic church up to the time of Queen Margaret,-

**"They worked on Sunday, but kept Saturday in a sabbatical manner."**

And this was as late as the middle of the eleventh century.

Thus do we learn from these historians and writers that for several centuries after Christ, the early Christian church not only did not observe the first day of the week (Sunday) as the Christian Sabbath, but that they did observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment-the seventh day of the week. But would they have done this if Christ or the apostles had changed the day and taught them to observe the first day of the week as the Lord' s day? Unquestionably No.

But while uninformed men-such as have never taken the trouble to investigate the ecclesiastical history for themselves -assert that Christ or the apostles changed the day from the seventh to the first day of the week, the testimony of the church historians and other reputable writers is decidedly against them and flatly discredits their statements, one writer, as we have seen, definitely stating that "not one ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to His apostles."

This statement is definite and unequivocal and affords positive evidence that Sunday-Lord' s Day-observance did not originate with either Christ or His apostles, but was an invention of a later period, and therefore was not of divine appointment but of human origin. With such conclusive evidence before us, on what grounds then can men contend for Sunday sacredness, and endeavour to bolster up an institution that is only of human origin, and pagan, at that?

That the scriptural argument for the Sabbath cannot be frustrated, a tacit admission has been made by one ecclesiastic, in a most remarkable statement as recorded in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 12, p.p. 109, 110, art. Sunday. The writer is M.G. Glazebrook SD.D. Canon Residentiary of Ely Cathedral, and formerly headmaster of Clifton College. He writes:-

**"Why is Sunday to be observed? It is easier for us to answer this question than it was for the theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and for two reasons. Recent investigations into early church history . . . have removed some prejudices which hampered our ancestors. We now know how gradually the observance of Sunday developed and how late was the theory which connected it with the Sabbath. And the modern study of the O.T. has removed a difficulty which they could never fully meet. So long as the story of the creation in (Genesis 1 and 2), and the account of the giving of the law on Mt.. Sinai were regarded as historical, the question had to be faced. How can a divine command, directly given to men, be abrogated? The answer for us is plain. No such commands were ever given, and the stories which record them are legends.**

**The Sabbath was made for man; and, under the guidance of Providence, it was made by man. Sunday, in its turn, was made by man for man. Man, therefore, is lord both of the Sabbath and of Sunday."**

Thus, in dealing with the question of Sunday observance, Dr.. Glazebrook candidly admits that "the observance of Sunday developed. . . gradually." And "the theory which connected it with the Sabbath" was "late." This is another frank admission that the change was not made in the days of either Christ or the apostles, and helps to swell the volume of evidence against the idea that such change was made on the authority of either one or the other.

But finding no way by which to get rid of the Sabbath of God' s institution, Dr.. Glazebrook is obliged to repudiate (Genesis 1 & 2) and the account of the giving of the law on Mt.. Sinai, declaring "the stories which record them" to be but "legends", and denying "that such commands were ever given."

Such are the lengths to which men are driven in their vain endeavours to rid themselves of their obligation to observe the Sabbath of Jehovah.

### THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND SUNDAY

We will now notice what is recorded by Historians and other writers regarding the relation of the early Christians to Sunday observance.

That some religious exercises were held by the early Christians on the first day of the week, none will deny. The records are clear concerning this. But they are also equally clear that there was no cessation of ordinary labour on that day, thus evidencing the fact that the early Christians did not regard the first day as being anything else but a working day. Quoting again from "The First Century of Christianity" page 324, Homersham Cox states that after "having thoroughly examined" "the principle passages from writings of the first and second centuries which relate to the Sabbath and the Lord' s day," and "after a most careful and laborious search, it is asserted with confidence that there is not one writer of the first or second century who suggests that Christians of their times regarded the Lord' s day as a substitute for the Sabbath. Neither is there any evidence whatever in those early writings that Christians abstained from their usual labours on Sunday, except so far as was necessary for the purpose of attending their assemblies. The earliest suggestion that Christians should abstain from labour on Sunday is contained in a passage of Tertullian, written not before the close of the second century . . . But this advice to defer matters of business is limited to the time of prayer, not to the whole of the Lord' s day.

"Up to the time when Tertullian wrote, that is, for more than a century after the last surviving apostle left the earth, there is not the slightest trace of a practice of abstaining from ordinary pursuits on the Lord' s day, excepting during the time devoted to Christian assemblies."

Then as to the extent of the worship which was conducted on that day he says,-

**"As to the mode in which the Lord' s day was observed in the first century, the sources of information are somewhat scanty, but they are sufficient. They show clearly that the Christians assembled before dawn on the first day of the week to celebrate the Eucharist, and afterwards proceeded to their ordinary daily labours and occupations."**

And this is confirmed by other writers and historians.

"Dictionary of Chronology" art. Sunday, page 813.

**"The early Christians met on the morning of that day (Sunday) for prayer and the singing of hymns in commemoration of Christ' s esurrection, and then went about their usual duties."**

Jeremy Taylor:-

**"The primitive Christians did all manner of works upon the Lord' s day, even in time of persecution, when they were the strictest observers of all the divine commandments." Duct. Dubi. Book 2, chap 2, sec 59.**

Encyclopedia Britannica:-

**"There is no evidence that in the earliest years of Christianity there was any formal observance of Sunday as a day of rest or any general cessation of work." Eleventh Edition, Vol. XXVI, page 94, art. ' Sunday' .**

Such then is the evidence that in the early centuries of Christianity, Sunday was not regarded as having any sacredness, but was merely a working day.

The early Christian Church being founded upon principles of eternal truth, its members knew only too well that they positively had no right or power to make any change in respect of the Sabbath of Jehovah.

No, the early Christian Church did not change the day, nor did Christ or His Apostles. But the standard encyclopedia' s tell us who did:

Encyclopedia Britannica, art. ' Sunday' .

**"It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; who appointed it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire."**

And this law was not enacted till the year AD 321 approximately 300 years after Christ' s ascension.

Chamber' s Encyclopedia, art. ' Sunday' .

**"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the Sabbatical observance of Sunday is known to have been ordained is the Sabbatical edict of Constantine, AD 321."**

These statements are both clear and positive, and all through the years no other statement of a contrary nature has been produced either from the Bible or from History to offset them. Prophecy, however, has both foretold and identified the power that would presume to tamper with God' s law and think to change it. With this we will now deal.

**PROPHECY REVEALS THE MAN OF SIN**

We will first notice a warning given by the apostle Paul to the Church at Ephesus:-

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:28-31).

Here a falling away is predicted. Not only would false teachers enter the church, but right in their midst, even of their own selves would men arise "speaking perverse things", teaching something that would be contrary to the truth. At the very time that Paul made this prediction, this subtle and blighting influence was being felt, for in writing to the Thessalonians Paul said, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." (2 Thessalonians 2:7).

The time was to come, however, when the one who was to do this nefarious work would be revealed; and both Paul and the prophet Daniel have given us such definite information regarding this that there can be no mistaking where it applies. Paul says, "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." (2 Thessalonians 2:3,4).

This "man of sin", "the son of perdition", will be found to be none other than the papal power, but we shall deal with this more specifically later.

We will now examine briefly a vision given to the prophet Daniel, as recorded in the seventh chapter of his book. There we read of four great beasts which he saw in his vision and which Bible students and commentators generally agree were symbols representing the four great empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The correctness of this view can scarcely be questioned, inasmuch as that the divine interpretation found in verse 23 states that "the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." The fourth kingdom was Rome.

In the vision, the beast which symbolised Rome had ten horns. These horns represented the ten kingdoms into which western Rome was divided between the years AD 351 and 476, viz:- the Alemani in Germany; the Franks in France; the Burgundians in Switzerland; the Vandals in North Africa; the Seuvi in Portugal; the Visigoths in Spain; the Saxons in Britain; the Ostrogoths in Austria; the Lombards in Lombardy; and the Heruli in Italy.

After this division it was revealed to the prophet that "another (little horn) shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hands until a time and times and the dividing of times." (Daniel 7:24,25).

This prophecy concerning the little horn and his doings we shall see finds its complete fulfilment in the history of the Papacy. It will be noticed that there are six identifying points in the specification, viz:-

1. He was to be "diverse" from the other horns or kingdoms
2. Was to subdue three kings.
3. To speak great words against the Most High.
4. To wear out the saints of the Most High.
5. Think to change times and laws.
6. And they shall be given into his hand for specific time

We will now identify this little horn through the pages of papal history.

First, it was to be "diverse" from the other horns. Now the ten kingdoms into which western Rome was divided and which the ten horns represented, were political kingdoms, but this little horn which had "eyes like a man, and a mouth speaking great things" (Daniel 7:8) was to be something different. And the Papacy was different. The Papacy was, first and foremost, an ecclesiastical power, yet one that claimed the right to exercise control over the temporal affairs of the State. It did exercise power, and in doing so it formed a union of Church and State, with the Church in command. In this respect then it was indeed "diverse" from the other ten.

Next, this little horn was to "subdue three kings." This the Papacy did. History records the fact that three of the divisions of Rome, viz. the Heruli, Vandals, and Ostrogoths, who being Arians, and objecting to being dictated to by the Bishop of Rome, refused to recognise his authority and resented his interference. Consequently the Bishop of Rome took steps to bring them into subjection and finally subdued them-the Vandals in AD 334, the Heruli in AD 493, and the Ostrogoths in AD 538. Thus did the Papacy fulfill the first two points of the specifications as set out in the prophecy; and it is a significant fact that today the Pope's tiara or crown is composed of a triple crown.

Then this little horn was to "speak great words against the Most High"; and in the church of Rome has not the Pope been exalted to the place of God, in that it is claimed that he is "God on earth", and, too, that he and all the priests possess the power to forgive sin, a prerogative which belongs to God alone? The following extract is to the point. It is taken from a Catholic publication by M. Gaume, entitled "The Priesthood", a work approved by nine bishops and archbishops, and also by Pope Gregory XVI who reigned from AD 1831 to AD 1846, and who, as a token of the appreciation of the said work, sent to Gaume the cross of the order of St. Sylvester. In this work he says:-

**"What human tongue can describe the dignity of the priesthood, and the greatness of the priest! The kings of the earth are mighty, who command armies and shake the world by the sound of their names. But behold! There is a man still greater, there is a man who daily, when it pleases him, opens the gates to heaven, addresses himself to the Son of the Eternal, to the Monarch of the worlds and says, ' Come down from your throne, Come' . Obedient to the voice of this man,**

**the Word of God, by whom all things were made, leaves instantly the abode of glory, incarnates himself in the hands of this man, more mighty than kings, than angels, than the august Mary; and this man says to him, ' You are my son; this day have I begotten you; you are my victim,' and he allows this man to immolate him, to place him wherever he wishes, and he gives him to whomsoever he chooses. This man is the priest.**

**"The priest is not only ALMIGHTY IN HEAVEN, and OVER the GOD-MAN, but he is almighty on earth and over the mystical body of Jesus Christ. Behold! A man has fallen into the hands of the devil; what power will be able to deliver him. Call to the assistance of this unhappy man the angels and archangels, holy Michael Himself, chief of the heavenly host, conqueror of Satan and his revolted legions, and they will never be able to sever the chains of the sinner who has placed his confidence in the wicked one. The priest can do it. Much more.**

**Suppose that the Redeemer visibly descends in person to His church, and station Himself in the confessional to administer the sacrament of penance while the priest occupies another. The Son of God says, I absolve you, and the priest also says, I absolve you; and the penitent finds himself absolved just as much by one as by the other.**

**"Thus, the priest, MIGHTY LIKE GOD, can instantly snatch the sinner from hell, render him worthy of pardon, and a slave of the devil be made a son of Abraham.**

**And GOD HIMSELF IS OBLIGED TO SUBMIT TO THE JUDGMENT OF THE PRIEST, to grant or refuse absolution. The sentence of the priest precedes. God submits to it! Can anyone conceive of a greater power?"**

We ask, could anyone conceive of greater or more blasphemous words being spoken against the Most High? How accurately, thus far, has the Papacy fulfilled the specifications of the prophecy.

But further, the little horn was to "wear out the saints of the Most High." And does not the history of the dark ages bear witness to the terrible lengths to which the papal church went in its persecutions? This is so well known, that it will suffice to here give but one corroborative extract taken from a Catholic paper:-

**"The church has persecuted. Only a tyro in Church history will deny that .... One hundred and fifty years after Constantine the Donatists were persecuted, and sometimes put to death . . . Protestants were persecuted in France and Spain with the full approval of the Church authorities. We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots, and the Spanish Inquisition. Wherever and whenever there is honest Catholicity, there will be a clear distinction drawn between truth and error, and Catholicity and all forms of error. When she thinks it good to use physical force, she will use it." "The Western Watchman" (Roman Catholic), St. Louis, Dec. 24, 1908.**

And now for the fifth point of identification: - "He shall . . . think to change times and laws", or as Spurrell' s translation has it "shall presume to change the appointed times and the law." And has the Papacy done this? The very first appointed "time" was the day, which from the beginning began with the evening and ended with the evening. (See Genesis 1; Leviticus 23:32; Mark 1:32). But Rome changed that time, and midnight now marks the beginning and ending of the day. But there is more.

For centuries the year began with the Jewish month, Nisan, or 25th March; but in AD 1582, Pope Gregory XIII invented a new calendar starting the year with January 1, and today the calendar is known as the Gregorian calendar. But, what of the law? Has the Papacy attempted to change that? Is it possible that they would attempt such a heaven-daring act? Yes, even that was not beyond them. Listen to their claims:-

**"The Pope' s will stands for reason. He can dispense above the law, and of wrong make right by correcting and changing laws." -Pope Nicholas, Dist. 96.**

**"The Pope has power to change times, to abrogate laws, and to dispense with all things, even the precepts of Christ."**

**"He can pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction to the rights of nations, to the law of God and man." -Decret. de Translat. Ep. cop, Cap.**

Now the only appointed time mentioned in the law of God is the time of the Sabbath-the seventh day-the one that God Himself appointed. And this, Rome has ruthlessly set aside as a day of worship, and supplanted it by appointing in its stead the first day of the week; and not only do the papal authorities admit that this change was wrought by them, but they boast of it in no uncertain terms, and hold their act up as an evidence of the authority which they claim is vested in them, as the following extracts show:-

#### PAPAL CLAIMS

**"The bible says, ' Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.' The Catholic church says, No! By my divine power I abolish the Sabbath day, and command you to keep holy the first day of the week. And, lo the entire civilized world bows down in reverent obedience to the command of the holy Catholic Church!"-- ' Father' T. Enright, C.S.S.R. of Redeptorist College, Kansas City, Mo., in ' American Sentinel' June 1 1893.**

**"Sunday as a day of the week set apart for the obligatory public worship of Almighty God, . . . is purely a creation of the Catholic Church."—American Catholic Quarterly Review, January, 1893.**

Cardinal Gibbons, in a letter to Mr E. E. Franke, of Williamsport, Pa., under date of October 3, 1889, says:-

**"The Catholic Church changed the day of rest from the last to the first day of the week because the most memorable of Christ' s works was accomplished on Sunday. They ( the Protestants ) cannot prove their point from scripture; therefore, if sincere, they must acknowledge that they draw from their observance of the Sunday tradition, and are therefore weekly contradicting themselves."**

**"The observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the Authority of the ( Catholic ) Church."—' Plain Talk about the Protestantism of Today.' by Monsignor Segur.**

**"You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scripture enforces the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify."—"Faith of our Fathers" by Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore.**

**"The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday . . . The Christians Sabbath is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world."—"The Catholic Mirror' (Cardinal Gibbons' official organ) September 23, 1893.**

**"The Bible commands you to keep the Sabbath day, Sunday is not the Sabbath day; no man dare assert that it is; for the Bible says as plainly as words can make it that the seventh day is the Sabbath, i.e. Saturday; for we know Sunday to be the first day of the week . . . I will give \$1000.00 to any man who will prove by the Bible alone that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep . . . The observance of Sunday is solely a law of the Catholic Church . . . The Church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships upon that day, in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church."—"Father' Enright in ' Weekly Call' February 22, 1884.**

With what boldness do the papal Authorities lay claim to the Sunday institution as the day of their own appointing, and with what confidence do they challenge the Protestant world to produce scriptural authority for their observance of that day. And in the absence of such Biblical authority, upon what grounds can Protestants, who worship on that day, deny the accusations that they "worship on that day in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church?"

But further, on one occasion a Dr. James Blake, a Roman Catholic, was in debate with a Protestant, when he drove the latter to the wall with the following unanswerable charges:-

**"Christ never wrote, but God the Father did. He wrote the Ten Commandments on the tables of stone, and the only commandment He emphasized was that to keep the seventh day. ' Remember to keep holy the seventh day' ; and there is no command so often repeated through the Old Testament. If the Bible alone be the gentleman' s rule of faith, he is bound by this commandment; but does he observe it? No, he does not. Why, then, does he not observe it? Because the church saw fit to change it. Here the gentleman admits the authority of the Church to superior to the handwriting of God the Father; and yet he will look you in the face, and declare that the Bible, without church authority, is his rule of faith."**

And are not first-day observers doing substantially this very thing, i.e. when they continue to observe the first day after being enlightened as to its origin? Are they not practically confessing "the authority of the church to be superior to the handwriting of God the Father"? It cannot be otherwise when done with a full knowledge of the facts. For when, "without a word of remonstrance" they "bow down and worship on that day in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church", and fear to disregard their command, while they do not fear to break God' s command, in so doing, do they not indeed place the authority of the Catholic Church above the authority of the God of Heaven?

And now, let us gather up other evidence from other sources concerning the change of the day.

Neander, who is recognised as the prince of church historians, bears this testimony:-

**"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered labouring on Sunday as a sin." ' Church History' Trans. by H.J. Rose, pg. 186.**

The festival of Sunday then being "only a human ordinance", there is nothing divine about it, and its observance as a sacred day or day of worship is not of divine requirement.

Then we recall the fact that the first law on record for the observance of the first day of the week was, as the Encyclopedia informed us, that enacted by Constantine in AD 321.

Now Constantine was a Roman emperor, and was originally a pagan—a sun worshipper. But about the time of his issuing his Sunday law he professed conversion to Christianity. It was only a profession, however, it was not a genuine conversion. And not only did he connect himself with the church, but "Wahroy's Church History" page 56, informs us that he placed himself at the head of the church, usurped supreme power over it, and claimed the right of modelling and controlling it in such a manner as would best subserve the public good. And so delighted no doubt, were the bishops with the idea of having the emperor at the head of the church .... that there was not found one disposed to question his right to exercise this most unscriptural usurpation.

Mosheim also states that at the time of his professed conversion, Constantine "became Bishop of the Catholic Church."

Thus in dual capacity as "Bishop of the Catholic Church" and Emperor, Constantine issued "the first law" ever known "either ecclesiastical or civil" for the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week. The following is his decree.

**"On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrate and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country however, persons engaged in agricultural work may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain growing or for vine planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of heaven should be lost. (Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time)."—Schaff's ' History of the Christian Church' vol.III chap. 75.**

Commenting on this decree Dr.. Schaff says:-

**"He enjoined the observance, or rather, forbade the public desecration of Sunday, not under the name of Sabbatum (the Sabbath), or Dies Domini (Day of the Lord), but under its old astrological and heathen title Dies Solis (Day of the Sun), familiar to all his subjects, so the law was as applicable to the worshippers of**

**Hercules, Apollo, and Mithras, as to Christians."—Ibid Vol. VIII, chap. 75, par. 5.**

Following close on this, in the year AD 325, Pope Sylvester authoritatively bestowed upon the first day of the week the title, "Lords Day. Then in 338, Eusebius, the court bishop of Constantine, wrote, :-

**"All things whatsoever that it was the duty to do on the Sabbath (the seventh day of the week) we (Constantine, Eusebius, and other bishops) have transferred to the Lord' s Day (the first day of the week) as more appropriately belonging to it."**

Later, in AD 364, the Council of Laodicea issued another very definite decree that:-

**"Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on the Sabbath (the seventh day), but shall work on that day; but the Lord' s day (the first day) they shall specially honour, and as being Christians, shall if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they be found Judaizing, they shall be accursed from Christ."**

The reason for this decree is stated by the Rev. William James, when addressing the University of Oxford. He said:-

**"When the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which had become so general at the close of this (the third) century, was evidently gaining ground in the Eastern Church, a decree was passed in the council held at Laodicea (AD 364) ' that members of the church should not rest from work on the Sabbath like Jews, but should labour on that day, and preferring in honour the Lord' s day, then if it be in their power should rest from work as Christians' —"Sermons on the Sacraments and the Sabbath" pages 122- 123.**

Then about the year AD 458 or 459, Pope Leo the Great issued the following decree,

**"We ordain, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles as thereby directed, that on the sacred day (Sunday) wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labour."— Cited by Justin Edwards in ' Sabbath Manual' page 23.**

Such then is the evidence that identifies the Papacy as being the power represented by the little horn, the power that should "think to change times and laws." Let it be noted that while Constantine placed himself at the head of the church as its chief bishop, and issued the very first Sunday law on record, there are four other acts recorded in respect to Sunday, all of which were issued by the Catholic Church, but not one can be found as coming from Christ or His Apostles.

Thus the fifth point of identification in the specification of the work of the little horn finds its fulfillment in the acts of the Papacy.

And here it will be appropriate to let the historians tell us what Constantine' s object was in issuing his Sunday law. We have drawn attention to the fact that Constantine was originally a pagan, a sun worshipper. Sun worshippers had their special "time" for worship, a distinctive day, and that day was Sunday, "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times", as the North British Review, Vol. 18, page 409, describes it.

Against this worship God warned His people under penalty of death. Ancient Israel was warned not to esquire even after the gods of the heathen saying, "How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise" (Deuteronomy 12:30).

Sun worship is shown in the Bible to be the greatest abomination of all in God' s sight (See Ezekiel 8:5-18). He will have none of it in His church. But Constantine' s object in issuing his decree was evidently to introduce it. The historian Milman says:-

**"If we may believe the biographies in the Augustian history, a more ambitious scheme of a universal religion had dawned upon the mind of the emperor. The Jewish, the Samaritan, even the Christian, were to be fused and recast into one great system, of which the sun was to be the central object of adoration."— "History of Christianity" Book 2, chapter 8.**

Stanley also says:-

**"The retention of the old pagan name Dies Solis, or Sunday, for the weekly Christian festival is, in a great measure, owing to the first day of the week and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the ' venerable day of the sun' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution."— ' History of the Eastern Church' Lecture 6, Par. 15.**

Thus Constantine' s aim was to establish universal SunWorship; and the first step towards this was his decree for the observance of the sun' s day (Sunday); and as the ultimate result, nearlyall Christendom has been (\*keeping this) festival. And thus it was that Dr.. Hiscox, in presenting his treatise on Sunday observance before the New York Conference in 1893, was obliged to make the following admission:- (\*"keeping this" added to make sense of this statement.)

**"Of course I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian fathers and other sources. But what a pity it comes branded with the mark of paganism, and christened with the name of the sun god, adopted and sanctioned by the papal apostasy, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism."**

At the very best then, Sunday observance is a man-made institution-an institution of the Catholic Church, and view it as we will, it is a relic of paganism-Sun worship-the mark of an idolatrous system which the Lord has denounced as in His sight, the greatest abomination; and against which He declares that He will "deal in fury."

But, in connection with the little horn, there is still one more point of identification to be dealt with, viz:- "They (the saints, the times, and the laws), shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

Concerning the interpretation of the expression "time, times, and the dividing of time", we have no need of conjecture. In Revelation 12 we find practically the same expression used and also the interpretation given. "To the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time." In verse 6, "time, and times, and half a time" are shown to be 1260 days, but adopting the Bible rule of counting in Prophecy a day for a year, they are 1260 years.

Applying this interpretation to "time, times, and the dividing of time" a found in Daniel 7:25, the question is, will it fit the prophecy? Did the Papacy hold sway for such a period of 1260 years? Yes, it will fit the prophecy, for history shows that the papal power did hold sway for just such a period. And the events that mark off that period of papal supremacy are of such a definite character, that there can be no mistaking it.

In the year AD 533, the Emperor Justinian issued an edict appointing the Bishop of Rome head of all the churches. But owing to the opposition of the three Arian powers, already referred to, that edict could not take full effect until the Ostrogoths (the last of the three horns that were subdued) were driven from Rome. And this as we have already stated, was accomplished in the year AD 538. This being done, "the last opposing horn had been plucked up, and the papacy was free to enter upon that career of ecclesiastical tyranny for which it had long been preparing; and the 'mystery of iniquity' which had been working so long, was given full liberty."

And now with the year AD 538 so definitely marked as the starting point of that long, dark night of papal supremacy, we now reach forward 1260 years and enquire for evidence to confirm the prophecy which calls for the breaking of the papal power at the end of that period. Adding, then, 1260 to 538, we are brought down to the year AD 1798, and what do we find? In that year, history records the fact, that "the French Directory ordered the invasion of Rome; Berthier entered the city February 10, 1798, and took possession of the castles of St. Angelo. Pius VI was called upon to renounce his temporal sovereignty, and on his refusal, was seized, February 20, and carried away to Siena and afterward to . . . Valence. . . where, worn out by age and the rigor of confinement, he died in August 1799." Thus at the end of the 1260 years (in the year 1798) true to the prophecy the power of the Papacy was broken; and for a short period it was practically abolished. Of this one writer says:-

**"The Papacy was extinct: not a vestige of its existence remained; and among all the Roman Catholic powers not a finger was stirred in its defence. The eternal city had no longer Prince or Pontiff; its Bishop was a dying captive in foreign lands; and the decree was already announced that no successor would be allowed in his place." "Rome and its papal Rulers" page 449**

Then upon the death of the Pope in 1799, it is stated by another writer that "Half Europe thought that, with the Pope, the Papacy was dead." In this, however, they were greatly mistaken, for very soon after, on March 14, 1800, another Pope was elected, but shorn of all temporal power.

And what more is needed to demonstrate that the Papacy is identical with the "little horn?" Every detail of the specification outlined in Daniel 7:24-25, has found its fulfillment in the acts of the Papacy.

Who then but the papal power has been guilty of tampering with the law of God, and the foisting upon the World a counterfeit Sabbath-a relic of Pagan worship?

With all this evidence it must be clear to every candid mind that the observance of the first day of the week, as a day of worship, is not in the order of Heaven, but is the invention of a rebel power. And can we suppose that the Majesty of Heaven will tolerate such an invasion of His rights, such an overriding of His will? We will find the answer to this in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of the book of Revelation.

In the thirteenth chapter and the first three verses, there is brought to view "a beast" having seven heads and ten horns. This "beast" is in all respects the counterpart of the "little horn" of Daniel 7:7-8, 24-25, and it is generally agreed that, like the "little horn" it represents Rome in its papal form. The

seven heads symbolise Rome' s successive form of government, while the ten horns, as in the non descriptive beast of Daniel 7:7, represent the ten divisions of the western portion of the Empire. The wounding of one of its heads or forms of government (Revelation 13:3) had reference to the overthrow of the papal rule in AD 1798, when the Pope was taken prisoner and the church shorn of its temporal power, and by which act it was then supposed that the papal rule had been forever silenced. It is thus referred to as a deadly wound. The healing of the deadly wound (verse 3) symbolises the revival of the Papacy which began with the election of another Pope on March 14, 1800.

Since that time the healing has been progressing slowly but surely, until now we see the wound all healed, at least, to the extent that the Pope once more ranks as a temporal ruler, recognised by every nation in the world. The complete healing of the wound is to come, when the Papacy will once again exercise supreme power over the nations.

### **THE BEAST TO IMPOSE A MARK**

Passing on to verses 11 to 16, John, in his vision beheld another beast coming up and which is represented as exercising "all the power of the first beast," and causing "the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed. . . saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast,. . . And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many that would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads." (Revelation 13: 11- 16)

This scripture indicates that another power is to arise and that it is to cause "the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed." The first beast with the deadly wound, we have seen, was papal Rome. To make this doubly sure another identifying feature is given in verse 18.

### **THE MARK OF THE BEAST**

Having fully identified papal Rome as "the beast" of Revelation 13:1-7, we will now look for the "mark" that is to be imposed. We will again refer to 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, where we read of the "man of sin", "the son of perdition", "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

We have already stated that this refers to the Papacy. to prove this we only need to quote their own claims. In an Encyclical letter dated June 20, 1894, Pope Leo XIII said, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty." -The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, Page 304.

**"To make war with the Pope is to make war against God, Seeing the POPE IS GOD, AND GOD IS THE POPE."—Morere' s History.**

**"The Pope is all, in all, and above all, so that GOD HIMSELF AND THE POPE, the Vicar of God, ARE BUT ONE CONSISTORY."—Hostiensis Cap., etc..**

Thus does the head of the papal church claim to be God; and in thus "showing himself that he is God," he reveals himself as "the man of sin," -"the son of perdition."

But in what way has he exalted himself "above all that is called God?" There is but one way which he can do this and that is by overriding or changing God' s law. And, as the statements already quoted from the Roman ' De Cretalia' show, he claims that he has power to do this. And in demonstration of this claim we have seen that the papal church has presumptuously abolished the observance of the day appointed by God, and in its place instituted the observance of Sunday. And while they boast of having done this, they go further and claim that the institution of Sunday observance is a MARK of their power and authority.

To the question, "Does the Roman Catholic Church claim the act of changing the observance of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, as a mark of her power?" Cardinal Gibbons, through his secretary, replied as follows,-

**"Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change was her act. It could not have been otherwise, as none in those days would have dreamed of doing anything in matters spiritual and religious without her, and the act IS A MARK of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters."**

Then the following from the Catholic "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine."-

**Question:- How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?**

**Answer:- By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday which the Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.**

Again, from the "Doctrinal Catechism.":-

**Question:- Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?**

**Answer:- Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionist' s agree with her; she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.**

From these quotations it will be seen that the Papacy refers directly to their act of substituting Sunday for the Sabbath as the sign or mark of their power and authority.

What then is the "Mark of the Beast?" It is just what the Papacy claims it to be-the Sunday Institution. And this is the mark that is to be enforced on "All, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond," when the image to the beast is fully formed. And this will be fully formed when apostate Prot-

estantism clasps hands with Roman Catholicism (which thing is now fast developing) and in the form of a Church Union or Confederation, move the State to pass laws to compel the observance of the first day of the week. And this we may expect to see accomplished in the very near future.

"And when Sunday observance shall be enforced by law, and the world shall be enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath, then whoever shall transgress the command of God to obey a precept which has no higher authority than that of Rome, will thereby honour Popery above God. He is paying homage to Rome, and to the power which enforces the institution ordained by Rome. He is worshipping the beast and his image."

Let it be distinctly understood, however, we do not say that all those who observe Sunday today have the mark of the beast. Far from it. There are many good people, God' s children, who are now worshipping on that day, who know nothing of the true facts regarding this question, and who honestly believe that Sunday is the Sabbath of divine appointment; and we believe God accepts the honest service of such.

But, when men become enlightened and have had their attention drawn to the counterfeit nature of this spurious, man-made Sabbath, and after investigation, or in their failure to investigate, they continue their observance on that day, can they reasonably expect that God will accept such service, branded as it is with the sign of allegiance to a rebel power? We will see what God Himself says about it.

While the "beast" seeks to impose a mark upon men, God also has a distinguishing mark , a sign of allegiance to Him and which is to designate His people. And it will not be difficult to perceive that it is with the object and purpose of obliterating this mark that the Mark of the Beast is sought to be imposed.

### **GOD'S MARK OR SEAL**

The fourth commandment points out specifically that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord; and God says to us, "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may KNOW that I am the Lord your God." (Ezekiel 20:20) Or as Spurell' s translation renders it; "And sanctify My Sabbaths that they may be a token between Me and between you, that ye may acknowledge that I am Jehovah your God."

Here is a clear and distinct declaration that God has instituted the seventh-day Sabbath to be a sign between Him and His people. And what more natural than He should appoint such a day! Is not the worshipper of Mohammed identified by his observance of the sixth day; and did not the first day-the Sunday-mark the Pagan in his devotion? So the seventh-day Sabbath is the distinguishing mark-the heaven appointed mark-of the worshippers of Jehovah; and whatever man may think regarding the importance or unimportance of the day upon which he chooses to worship, when God Himself appoints a day to be observed, and plainly declares that that particular day is to be the sign between Him and His people, it is His sign, and the observance of any other day (after our having been made aware of the facts concerning it) is decidedly a rejection of the divinely appointed sign, and a dishonouring of the One whom we profess to serve.

But as opposed to this sign, as we have already seen, the Papacy has been instrumental in abolishing the observance of the Sabbath of Jehovah, and in its place has instituted Sunday observance, and

now claims their act to be a mark of their power and authority.

But against worshipping the Beast and receiving his mark the Lord has given a very definite and positive warning, coupled with the most terrible threatening of His wrath to be found in all the Bible. It is found in Revelation 14:9-11, the chapter following that in which we read of the beast and his mark.

***"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, if any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."***

Thus does the God of heaven warn men against worshipping the beast and receiving his mark. In no uncertain language does He make it clear that He will not tolerate the observance of another day to the exclusion of the day of His appointing—the obliterating of the sign which He has ordained as the sign between Him and His people.

Such a warning should be sufficient to arrest attention, and cause men to most seriously consider the course they are pursuing in yielding obedience to a law that is in direct opposition to the law of God, and which has no higher authority than that of the Roman Church.

The real and vital importance of this question lies in the fact, that the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath of Jehovah, is a counterfeit of a most subtle nature; for while in Sunday observance men have been deluded into the belief that they are worshipping and serving the creator, the God of heaven, and also paying special honour to Christ in commemorating His resurrection; the fact is, they are positively disobeying and dishonouring Him in that they are actually—though all unwittingly—yielding obedience to the archenemy of Christ, by adopting as a day of worship, the day that has been instituted in direct opposition to the day set apart by God.

That we might fully sense the subtlety of the imposition of this opposing mark, let us fully notice that:-

***Just as the Seal of God is given in connection with worship; (Revelation 7:3)***

***So the Mark of the beast is also given in connection with worship. (Revelation 13:12, 15, 16)***

***Just as the Seal of God is the SIGN by which the worshippers of the true God may identified; (Revelation 7:3) So the Mark of the Beast and his image may be identified. (Revelation 13:16-17)***

***Just as the Seal of God is to be placed in the foreheads of His servants; (Revelation 7:3)***

***So the Mark of the Beast is to be received in the foreheads or the right hand of its worshippers. (Revelation 13-16)***

***And lastly, while the "two horned Beast" is to "cause that as many as would not worship the image of the Beast should be killed;" (Revelation 13:15)***

***God says, "If any man worship the Beast and his image and receive his mark .... the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God .... and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels." (Revelation 14:9-11)***

And how plainly does this comparison reveal the fact that the worship of the beast and the receiving of his mark is in full and complete opposition to the worship of Jehovah and the receiving of His seal; in fact, was most definitely designed to supersede and utterly obliterate it. And this becomes the more apparent as we recall that it is designed to place the mark of the beast, without exception, upon "ALL, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond," (Revelation 13:16) and also to cause "the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed." (verse 12)

And if it were so that ALL did receive the mark of the beast, and ALL "the earth and them which dwell therein" were caused to worship the first beast, would that not very effectively obliterate both the worship of the Creator and the seal of God? It certainly would; and beyond all question this is the supreme aim and purpose of the institution of the worship of the beast and the placing of his mark.

We repeat, the institution of Sunday observance was a most subtle attempt on the part of Satan, working through human agents, to obliterate the worship of Jehovah by blotting out the Sabbath, the day appointed by God Himself to be a sign between Him and His people for ever.

Little wonder then that such a terrible warning is given against worshipping the beast and receiving his mark.

How then can Jehovah accept the service of those, who, while making a profession of serving Him, are manifestly disobeying Him (that is after enlightenment) and are observing the day that is the sign of allegiance to a rebel power?

***Paul says, "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are." (Romans 6:16)***

Thus, in obeying God and keeping His Sabbath, we are rendering Him true worship, acknowledging Him as our God, and manifesting the sign which He Himself has declared to be the sign of allegiance to Him.

On the other hand, if, with a full knowledge of the facts as now brought before us, that Sunday observance is not of God, but merely the institution of the Papacy, and we then continue to keep the Sunday in preference to the Sabbath of Jehovah, view it as we may, by so doing we are, beyond all question, yielding obedience to the Papacy, worshipping the beast and thus permitting his mark to be placed upon us.

For upwards of ninety years now Seventh-day Adventists have been endeavouring to draw the attention of the world to the binding claims of the seventh-day Sabbath and pointing out the counterfeit nature of the Sunday institution; and during all that time they have been asking the advocates of Sunday observance for just one text from the Bible which demands the observance of Sunday as a holy day, but it has not been forthcoming. It cannot be produced. Instead of this, however, we are accused

of all manner of disloyalty, that we do not believe in Christ or in the atonement and such like things. We are accused of making Satan our sin-bearer; of endeavouring to obtain salvation by works; of keeping the law in order to be saved, and not depending on Christ for salvation. To all this we say to our accuser, whoever or wherever he may be, that he "Multiplieth words without knowledge."

Our attitude toward the law of God is precisely as the American "Sunday School Times" of May 30, 1931 has expressed it. "We are saved, not because we have kept the law, but in order to keep the law."

Seventh-day Adventists, above all people do believe in Christ, and do depend upon Him and Him alone for salvation from sin. They do not believe that the keeping of the law will save anyone or atone for past sin. They believe that scripture which says, "For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." No, justification comes only through faith in Christ, in what He has done, and is doing for us. But faith in Christ, in no sense, does away with the law of the Ten Commandments or our obligation to keep it. That law throughout the ages has been, and still is, the standard of God's righteousness, the righteousness which Christ Himself enjoins us to see as our first duty. (Matthew 6:33) Moses declared, "It shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as He hath commanded us." (Deuteronomy 6:25) The Psalmist also says, "All thy commandments are righteousness." (Psalms 119:172) then, the Lord speaking through Isaiah, makes the very definite statement that the people "who know righteousness" are "the people in whose heart is My law." (Isaiah 51:7)

These scriptures reveal very clearly the fact that the law of God, the Ten Commandments, is the standard of righteousness, the law of righteousness; and the Lord had proclaimed it "an everlasting righteousness." (Psalms 119:142), that "shall not be abolished." (Isaiah 51:6) So it comes down to us today as the standard to which Christ enjoins us to attain.

But while the law is shown to be the standard of God's righteousness, we do not take the position, or believe, that the keeping of it can ever make us righteous. It cannot do that. Had we kept all its righteous precepts all through our lives, from the moment we were born right to the present time, we certainly would be righteous, and the law would witness to that fact. "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin." (Galatians 3:22) And why? "For all have sinned" (Romans 3:23) in that all have transgressed God's law, and are therefore unrighteous; and the law can only witness to that fact and condemn us as sinners; and all our present or future keeping of the law will not atone for the sin of the past or make us righteous. No, righteousness does not come that way. It is "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us .... being justified by His grace." (Titus 3:5-7)

We repeat, justification or righteousness comes only through faith in Christ—faith in what He has done and is doing for us. It is by nothing that we can do, not through any merit of ours, that we are made righteous. It comes to us absolutely as a free gift through faith, for "by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Romans 5:18) "even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." (Romans 3:22) Moreover, the scripture very positively precludes our taking any other position for we are told that "by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight." (Romans 3:20) And again, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." (Galatians 2:16) Then further, Paul says, "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." (Galatians 2:21) And still again we read, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law are fallen from grace." (Galatians 5:4)

Language could not be more explicit than this, and thus it is made plain in that works avail nothing. The keeping of the law will not save. It is faith in Christ that is the all-important thing. And so it is that Paul adds; "therefore we conclude that a man is justified (i.e. accounted righteous) by faith with-

out the deeds of the law." (Romans 3:28) Yes, we would emphasise, by faith and faith only-faith in Christ' s promise to forgive and cleanse, if we will but repent and confess and forsake our sins.

### **NEED WE NOT KEEP THE LAW THEN?**

But because we are justified by faith without the deeds of the law, does Paul teach that we are no longer under obligation to keep the law? No, by no means. But he seems to have anticipated that some would think that he does; and so to avoid and such misunderstanding or misinterpretation of his words, he asks, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." (Romans 3:31)

No, that faith brings righteousness does not do away with the law or any part of it. The law has its place and purpose. And what is that purpose? "The law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." (Galatians 3:24) It reveals to us our sin (Romans 3:20) in that it holds up to us the standard of righteousness (Psalms 119:172); And seeing that it cannot justify us, but on the contrary, places us under the sentence of death (for "the wages of sin is death") it drives us to Christ, the only source of righteousness, that we might be justified and saved through His grace.

Spurgeon commenting in this says:-

**"I say you have deprived the gospel of its ablest auxiliary when you set aside the law: you have taken from it the school master that is to bring men to Christ. They will never accept grace until they tremble before a just and holy law. Therefore the law serves a most necessary and blessed purpose, and it must not be removed from its place."**

But let us notice how the Apostle James illustrates our relationship to the law of God. He says:-

***"But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and he goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."* (James 1:22-25)**

Here James likens the law to a mirror. As we look into a mirror it reveals to us any defects about our person. If our face is besmirched or our hair dishevelled, it makes that known to us, **and leads us to cleanse this?** No the mirror can not do it; we must find some other means for that. We take soap and water with which to cleanse the face, and use a brush to smooth the hair; and having done this we again look into the mirror; and what does it now reveal? It reveals the face clean and the hair smooth.

And so with the law of God. As we look into its divine precepts it reveals to us any defects of our character. And then what? Do we expect the law to cleanse us? No, no more than we expect the mirror to cleanse our faces or straighten our dishevelled hair. The law merely reveals the sin ("for by the law is the knowledge of sin"), and as the mirror leads us to take soap and water for physical cleansing, so

the law drives us to the proper source for spiritual cleansing. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John 2:1) And so we go away to Christ and confess our sins, and the promise is: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all our unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9) And having confessed our sins, what then? We are justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. (Romans 3:24-25)

And let us again emphasise the fact, that it is through repentance and confession of our sins, and not through any works of ours in keeping the law, that He justifies us and declares His righteousness for remission of sins that are past. It is our faith, our belief, in His promise to make us so, AND THERE IS NO OTHER WAY.

And He does all this for us with the one purpose "that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." (2 Corinthians 5:21) and "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit" (Romans 8:4), and so have the righteous character which all must have who enter in within the gates of the heavenly city.

And now we come to the law-mirror. We have confessed our sins and have been cleansed of all unrighteousness, and the Saviour has declared His righteousness for the remission of sins of the past. In other words, His righteous life is imputed to us, covering all our wicked past; and as we stand before the law-mirror, firmly believing that this has been done, that we have been forgiven and have been clothed in the righteousness that, through faith in His promises Christ imputed to us, we, at that moment, present a life as righteous as Christ Himself, as righteous as the law itself. And what does the law-mirror now say? It says, "Clad in the garments of Christ' s righteousness, I can no longer condemn you; you are righteous."

But did the law make us so? No, a thousand times no. But it can now witness to the fact that we are accounted righteous in Christ. And this is what Paul means when he says, "But now the righteousness of God without the law (i.e. notwithstanding our failure in the past, to keep the law) is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." (Romans 3:21)

Yes, the law not only reveals to us our sin, but being the standard of righteousness, it also witnesses to our righteousness when we have been accounted righteous through Christ.

But now, having been justified by faith from all our sins, "that are past," shall we again transgress God' s lawsin again? Surely not, for how should we then continue to be righteous? Would not the transgression of that law-sin-make us unrighteous again? It surely would; and where would be the sense in Christ declaring His righteousness to cover our past sins, only for us to commit the same sins again, and again to become unrighteous? The so called faith that gives license to do this, is not faith at all but presumption.

It is Christ' s plan to save us from sin, and if we do not cooperate with Him, by obeying His law, the standard of righteousness, so that He can save us from sin, it is certain that He will not save us in sin. (Matthew 1:21)

Andrew Murray, in his book, "The Holiest of All," page 193, has well expressed this as follows:-

**"Let us beware that no wrong or one sided view of what salvation by faith means, lead us astray. There are some who think that salvation by faith is all, and obedi-**

**ence not so essential. This is a terrible mistake. In our justification there is indeed no thought of obedience in the past. God justifieth the ungodly. But repentance is return to obedience. And with a means to an end. They point us to Christ, and the salvation which is to be found in union with Him. AND HE HAS NO SALVATION BUT FOR THEM THAT OBEY HIM."**

By some this may be considered a bold statement, nevertheless it is true, for inasmuch as the scripture defines sin as "the transgression of the law," it is clear that without obedience to God' s law we cannot be free from sin; and if we are not free from sin how can we ever hope to enter the kingdom and be partakers of the salvation that Christ has provided? Is it possible that Christ can save us from sin while we continue in sin, continue to transgress His law? Verily, no.

Then too, in having Christ' s righteousness imputed to us to cover the sins of the past, is it not to the end that we might return to a life of obedience and thus maintain the righteousness that has been imputed to us? John says: "Let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous." (1 John 3:7) So after being counted righteous, it is our duty to walk in the path of righteousness; and let us not deceive our own selves in this respect. If we would maintain the righteousness that Christ has imputed to us, we must return to complete obedience and keep all God' s laws, for the scripture says: "All thy commandments are righteousness;" (Psalms 119:172) and to enable us to do this, Christ made ample provision. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes, and ye shall keep my judgements and do them." (Ezekiel 36:27) And this is none other than the promised new covenant. (See Jeremiah 31:31-33, also Hebrews 8: 10.)

How wonderfully full and complete is the provision that the Lord has made for weak, fallen humanity. Man of himself can do nothing good-absolutely nothing. So Christ undertakes to do all, not only to justify us from all past sin; but in order that we might maintain the righteousness imputed to us, He will put His law in our hearts, and strengthen us with might by His spirit in the inner man that we may walk in His statutes and do them.

But when will the Lord do this for us? When we make full and complete surrender to Christ to do His will, and come to the place, where all true Christians must come, where they can say with Paul: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but CHRIST LIVETH IN ME: and the life which I now live; IN THE FLESH (in this present life) I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." (Galatians 2:20)

Thus it is that Seventh-day Adventists, who, having confessed every known sin, claim through Christ the forgiveness and complete cleansing of all their wicked past, depending on Him alone for that; and having through faith in His blood obtained this cleansing, then seek through the indwelling Christ to maintain the righteousness imparted to them by walking in the way of His commandments, the standard of God' s righteousness.

Let this then, be our reply to those who accuse us of seeking salvation through works.

### **THE STANDARD OF THE JUDGMENT**

But not only is the law of God the standard of righteousness, but it will be the standard of the judgment. We shall be judged by that law. The law that points out sin here, will also be the law that

will point out sin in the court of heaven. Our lives-our acts-will be measured by those ten precepts; (Romans 2: 12; James 2: 10- 12) and the continued willful violation of any one of those precepts will result in such violators being shut out of the kingdom of heaven. God is particular. He demands implicit obedience as a first essential. When Saul presumed to vary Gods command he lost the kingdom and was told that "to obey was better than sacrifice." And so today obedience to God' s command to keep holy the seventh-day (Saturday) is the only safe course for those who are seeking "the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

The observance of Sunday, a day which God has never made holy, and which is beyond the power of man to make holy, much less keep holy, will never compensate for the desecration of the seventh day, God' s holy day. Arnt this point, the Rev. Geo. Hodges writes:-

**"The seventh day, the commandment says, is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. No king of arithmetic, no kind of almanac, can make seven equal to one, nor the seventh mean the first, nor Saturday mean Sunday. . . The fact is that we are all Sabbath breakers, every one of us."**

Another writer says:-

**"If our Authority for keeping Sunday be the fourth commandment simply, just as it stands without interpretation, without reservation, the whole Christian world lies convicted of a most serious breach of God' s law. Say! this is not quite true. There is a curious sect, called I believe, ' Seventhday Adventists' which literally obeys. They alone, then of all Christians keep the whole of God' s commandments ..... Those who deny the church' s authority, if they desire to be consistent, should keep Saturday, as the Jews do, ..... and refuse to have anything to do with an institution which is admittedly Catholic." —St, Cyprian' s Parrish Chronicle, Durban, Natal.**

Then shall we be content to go on breaking God' s law, desecrating His Sabbath, knowing that we are judgment bound, and will have to answer at the bar of heaven for our desecration of that day? Can we hope to be exonerated before that great tribunal for our persistent and willful breaking of God' s law any more than we could hope to be exonerated in an earthly court, had we willfully broken the law of the land? We cannot indeed. One writer of deep Christian experience has said:-

**"The love of God does not lead Him to excuse sin. He did not excuse it in Satan; He did not excuse it in Adam or in Cain; nor will He excuse it in any of the children of men. He will not connive at our sins or overlook our defects of character. He expects us to overcome in His name."**

***Then why not cease to be Sabbath-breakers by becoming Sabbath-keepers, and thus come into right relationship with Christ, by honouring His law. In doing so we demonstrate our love for Him and our loyalty to heaven; and at last it will be our privilege as commandment-keepers to triumph gloriously in the Saint's Inheritance, when, in obedience to heaven's command, the angels will fling wide those pearly gates of the Heavenly City "that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in." (Isaiah 26:2)***

***"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter into the City." (Revelation 22:14)***

**"Let us here the conclusion of the whole matter: FEAR GOD AND KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS FOR THIS IS THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN." (Ecclesiastes 12:13)**

**"This is the love of God that we keep His commandments, and His commandments are not grievous." (1John 5:3)**

***F. L. Ship***

