

MINEOLA BIBLE INSTITUTE AND SEMINARY

Page | 1

The Sabbath

Radical, Biblical, Apostolic, Christianity



Bishop D.R. Vestal, PhD
Larry L Yates, ThD, DMin

“Excellence in Apostolic Education since 1991”

Copyright © 2019

Mineola Bible Institute and Seminary

All Rights Reserved

Page | 2

This lesson material may not be used in any manner for reproduction in any language or use without the written permission of Mineola Bible Institute and Seminary.

Contents

I. Bible Proof That the Old Covenant Was Entirely Abolished	4
II. Contrasts Between the Old and New Covenants.	14
III. The Old and New Covenant Illustrated.	17
IV. What Part of the Old Covenant is Made a Part of the New Covenant?	18
V. Why is the Fourth Commandment Left Out of The Covenant?	19
VI. Did Constantine and the Pope Change the Sabbath?.....	26
VII. Why do Christians Keep the First Day of the Week?.....	32
IX. Christians Are Free To Keep Any Day.....	40

The Sabbath

The Old and New Covenants

I. Bible Proof That the Old Covenant Was Entirely Abolished

1. The whole law of God and Moses, including the Ten Commandments, and all the civil and ceremonial laws based upon the Ten Commandments, was done away with and abolished in Christ on the cross in 33 A.D., and the New Covenant now takes the place of the Old Covenant.

This is stated in 2 Corinthians 3: “Who hath made us able ministers of THE NEW TESTAMENT.....if THE MINISTRATION OF DEATH, WRITTEN AND ENGRAVEN IN STONES (the Ten Commandments); was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance WHICH WAS TO BE DONE AWAY. For if THE MINISTRATION OF CONDEMNATION be glory, MUCH MORE doeth THE MINISTRATION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS EXCEED IN GLORY. For even that (the Old Covenant) which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that (the Old Covenant) WHICH IS DONE AWAY was glorious, MUCH MORE that (the New Covenant) WHICH REMAINETH IS GLORIOUS....not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that (the Old Covenant) WHICH IS ABOLISHED: But their minds were blinded: for UNTIL THIS DAY remained the same vail untaken away in the reading of THE OLD TESTAMENT: WHICH IS done away in Christ” (2 Cor. 3:6-15; Col. 2:14-17; Eph 2:15). The word “vail” in this verse 14 is not in the original Greek, so it is not only the vail that is “done away,” but it is the Old Covenant itself WHICH IS DONE AWAY in Christ on the cross.

Some people may need an interpreter to explain this simple passage of Scripture, but to the common reader it is clear that the Old Covenant has been “done away” and “abolished” entirely and the New Covenant has taken its place. The Ten

Commandments were the only part of the law that was written and engraven on tables of stone, so they were done away with on the cross (Ex. 24:12; 31:18; 32:15; 34:1-4; 27:35; Deut. 4:13; 5:22; 10:4). Some people argue that it was only the glory of the Old Covenant that was done away, but what good is an Old Covenant that has lost its glory? Why contend that we should keep it when we have a better and a New Covenant that is more glorious and which remains in force? Paul argues that the Old Covenant was given in glory, so if its glory is done away the covenant itself is also done away. Leaving out the second “glory” in verse 7 and the second “vail” in verse 14, which are not in the original Greek, we have the fact plainly stated in both verses that it is “the Old Testament; WHICH IS DONE AWAY IN CHRIST.” In verse 15 the Old Covenant is called “Moses” thus proving that Moses gave the Ten Commandments.

Note the following contrasts between the Old and New Covenants in 2 Cor. 3: the first is “old” and the second is “new;” the first brought “death” and the second brings “life;” the first was “glorious” and the second is “much more glorious;” the first brought “condemnation” and the second brings “righteousness” which frees from condemnation (Rom. 8:1-4); the first was of “the letter” and the second is of “the Spirit;” the first had “no glory” in comparison to the second “by reason of the glory that excelleth;” the first was “done away” and “abolished” and the second “remained;” the first came by “Moses” and was “done away in Christ;” the first required a vail to hide the glory because it was “the manifestation of death” but the exceeding glory of the second can be looked upon with “open face” because it is “the Spirit that giveth life;” and the first brought blindness and bondage, while the second brings enlightenment and liberty and changes character by the Spirit of the Lord.

A mere change in administration of the Old Covenant, the failure of either party in keeping it, or the place where it is written does not change the covenant from an old to a new one. Nor does such change its glory in any sense, as some argue in trying to get around this plain Scripture which says three times that the Old Covenant was “done away” and once that it was “abolished” in Christ. Any change in the administration of a contract or the terms of a will would not change the will or contract itself. A will or a

contract itself would have to be changed or a new one take the place of the old one if it would be “done away” and “abolished” as is here stated of the Old Covenant.

Why would any cult, if its devotees had the slightest degree of honesty and faith that the Bible is the Word of God, would change the Word of God to fit some human theory is more than one can imagine. It would be much easier to accept the plain words of God, and if human theories do not harmonize with them to throw such theories away and stick by God and His Word on all questions.

2. *Christ came to “fulfill” the Law before He “abolished” it on the cross* (Matt. 5:17, 18). The Greek word for “fulfill” is *plero*, to satisfy, execute, finish, end, make complete, and cause to expire. It is translated “fulfilled” in connection with many prophecies which came to an end when they were fulfilled (Matt. 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 26:54-56; 27:9, 35; etc). That the law also ceased to be in force when it was “fulfilled” is clear from Matt. 11:13; Luke 16:16; 24:27, 44; Gal. 3:19-25. The law was only a shadow of things to come and when these realities came the mere type, picture, or shadow of them was no longer needed (Col. 2:14-17; Heb. 4:1-11; 8:1-6; 9:1-10; 10:1-18).

3. *Law keeping was not required by the apostles:* But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful TO CIRCUMCISE them (Gentile Christians), and TO COMMAND THEM TO KEEP THE LAW OF MOSES. And the apostles and the elders came together for TO CONSIDER OF THIS MATTER. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said.....Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear....Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, AFTER THIS (the church age) I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build the ruins thereof, and I will set it up....Wherefore my sentence is, THAT WE TROUBLE NOT THEM, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, THAT

they abstain FROM fornication, and FROM things strangled, and FROM blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach Him (his law, the Old Covenant), being read in the synagogues every Sabbath. THEN pleased it the apostles and elders AND THE WHOLE CHURCH to send men.....they wrote letters by them AFTER THIS MANNER; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren WHICH ARE OF THE GENTILES....Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us (Jews in the early church who have been under the law from birth) have TROUBLED YOU WITH WORDS, SUBVERTING YOUR SOULS, saying, YE MUST BE CIRCUMCISED, and KEEP THE LAW: to whom WE GAVE NO SUCH COMMANDMENT....For it seemed good TO THE HOLY GHOST, and TO US, to lay upon you no greater burden than THESE NECESSARY THINGS; THAT ye abstain FROM meats offered to idols, and FROM blood, and FROM things strangled, and FROM fornication (all fleshly lusts as in Gal. 5:19-21); FROM WHICH IF YE KEEP YOURSELVES, YE SHALL DO WELL” (Acts 15:5-29).

The apostles here did away with all keeping of the law and circumcision and stated in no uncertain terms that Gentiles were not to keep the Law of Moses, which included the old Jewish Sabbath. This is the Christian position in all of this age of grace. However, if this decision could have been made by some modern teachers of today, it would have been law and Sabbath-keeping as the sum total of salvation.

Included in this apostolic decree that Christians are not to keep the law in any detail, was the very sign of law keeping which was abolished - circumcision. Even those who keep the Jewish Sabbath do not practice this, thus proving again their inconsistency in requiring men to keep a law they themselves do not keep (Exodus 12:44-48; Lev. 12:3; John 7:22-23). Circumcision was required as a sign of the covenant that God made with Abraham (Gen. 17:9-14). The New Covenant does not require it (Rom. 4:11; I Cor. 7:18; Gal, 2:3; 5:1-5). This change proves that the New Covenant is not the same as the one made with Abraham as taught by some people today. If it is the same covenant, circumcision would also be required in the New Testament.

5. *Concerning meats and Sabbath days:* “One man esteemed one day above another: another esteemed every day alike. LET EVERY MAN BE FULLY PERSUADED IN HIS OWN MIND. He that regarded the day, regarded it unto the Lord; and he that regarded not the day, to the Lord he doeth not regard it....But why doest thou judge thy brother? Or why doest thou set at ought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ....So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God. LET US NOT THEREFORE JUDGE ONE ANOTHER ANYMORE” (Rom. 14:1-13; Gal. 4:9-11; Col. 2:14-17). If the Law of Moses, including the fourth commandment, was in force in the New Covenant, the above statements would never have been written by Paul. Each Christian can do as he pleases concerning the Sabbath and he is not to be judged by his brother “ANY MORE.”

6. *Christian experiences do not come by the law:* “Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?...the law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them (things of the law) shall live in them....how turn ye AGAIN to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage?” (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:15-21; 3:1-12, 19-25; 4:1-3, 19-31; 5:1-9, 11-21). Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years (that the law required). I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labour upon you in vain: (Gal. 3:1-12; 4:9-11). Going back to observe Sabbaths according to the law is spoken of here as going back into the bondage of the law. If one does this “He is a debtor to do the whole law” (Gal. 5:3).

7. The law “was added because of transgressions, TILL THE SEED (Christ) SHOULD COME *to whom the promise was made*....But before faith came (that Christ brought in the gospel and the New Covenant, Heb. 12:1, 2), we were kept under the law, shut up unto that faith WHICH SHOULD AFTERWARDS BE REVEALED....Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, THAT we might be justified by faith. BUT AFTER that faith is come, WE ARE NO LONGER UNDER A SCHOOLMASTER” (Gal. 3:19-25). Not being “under” law is here explained as being out from under its authority like one who is no longer under a schoolmaster when they graduate from school. The law is not in force and it has no claim or authority

over the person under the New Covenant. He is under the obligation to keep the New Covenant laws and commandments, which include new laws that were never a part of the Old Covenant, as well as those old laws that God saw fit to make a part of the New Covenant.

8. *The law, including the Ten Commandments, has been "CAST OUT:"* "Tell me, YE THAT DESIRE TO BE UNDER THE LAW, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had TWO SONS....he who was under the BONDWOMAN was born after the flesh; but he of the FREEWOMAN was by promise. WHICH THINGS ARE AN ALLEGORY; for THESE ARE THE TWO COVENANTS; THE ONE FROM MOUNT SINAI, which GENDERETH TO BONDAGE, which is Agar, (Hagar)....and answered to Jerusalem which now is, and IS IN BONDAGE with her children. But Jerusalem which is above IS FREE, which is the mother of us all....Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. BUT AS THEN he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that is born after the Spirit, EVEN SO IT IS NOW. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? CAST OUT THE BONDWOMAN (the first or Old Covenant from MOUNT SINAI), AND HER SON (those under the law): for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then brethren, WE ARE NOT CHILDREN OF THE BONDWOMAN (the old Ten Commandment covenant and its many laws), BUT OF THE FREE (the New Covenant). Stand fast therefore IN THE LIBERTY wherewith Christ hath made us FREE and BE NOT ENTANGLED AGAIN WITH THE YOKE OF BONDAGE (the Old Covenant).....For I testify again to every man that is circumcised (no man had any part in the Old Covenant unless he was circumcised), that he is a debtor TO DO THE WHOLE LAW" (Gal. 4:21-31; 5:1-5, 18).

Modern law keepers never mention this passage of Scripture, for there is no possible way for them to explain such simple language as the Old Covenant "from Sinai" being "cast out" with all its sons who are under bondage and death. The Old Covenant of commandments that brought death has no more relationship to people under the New Covenant than Hagar and Ishmael had with Sarah and Isaac. Abraham was the father of both Ishmael and Isaac, but Ishmael had no part in Isaac's inheritance (Gen. 21:9-

21). God was the author of both covenants, but one was designed to bring death and guilt of sin, and the other was designed to bring life and freedom from sin. There can be no keeping of both, for the reasons given in Point 12 below.

9. *The law was a covenant of types and shadows and was abolished when the realities of those shadows appeared.* “Having ABOLISHED in his flesh the enmity (the law of bondage and death), EVEN THE LAW OF COMMANDMENTS contained in ordinances...BLOTTING OUT (making void) the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and TOOK IT OUT OF THE WAY, NAILING IT TO HIS CROSS..... Let no man therefore judge you in MEAT, or in DRINK, or in respect of an HOLYDAY, or of THE NEW MOON, or of THE SABBATH DAYS; WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME; but the body (or reality of which those things were mere shadows) is of Christ” (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14-17).

Followers of Moses today naturally attempt to explain away some of the New Testament passages of Scripture which state that the old law or covenant has been “abolished,” but the more they attempt such an impossible job the more ridiculous their position becomes. It is like trying to sink a battleship with a blow gun. It cannot be done. In trying to explain away the passages of Scripture mentioned above they say that “the law of commandments” referred to the ceremonial law, and that “the Sabbath days” of Col. 2:14-17 were the ceremonial Sabbaths and not the weekly Sabbath.

It is strange that they take this position for wherever “commandments” and “Sabbath days” are found at every other place in Scripture, they argue that they refer to the Ten Commandments and the weekly Sabbaths. This only magnifies the inconsistency of their doctrine as well as their plain and open rebellion against the Word of God. If they are the sole representatives of God on earth as they claim, it is strange that they would fight against God and His Word.

Regardless of what Old Covenant disciples say about these passages of Scripture, it is certain that Paul was not with them because he did not one time require men to keep

any certain day, especially the old fourth commandment Sabbath. The Greek word for “Sabbath” is in the plural, and the word “days” is not in the original language, so it should read “Sabbaths.” It is the same Greek word used of all the weekly Sabbaths in 59 other places, so it must refer to the weekly Sabbath as well as any other Sabbath of the Old Covenant.

The weekly Sabbath as well as the other Sabbaths is part of the ordinances given by God to Moses. The weekly Sabbath was the first of eight feasts of the Lord in Lev. 23, “Concerning THE FEASTS OF THE LORD, which ye shall proclaim TO BE HOLY CONVOCATIONS, EVEN THESE ARE MY FEASTS. Six days shall work be done: but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, AN HOLY CONVOCATION; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the LORD IN ALL YOUR DWELLINGS.” After commanding this weekly “Feast” and “holy convocation” the Lord next commanded the seasonal “feasts” and “holy convocations” which were to be kept “IN THEIR SEASONS” (Lev. 23:2-4). Thus we have a “weekly feast” and a “seasonal feasts” and all were to be “holy convocations” and the times of rest and holy worship.

In Lev. 23:38, after giving the seven seasonal feasts, which were given after the weekly feast, the Lord said, “These are the feasts of the Lord...Besides THE SABBATHS of the Lord,” referring to the weekly Sabbaths, thus proving that the word “Sabbaths” includes the weekly Sabbath as much as it does all other Sabbaths. See also Ex. 31:13-17; Ezek. 20:12, 20, or any place where “Sabbaths” is found, and one will have to acknowledge that the weekly Sabbath is included in the word “Sabbaths’ in Col. 2:14-17.

All these “feasts” were to be observed “for ever” (Lev. 23:14, 31, 41), so the theory of some that the weekly Sabbath is the only eternal feast is unscriptural. All eight feasts were part of one eternal law that would have continued eternally if man could have kept his part of the contract. Since man could not keep it and there was no provision in it to make a man righteous and capable of keeping it, then it had to be set aside for the New Covenant which does not have faults like the old one, as seen in Points 11 and 12

below. When the old law was “abolished,” the weekly Sabbath (the sign of the Old Covenant to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt) was done away, with all other Sabbaths and parts of the old law. The fact is, that eternal terms are used profusely in the so-called ceremonial part of the Law of Moses, but not one time are they used in connection with the Ten Commandments of Ex. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:1-21, so it can be proved with more authority that the ceremonial part of the law was external and the Ten Commandments were temporary if we are going to use eternal terms as the basis of proof.

The Greek word for *ordinances* is *dogma*, a civil or religious law (Luke 2:1; Acts 16:4; 17:7; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14). As we have already proved and will see more fully in point X below, the Ten Commandments were part of God’s law to Israel, and since the whole law has been abolished, there are no grounds to prove that the law of commandments in Eph. 2:15 refers to all the laws except the Ten Commandments. If such commandments were the basis of the whole law as all men agree, then they would have to be included in the law of commandments that was abolished in Christ on the cross. As we have seen in Point 1 above, it is the Ten Commandments that are singled out as having been “done away” and “abolished.” As we have seen above, the weekly Sabbath is part of the ceremonial law. Therefore, when men admit that the “Sabbaths” in Col. 2:14-17 refer to the ceremonial Sabbaths they state the truth, but this does not mean that the weekly Sabbath is not included in all the old law ceremonial Sabbaths.

10. *The old law was imperfect and had to be changed.* Christ came “after the order of Melchizadek” and not after the Levitical priesthood which could not bring perfection and under which “the people received the law.....For the priesthood BEING CHANGED, there is made of necessity A CHANGE (abolishment) ALSO OF THE LAW.....For the WEAKNESS AND UNPROFITABLENESS THEREOF. FOR THE LAW MADE NOTHING PERFECT, but the bringing in of a better hope did.....By so much was Jesus made a surety of A BETTER TESTAMENT....For the law maketh men priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath WHICH IS SINCE THE LAW, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore....But now hath he ordained a more excellent ministry

(than Old Covenant priests), but how much also he is the mediator of A BETTER COVENANT, which is established upon better promises. For if THAT FIRST COVENANT (from Sinai, Gal. 4:21-31) had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for THE SECOND. But finding fault with them, he saith.....A NEW COVENANT, he hath made THE FIRST OLD (obsolete). Now that (Old Covenant) which decayeth (is obsolete, discarded) and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (to be abrogated). Then verily THE FIRST COVENANT had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary....Which was A FIGURE FOR THE TIME THEN PRESENT....Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal (human) ordinances, imposed on them UNTIL THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION (setting things right of the new order)....for this cause He is the mediator of THE NEW COVENANT, that by means of death, FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS THAT WERE UNDER THE FIRST TESTAMENT, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth (the New Covenant was not in force until Christ died). Whereupon neither the FIRST TESTAMENT was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken EVERY PRECEPT (including the Ten Commandments) to all the people ACCORDING TO ALL THE LAW, he took the blood of calves and of goats....and sprinkled both THE BOOK and ALL THE PEOPLE, Saying, THIS IS THE BLOOD OF THE TESTAMENT which God hath enjoined unto you.....For THE LAW HAVING A SHADOW OF GOOD THINGS TO COME, and NOT THE VERY IMAGE OF THE THINGS can never....make the comers thereunto perfect.....Then said he, Lo I come to do thy will O God. He TAKETH AWAY (abolishes) THE FIRST (Old Covenant) THAT HE MAY ESTABLISH THE SECOND (New Covenant)” (Heb. 7:11, 12, 22, 28; 8:6-18; 9:1, 9, 10, 15-22; 10:1-18).

The word “establish” here means to enact the laws of the New Covenant, while the word as used in Romans 3:31 means that the righteousness of the Old Covenant is upheld in the New Covenant by fulfilling that righteousness in men, not by the keeping of the old law, but by faith in Christ provided by the New covenant (Rom. 8:1-4; Gal.

2:15-20; 3:1-14; 5:1-26).

The many passages in Hebrews and in the other points above are clear in themselves that the Old Covenant with the Ten Commandments and all the laws given to Moses were abolished, abrogated and annulled.

II. Contrasts Between the Old and New Covenants.

Contrasts between the Old and New Covenants prove that they were two distinct covenants made for different purposes and to be in force at different times:

1. One is called “the first covenant;” the other “the second covenant” (Heb. 8:7; 9:1-18; 10:1-9).

2. The first is called “the old covenant;” the second is called “the new covenant” (Matt. 26:28; 2 Cor. 3; Heb. 8:13).

3. The first covenant was given by Moses; the second by Jesus Christ (John 1:17; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 9:15; Matt. 26:28).

4. One is “the law of Moses;” the other “the law of Christ” (Acts 13:39; Gal. 6:2).

5. One is “the law of sin;” the other is “the law of righteousness” (Rom. 7:7-25; 8:1-4; 9:31).

6. One is the law of “the flesh;” the other is “the law of the Spirit: (Rom. 7:5, 6; 8:1-4; Gal. 5:16-26).

7. One is “not of faith;” the other is “the law of faith” (Gal. 3:12; Rom. 3:27).

8. One is “the yoke of bondage;” the other is “the law of liberty” (Gal. 5:1; James 1:18-

25).

9. One is brought to an end by Christ (Rom. 10:4; 2 Cor. 3:14; Heb. 10:9); the other is established by Christ (Heb. 8:6; 9:15; 10:9; 2 Cor. 3:6-18; Matt. 26:28).

10. One brought death, the other brought life (2 Cor. 3:6-18; Rom. 8:1-4; Gal. 3:21; Heb. 9:15; 10:1-18).

11. One makes guilty (Rom. 3:19-20); the other justifies or makes not guilty (Acts 13:39; Rom. 3:21-31; 5:1-11).

12. One is “a shadow of things to come;” the other is the reality (Col. 2:14-17; Heb. 10:1-18).

13. One is “fulfilled” or completed; the other is still in force (Matt. 5:17, 18; 2 Cor. 3:6-18; Heb. 10:9).

14. One demanded righteousness; the other gave righteousness (Luke 10:28; Rom. 8:1-4; Gal. 3:1-9; 5:1-26).

15. One made nothing perfect; the other made perfect (Heb. 7:19).

16. One was glorious; the other was more glorious (2 Cor. 3).

17. One was powerless to save from sin, the other saves to the uttermost (Heb. 7:11-28; 8:7-13; 9:9-28; 10:1-18).

18. One had many sacrifices; the other had only one (Heb. 9:9-14; 10:14-16; Rom. 6:6-13).

19. One had a changeable priesthood; the other did not (Heb. 7:23-28; 4:14-16; Rom. 8:34).

20. One remembered sins, the other forgets sin (Heb. 10:3; 8:12; etc.).
21. One had a representative and a seasonal access to God (Heb. 9:7-10); the other had a personal and daily access to God (Heb. 4:14-16; 7:25; 10:19, 20; Eph. 2:18).
22. One had a sinful ministry (Heb. 5:1-4); the other had a sinless ministry (Heb. 7:26-28; 2 Cor. 3; I John 3:9).
23. One was given under the Levitical priesthood (Heb. 7:11-12) the other under the present Melchizadek priesthood (Heb. 6:20' 7:11-21, 24).
24. One had an earthly tabernacle service of animal sacrifices (Heb. 9:1-10); the other had a heavenly tabernacle service of spiritual salvation (Heb. 4"14-16; 7:25; 8:1-5; 9:11-15).
25. One had a sinful mediator (Gal. 3:19); the other had a sinless mediator (I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 7:26; I Peter 2:22).
26. One had no eternal inheritance (Rom. 4:13); the other had an eternal inheritance (Rom. 8:17; Heb. 9:15; I Peter 1).
27. One was ratified by animal blood (Ex. 29:1-8; Heb. 9:16-22); the other by the blood of Christ (Matt. 26:28).
28. One was a law of works; the other a law of grace (John 1:17; Rom. 3:24-31; Gal. 3:10-12; Eph. 2:8-9).
29. One brought wrath (Rom. 4:15); the other brought salvation from wrath (Rom. 5:9; Gal. 3:13-14).

30. One could not redeem, the other could redeem (Gal. 3:10-14; Rom. 8:1-4; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Heb. 7:25).

31. One could not satisfy God's demands; the other one did (Gal. 2:21; Heb. 7:22; 8:6; 10:5-18).

32. One made no provision for doing miracles, the other one provided for them (Gal. 3:1-5; I John 5:8; John 14:12; Luke 24:29).

33. Prophecy foretold the abolishing of one and the establishing of the other (Isa. 51:4; Jer. 31:33; Acts 3:22; Heb. 8:7-13; 10:4-18; Rom. 11:25-29).

34. One had a fleshly sign of obedience (Acts 7:8; Rom. 2:25); the other did not (Rom. 4:11; I Cor. 7:18).

35. One was too weak to overcome sin, the other gave victory over sin (Rom. 6:1-23; 8:1-4; Eph. 2:8-9; I John 5:1-18).

36. One was made to be changed (Heb. 7:11-22; 8:5-6; 9:19; 10:1-18; Gal. 3:19-24;) the other was made to be unchanged (Heb. 7:22; 8:6; 10:9; 13:20).

III. The Old and New Covenant Illustrated.

The Scriptures we have studied so far prove that Christians are not under the law in any sense. No Christian is obligated to keep the Ten Commandments, not one of them, because they are part of the Old Covenant that was "abolished." However, those commandments and laws of the Old Covenant that were brought into the New Covenant, the Christian is still obligated to keep, not because they were in the Old Covenant, but because they are in the New Covenant. Only men today who persist in being under the law are under it, and they are going to be held accountable for every detail of the law (Gal. 3:10-12; 5:3; James 2:10). If they persist in keeping the old law Sabbath, then they are responsible for not being circumcised, for not offering sacrifices,

and for not doing everything else the law requires.

To the Christian, the question is, does the New Covenant forbid murder, robbery, adultery, etc? If it does, then these things cannot be tolerated under the New Covenant. If the New Covenant commands a Sabbath like the Old Covenant did, then the Christian is obligated to keep a certain day, but if such is not commanded in the New Covenant, then the Christian is free from that obligation.

Those parts of the Old Covenant that God wanted to be a part of the New Covenant are as much in force under the New Covenant as they were in the old one. Israel promised to obey the Old Covenant when it was proposed by God (Ex. 19:3-8; 24:1-8). Jesus came to make a New Covenant to replace the Old Covenant, and it is only when it is accepted by man that the benefits of the New Covenant are enjoyed by man who then becomes a party to it (Mark 16:16; John 3:16-19; I Tim. 2:4; 2 Peter 3:9; Rev. 22:17). If men do not accept the terms of the New Covenant, then they have to pay the original death penalty incurred by Adam, choosing it in preference to the terms of the New Covenant (Gen. 2:16-18; Rom. 5:12-21; Mark 16:16; Heb. 2:3).

IV. What Part of the Old Covenant is Made a Part of the New Covenant?

It is admitted by all denominations that the ceremonial laws are not part of the New Covenant; so it is unnecessary to discuss this point. The big question is whether the whole Ten Commandments are a part of the New Covenant or not. By an honest investigation, anyone can soon find nine of the Ten Commandments in the New Covenant, but the 4th commandment, which refers to the Sabbath, is nowhere to be found.

New Covenant Scriptures on the Ten Commandments are:

1. Ex. 20:3 with Rom. 5:8; I Cor. 13; I John 3:1-4:21

2. Ex. 20:4-6 with Rom. 2:22; I Cor. 5:10; 6:9-11; 8:1-10; 10:7; 19:28; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:5; I John 5:21; Acts 15.
3. Ex. 20:7 with Acts 26:11; Rom. 2:24; Col. 3:8; Titus 3.
4. Ex. 20:8-10; (Not commanded in the New Covenant).
5. Ex. 20:12 with Eph. 6:2-3; Col. 3:20; 2 Timothy 3:2
6. Ex. 20:13; with Rom. 13:9; I Peter 4:14; I John 3:15
7. Ex. 20:14; with Rom. 2:22; 13:9; I Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 5:19-21; Heb. 13:4.
8. Ex. 20:15 with Rom. 2:21; 13:9; Eph. 4:28
9. Ex. 20:16 with Rom. 13:9
10. Ex. 20:17 with Rom. 13:9; I Cor. 5:10-11; 6:9-11

V. Why is the Fourth Commandment Left Out of The Covenant?

1. *Neither God nor Jesus commanded it to be a part of the covenant, for the all sufficient reason that God did not want it as a part of the New Covenant. If God had wanted it to be a part of the New Covenant it was in His power to command that it be so, as it was in the Old Covenant. But since God did not require the fourth commandment to be a part of it and since the New Covenant teaches that men are to be persuaded in their own minds as to what day they want to observe, it is the height of folly to follow a practice in any Christian organization that God did not see fit to make it a part of the New Covenant (Rom. 14:1-11; Gal. 4:9-11; Col. 2:14-17). Of all the words of Jesus on earth, there are only four references to the Sabbath:*

A. “The son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day” (Matt. 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:1-9). If Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath and did not see fit to make it part of the New Covenant, then it certainly is presumptuous of man to make it a part of that covenant.

B. “The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath” (Mark 2:27). Therefore, to be bound so strictly by a day as were the Jews, would bring the bondage of the Old Covenant into the new one.

C. “It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days” (Matt. 12:1-12; Mark 2:23-28; 3:2-4; Luke 6:1-9; 13:10-16; 14:1-5; John 5:9-18; 7:22-23; 9:14-16).

D. “Pray that your flight be not in winter, neither on the Sabbath day” (Matt. 24:20). This refers to the last days when Jews will have to flee Judea from the Anti-Christ. Orthodox Jews will not travel more than a mile on the Sabbath (Acts 1:12), so Jesus warns them to pray they will not have to flee on this day in order that they might escape quickly.

Not one of these references commands Christians to keep the old law Sabbath, so since it is done away along with the old law, as we have seen in Point 1 above, Christians are not under obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath. The main reasons why neither God nor Jesus made the fourth commandment a part of the New Covenant can be seen from the points below.

2. *The old Jewish Sabbath was a particular “sign” and “token” of the Old Covenant between God and Israel:* “The Lord made a covenant WITH US in Horeb. The Lord MADE NOT THIS COVENANT WITH OUR FATHERS (not with Adam, Noah, Abraham, or any other man in the past, as some teach He did), BUT WITH US, EVEN US, WE ARE ALL OF US HERE ALIVE THIS DAY....Neither WITH YOU ONLY do I make this covenant and this oath; BUT WITH HIM (of the Gentiles) THAT STANDETH HERE WITH US THIS DAY before the Lord our God, and ALSO WITH HIM (coming

generations) THAT IS NOT HERE THIS DAY” (Deut. 5:2-3; 29:13-15; I Chron. 16:17; 2 Chron. 5:10). “My Sabbaths shall ye (Israel and the Gentiles in the nation of Israel) keep: FOR IT IS A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU.....ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you (set you apart from all people of God)....It is a SIGN BETWEEN ME AND THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL forever: (Ex. 31:13-18). “I gave them my Sabbaths TO BE A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND THEM....They shall be A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU” (Ezek. 20:12-20). “Remember THAT THOU WAST A SERVANT IN THE LAND OF EGYPT, and the Lord brought thee out thence through a mighty hand.....THEREFORE THE LORD THY GOD COMMANDED THEE TO KEEP THE SABBATH DAY” (Deut. 5:15) “Remember” (Ex. 20:8) refers to the Sabbath of Ex. 16:23, which was given before the Ten Commandments, and not the Sabbath of Gen. 2:3, which they could not possibly remember because of not having been there.

These numerous passages of Scripture show the exact purpose of keeping the Sabbath between God and Israel. It was to commemorate their deliverance from slavery in Egypt when they had no rest. Only such Gentiles as came out of Egypt with the Israelites and were a part of the nation of Israel were commanded to keep this Sabbath and the old law (Ex. 12:49; Num. 15:15-16).

The Old Covenant then was one between God and the nation of Israel and it never was between God and the Gentiles who were not a part of Israel. Moses recognized this when he bragged to Israel that they were the only nation on earth that had the Old Covenant laws (Deut. 4:7-10). David recognized that Israel alone had such laws and to God they were a special people (2 Sam. 7:23; I Chron. 17:21). Paul taught that the Jews has an advantage over the Gentiles because of having the law (Rom. 2:17-29; 3:1, 2, 7:1; 9:4; 11:11). Jesus also recognized this when He said He was sent only to the Jews (Matt. 10:5; 15:24; 21:33-46). It is through the fall of the Jews that salvation is come unto the Gentiles (Rom. 11:11). Paul definitely said “the Gentiles, WHICH HAVE NOT THE LAW” and thus the Gentiles were made guilty before God by other means than breaking the law (Rom. 1:21-32; 2:12-16; I Cor. 9:20-21). Gentiles were not of the circumcision because they were not under the law (Ex. 12:48; Judges 14:3; 15:18; Jer.

9:26; Rom. 2:26; 3:30; 4:9; I Cor. 7:18; Eph. 2:11; Gal. 2:7-14). Thus the Gentiles were not under either the Abrahamic or Mosaic covenants, which had circumcision.

It was necessary for the New Covenant to be made, so that God could serve all men alike. All men had been proved guilty of sin, in Adam and by different means since, so now provision had to be made for those outside the Jewish covenant as well as for the Jews. The New Covenant and the Gospel make such provision and now all men can be saved apart from any special covenant between God and Israel (Rom. 3:21-31; 4:13-25; Gal. 2:16-21; 3:1-24).

Abraham's promised blessings can benefit all men alike, apart from circumcision which sealed the covenant with Abraham and Moses. Abraham received his blessing before he was circumcised (Rom. 4:9-12). Gentiles and Jews can be blessed through Christ, apart from law keeping (Gal. 3:13-14; 19:29; 5:1-26).

This promise was given to Abraham 430 years before the law (Gal. 3:17-25), and a number of years before he was circumcised (Gen. 17:9-27). This promise was one of "faith" and the law is not of faith (Rom. 4; Gal. 3:6-12). If one keeps these things in mind they can understand some statements of Paul, James, and others to Jews concerning the law that never would have been written to Gentile Christians (Rom. 2:17-29; 3:1-2; 9:1-11; James 1:1; 2:10-11).

The Old Covenant was made between God and Israel, and keeping the Sabbath was a particular sign or token between God and Israel to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt. There would be no object in making this Sabbath a part of the New Covenant, which concerns all nations who never were delivered from Egypt. Thus the Sabbath would not have the same meaning to other nations as it would to Israel, hence it was left out of the New Covenant entirely. If all men were to have a Sabbath in the New Covenant, it would have to be another day and for a purpose different from the old Jewish Sabbath of the Old Covenant. This is why Christians keep Sunday - to commemorate the resurrection, the beginning of the new creation in Christ. From the

standpoint of resting every seventh day and having a day of worship to God, Sunday meets all the requirements of both man and God, and is in keeping with the New Covenant and the early Christian practices as we shall see in Point VI below:

3. *The fourth commandment is the only one of the ten that was a ceremonial law.*

It's sole purpose was to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt (Deut. 5:15) and be a type or shadow of the rest in Christ and in eternity (Heb. 4:1-11; 10:1; Col. 2:14-17). Since it is the only commandment that had a typical meaning, it is only natural that it cease to be a part of the New Covenant, which brings the reality of what it typified (Col. 2:14-17; Heb. 4:1-11). The physical and spiritual benefits of a rest day can be realized on Sunday as well as on a Saturday.

The ceremonial and memorial nature of the fourth commandment is further proved by the fact that it was for a particular people in a certain land, and because it is the only law of the ten that has been broken and be broken without violating some moral law which affects both God and man. It is impossible to keep the fourth commandment in all lands, as proved in Point IX below.

4. *The Sabbath commandment was the only one of the ten that could degenerate into a mere form without affecting the morals of human beings.* All others concern moral obligations of man to God. It was the only one that could be disposed with without affecting the highest good of all. No other one of the ten but the fourth commandment could be done away with and still leave a moral law that covered every need of man in his relation to both God and other men.

In Rom. 13:7-10 Paul sums up the New Covenant commandments. After listing a few, he adds, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended (summed up) in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Paul did not list the fourth commandment here or elsewhere as being necessary in the New Covenant. If it was half as important as some teach that it is, it certainly would have been listed with other commandments as least one time in the New Covenant. It was of no moral value,

and since its religious and physical benefits could be enjoyed as well on any other day, it is no longer necessary in the New Covenant as it was in the old.

5. *It was foretold that the Sabbath would be abolished because it had become something to be abhorred by God.* The reason God hated it was because of the sins and hypocrisy of Israel in keeping the Sabbath which was a “sign” between Him and Israel. “I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts” (Hosea 2:11). “Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I CANNOT AWAY WITH; it is iniquity, even the solemn meetings. Your new moons and your appointed feasts MY SOUL HATETH; they are a trouble unto me; I AM WEARY TO BEAR THEM” (Isa. 1:10-15).

6. *The prophets not only predicted that God would do away with the Old Sabbaths of the Old Covenant, but that He would make a New Covenant with Israel when their Messiah would come to earth to set up His kingdom* (Isa. 42:6; 49:8; 59:21; Jer. 31:31-40; 32:37-44; Ezek. 36:24-38). The New Covenant was made at the first advent of Christ, but was not accepted by Israel and will not be until the second advent as is explained in these passages, and in Rom. 11:25-29; Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16-18; Matt. 23:37-39.

In Psalms 78:1, 2 it was predicted that the Messiah would open His mouth and utter a “law” and speak things kept secret from the foundation of the world. This was fulfilled in Matt. 13:35; John 1:17; 12:49-50; 14:15; Acts 1:2. Therefore, the old theory that the New Covenant was made known to Adam, Abraham and all other men, and that it is the same as the Old Covenant, is unscriptural.

Disciples of Moses argue that the New Covenant is the same as the old one, the great difference being in that the Old Covenant laws were written on stones, whereas in the New Covenant the same laws are written on the heart. It is utterly foolish to argue that the place where a contract is written makes a difference in the contract. Because it

was predicted that the New Covenant was to be written on the heart does not make it the same as the Old Covenant. Even the Old Covenant was to be written on the heart (Deut. 4:9; 6:5; 30:6-20; Prov. 3:1-3; 7:3; Ps. 37:31; 119:11; Ex. 13:9; Isa. 51:7; Jer. 20:9; Ezek. 3:10). The Old Covenant was to be written on two mountains (Deut. 27); in books for the priests, kings, and people (Deut. 7:18; 31:9-11); and on the gates, door posts, hands, and other places (Deut. 6:6-9); but every time it was written on a new place, that did not make it a New Covenant. As seen in Point III, the New Covenant was entirely a new contract that took the place of the Old Covenant, so the old Jewish Sabbath of the Old Covenant naturally was done away with, for its purpose could not be the same to Christians as it was to the Jews.

7. The Sabbath of the Old Covenant was not a memorial of the old creation. If it was a memorial of the old creation which was cursed by sin, it is only proper that it be done away with and a new Sabbath be instituted as a memorial of the new creation in Christ. It is better to commemorate the present new creation than the old creation that was cursed. The Bible, however, teaches that the Jews were to keep the Sabbath as a memorial of the day they were delivered from Egypt (Deut. 5:15), so their Sabbath could not possibly be the proper day for all nations to keep because they had no such deliverance. This is why it is not a day to be kept in the New Covenant. Not one Scripture says the old Sabbath was a memorial of the old creation.

Because keeping the Sabbath was a memorial day of the deliverance from Egypt, and a typical practice of the rest in Christ to come, it could be broken and has been broken many times without the committing of moral sin. The day Israel left Egypt was established as their Sabbath (Num. 33:3; Lev. 23:5-11). Israel marched around Jericho (Joshua 6), set up the Tabernacle (Ex. 40:1; 17 with Lev. 23:5-11), searched out Canaan (Num. 13:25), made war (I Kings 20:29; 2 Kings 3:9; Joshua 6), circumcised (John 7:22-23), and did other things on the Sabbath and were guiltless. David and priests of old broke it and were guiltless (Matt. 12:2-5). If any other of the Ten Commandments had been broken, no man would have been morally guiltless, thus the fourth commandment, being of a memorial and of a typical nature, has no place in the

New Covenant where we have the rest of which it was a type and where we could never observe it as the day of deliverance from Egypt.

VI. Did Constantine and the Pope Change the Sabbath?

The disciples of Moses teach that the Sabbath was changed from Saturday to Sunday by Constantine, 321 A.D., and by the Catholic Church, 364 A.D. *The following facts from history prove that they are historically wrong:*

1. The Encyclopedia Britannica under "Sabbath" and "Sunday" says, "In the early Christian Church JEWISH CHRISTIANS continued to keep the Sabbath, like other points of the law.....On the other hand, Paul from the first days of GENTILE CHRISTIANITY, laid it down definitely that the Jewish Sabbath was not binding on Christians. Controversy with Judaizers led in process of time to direct condemnation of those who still kept the Jewish day....In 321 A.D., Constantine made the Christian Sabbath, Sunday, the rest day for the Roman Empire, but it was observed by Christians for nearly 300 years before it became a law of Constantine."

This Encyclopedia also gives a number of dates from Constantine to modern times when rulers have made laws concerning Sunday keeping, but it would be foolish to argue that every time someone made a law like this that he changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, as some claim in the case of Constantine. *Constantine merely accepted the Christian Sabbath, Sunday, as the day of worship when he embraced the Christian religion. He did not change any day of worship for Christians. He changed the day of worship from pagans in the Roman Empire. The Laodicean Council in 364 A.D. did not change the day of worship for Christians from Saturday to Sunday. It merely confirmed the practice of Christians for 300 years or more, and made a definite decree that Christians should not work on Sunday.*

2. The New International Encyclopedia on "Sunday" says, "For some time after the foundation of the Christian Church the converts FROM JUDAISM still observed the

Jewish Sabbath to a greater or lesser extent, at first, it would seem, concurrently with the celebration of the first day; but before the end of the apostolic period, Sunday, known as the Lord's day, had thoroughly established itself as the special day to be sanctified (set apart) by rest from secular labor and by public worship. The hallowing of Sunday appears incontestably as a definite law in the Church by the beginning of the fourth century; and the Emperor Constantine confirmed the custom by a law of the state."

3. The Catholic Encyclopedia on "Sunday" says, Sunday was the first day of the week according to the Jewish method of reckoning, but for Christians it began to take the place of the Jewish Sabbath in apostolic times as the day set apart for public and solemn worship of God." This volume quotes a number of early Christian writings of the first, second, and third centuries to prove that Sunday was kept by Christians from the earliest times.

On pages 440-68 in "Bible Readings for the Home" Adventists give a number of quotations from modern Catholic writers proving that Catholics changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, but this proves nothing. They are mere boasts of modern men in trying to magnify the authority of the Roman Church and its pope. The authoritative Catholic Encyclopedia above does not confirm these recent claims of Catholics, which must be rejected as well as the Adventists' claims, for they are not true to history. There was no Roman pope ruling the whole Christian world for centuries and yet Christians kept Sunday as their Sabbath. On page 223 of the same book Adventists teach that the papacy came to power in 538 A.D., 217 years after Constantine made the law to keep the Christian Sabbath in his empire, and 174 years after the Laodicean Council confirmed this ancient practice of Christians, and yet on page 440 of this book they claim the papacy is what changed the Sabbath of the Christians from Saturday to Sunday. Consistency would certainly be an invaluable jewel in this case. How could the papacy change the Sabbath long before it came into power?

4. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia on "The Lord's Day" says, "The

Lord's day in the New Testament occurs only in Rev. 1:10, but in post-apostolic literature we have the following references: the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, IX, 1, "No longer keeping the Sabbath but living according to the Lord's day, on which also our light arose.....Acts 2:46 represents the special worship as DAILY. But this could not continue long.....A choice of a special day must have become necessary, and this day would, of course, have been Sunday.....Uncircumcised Gentiles, however, were free from any obligation of Sabbath observance.....No observance of a special day of rest is contained among the "NECESSARY THINGS" of Acts 15:28-29....A given day as a matter of divine obligation is denounced by Paul as forsaking Christ (Gal. 4:10), and Sabbath-keeping is condemned explicitly in Col. 2:16. As a matter of individual devotion to be sure, a man might do as he pleased (Rom. 14:5-6), but no general rule as necessary for salvation could be compatible with liberty wherewith Christ has made us free (Gal. 2:1-21; 3:1-14; 5:1-4, 13)."

5. We next quote from the ten volumes called "The Ante-Nicene Fathers," the writings of the early Church Fathers down to 325 A.D. and before Constantine and the Catholic Church are supposed to have changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday:

A. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who lived at the time of the apostles, 30-107 A.D. He, like Polycarp, was a disciple of St. John and one who should know Christian practice among the early Christians as to the Sabbath. He wrote, "And after the observance of the Sabbath (that the Jews kept), let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all days of the week....on which our life sprang up again, and victory over death was obtained in Christ....it is absurd to speak of Jesus Christ with the tongue, and to cherish in the mind a Judaism which has come to an end....If any man preach the Jewish law unto you, listen not to him. For it is better to hearken to Christian doctrine from a man who is circumcised than to a Judaism from one uncircumcised" (Vol. 1, pages 63-82).

B. In the epistle of Barnabas, ascribed to Paul's companion by Clement, Origen, and others, we read, "He says to them, "Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot

endure” (Isa. 1:13). Ye perceive how He speaks: Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me....I will make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day on which Jesus rose again from the dead” (Vol. 1, page 147).

C. Justin Martyr, A Gentile born near Jacob’s well about 110 A.D. writes, “And on the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather to gather to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read....But Sunday is the day on which we hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead” (Vol. 1, page 186).

In his dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, Justin Martyr says, “Is there any other matter, my friends in which we are blamed, than this, that we live not according to the law, and are not circumcised in the flesh as your forefathers were, and do not observe the Sabbaths as you do....Christians would observe the law, if they did not know why it was instituted....For we too would observe the fleshly circumcision, and the Sabbaths, and in short all feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined you...How is it, Trypho, that we would not observe those rites which do not harm us - I speak of fleshly circumcision, and Sabbaths, and feasts?....The Gentiles, who have believed in Him, and who have repented of their sins.....shall receive the inheritance along with the patriarchs....even although they neither keep the Sabbath, nor are circumcised, nor observe the feasts...Christ is useless to those who observe the law....The Sabbath and sacrifices and offerings and feasts....have come to an end in Him who was born of a virgin....But if some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given to Moses....along with their hope in Christ.....they shall probably be saved” (Vol. 1, pages 199-218).

D. Tertullian, presbyter of the North-African Church, who was born about 145 A.D., writes, “The Holy Spirit upbraids the Jews for their holydays. Your Sabbaths, and new moons, and ceremonies my soul hateth....But us (Christians), to whom Sabbaths are

strange....to the heathen each festive day occurs but once annually: you (Christians) have a festive day every eighth day.....Others suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray toward the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity....you who reproach us with the sun and Sunday should consider your own proximity to us. We are not far off from your Saturn and your day of rest.....It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated to have been temporary” (Vol. III, Pages 70, 123, 155, 313-14).

E. In “The Teachings of the Twelve Apostles,” written about 80 A.D., we read, “But every Lord’s day (Sunday) do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread and give thanksgiving” (Vol. VII, page 381).

F. In the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles (2nd century) we read, “Break your fast....the first day of the week, which is the Lord’s day....After eight days let there be another feast observed with honor, the eighth day itself: (Vol. VII, page 447).

G. Irenaeus, 178 A.D., in arguing that the Jewish Sabbaths were signs and types and were not to be kept since the reality of which they were shadows has come, says, “The mystery of the Lord’s resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord’s day and on this alone should we observe the breaking of the Paschal Feast....Pentecost fell on the first day of the week, and was therefore associated with the Lord’s day.”

H. Clement of Alexandria, 174 A.D., says, “The old seventh day has become nothing more than a working day.”

I. Theophilus, pastor of Antioch, 162 A.D., says, “Both custom and reason challenge us that we should honor the Lord’s day, seeing on that day it was that our Lord completed His resurrection from the dead.”

J. Origen, about 200 A.D., says, “John the Baptist was born to make ready a people for the Lord, a people for Him at the end of the covenant now grown old, which is the end of the Sabbath....It is one of the marks of a perfect Christian to keep the Lord’s day.”

K. Victorianus, 300 A.D., says, “On the Lord’s day we go forth to our bread and giving thanks. Lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews, which Christ Himself the Lord of the Sabbath in His body abolished” (Section 4, “On the Creation”).

6. Eusebius, the Father of Church History, who made a history of the time between the birth of Christ and Constantine, and who lived 265-340 A.D., says, “From the beginning Christians assembled on the first day of the week, called by them the Lord’s Day, for the purpose of religious worship, to read the Scriptures, to preach, and to celebrate the Lord’s Supper....the first day of the week on which the Saviour obtained the victory over death. Therefore, it has the pre-eminence, first in rank, and is more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath.”

Many other ancient testimonies could be given, as well as scores from more modern writers, but these are sufficient to prove that neither Constantine nor the pope or the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. For Constantine to change the Christian Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, the Christians would have had to keep Saturday up to the time of his decree and this they did not do. No greater falsehood has ever been taught the ignorant masses of people than this. As we have seen, Constantine merely accepted the Christian Sabbath, and he did not change the Christian day of worship at all. Early Christians called the first day the Lord’s day to distinguish it from the Jewish Sabbath.

The question now is not whether the early Christians were right or wrong, but it is, was it their custom to keep the first day of the week as their Sabbath before Constantine? Not one statement has ever been found that contradicted the above testimony of the

early Christians, who ascribe Sunday-keeping to reasons other than the one some civil or religious leader changed it. Because the early Christians all confessed that they kept the first day of the week, then they told the truth or were self confessed liars.

Elder Andrews, the ablest historian the Adventists ever had, says in his "History of the Sabbath," page 308, "The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they have no special light on the subject which we in this later age do not possess." This is a frank admission of what we are contending for. If it is clear to us today by the plain Scripture that the old Jewish Sabbath was done away with the law of Moses, and Christians observed the first day as the Lord's day, and as the Sabbath, then it is foolish for anyone to reject such simple and true light.

VII. Why do Christians Keep the First Day of the Week?

1. *Because the Lord Jesus Christ finished His redemptive work and completed His victory over death, Hell and the grave at the close of the seventh day Sabbath of the old law and rested on the first day.* The first day was the day of the greatest victory for God and the universe. It was the great day of triumph over sin, Satan, death, and Hell. It was the day of joy and praise because of the resurrection, which guarantees the salvation and eternal life of all men who believe and obey the Gospel (John 3:16; Acts 2:38).

Why is any day kept? Because of what happened on that day. One remembers a day because of the events of that day. Israel celebrated the Sabbath because of their deliverance from Egypt (Deut. 5:15) and because it typified rest that was to come in Christ (Heb. 4:1-11; Col. 2:14-17). They celebrated the Passover because their first-born escaped death (Ex. 12). Americans celebrate the 4th of July, Nov. 11th, and other days because of what happened on those days. So it is with the Christians, who celebrate the first day of the week. It is because of the resurrection of Christ when eternal redemption was obtained.

2. *The first day was the day of our Lord's special manifestations to His own disciples.* And it was on the first day that Christ met with His disciples. Exactly one week later on the second first day of the week He again met with them (John 20:19, 26). Why did the disciples meet again at the same time and at the same place? Why did Jesus delay His meeting with them for another whole week, passing up the Jewish Sabbath? This was no mere accident. The Lord wanted to sanction that day as the one to be observed from that time on.

3. *There is no record of Christ giving any recognition to the old seventh day Sabbath of the Jews after His resurrection.* Hence, His example of recognizing the first day for Christian gatherings should be sufficient, definite, and conclusive.

4. *The first day was the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.* Pentecost, according to the testimony of the early Church Fathers came on the first day. Pentecost fell on the 50th day after the feast of First-fruits, which typified the resurrection. The coming of the Holy Spirit had been foreshadowed and predicted and several chapters had been devoted to it in the Old Testament. His presence in the Church was to be the beginning of a new work among men in a new age (Isa. 28:9-11; Hab. 1:5; with Acts 13:41; I Cor. 14:21-22).

Would it not be strange that the Lord remained in the grave all through the Jewish Sabbath, and the Holy Spirit stayed in heaven until another Jewish Sabbath was over and then came on the first day of the week; if the Lord had not intended to do away with the old Sabbath and institute a new day? Just as Christ honored the first day by His manifestations, so the Holy Spirit honored and set His seal upon the first day of the week by His coming and manifestation on that day. Since the Lord Jesus Himself sanctioned it, the Holy Spirit sanctioned it, and the church has been observing it from the very beginning, there is no need for a special command to keep the first day as a memorial of the resurrection and the descent of the Holy Spirit to begin His glorious ministry among men.

At least 3,000 souls were saved and baptized in Jesus name on this eighth first day of the week after the resurrection of Christ, and God has been blessing every Sunday since with the salvation of multitudes, so if it is such a curse to keep Sunday, and if it is the mark of the beast as some declare, God would not so bless men on this day. If God blesses only Saturday, no blessing could be possible on any other day. In the early church God blessed "daily" and He will always continue to do so where men gather on any day in the name of Jesus (Acts 1:12-15; 2:1, 41-47). Thus God's blessing this day at the beginning of the new order makes it as sanctified and holy as the day that He blessed at the beginning of the old creation, as well as the day that He commanded Israel to keep under the old law as typical of the coming rest and their deliverance from Egypt (Deut. 5:15; Ex. 31:13-18; Col, 2:14-17).

5. *The very lack of any warning by Christ or the apostles that Sunday-keeping was to be a mortal sin and the mark of the beast that would damn the soul, is enough proof that they did not teach this theory.* If it was such a sin, they surely would have warned Christians not to keep such a day. They warned them many times against all other sins. Obviously, they did not seem to care whether Christians committed this so-called sin or not. In fact, should it have been a sin, they would have committed it by starting out to keep the first day of the week and having religious gatherings on that day.

The whole church was in ignorance of this so-called sin for eighteen centuries until about 1844 A.D. some disciples of Moses claimed to get a *special revelation* that keeping Sunday was the mark of the beast and would damn the soul. As a matter of fact, a revelation or a command from Christ or anyone else was not necessary to make the change of days in this new order, for the change had been in type and prophecy, as we have seen, and when the day came, it was blessed by God. It was no more necessary to receive a commandment from God to change the Sabbath than it was to change the old sacrifices, circumcision, and other Old Testament laws - changes which were so radical to the Jews at that time. Such changes had to come gradually and by the work of the Spirit. The wisdom that brought this about during the necessary

transitional period and without arbitrary enforcement, is obvious.

An explicit command to keep the first day would have brought about the same formality and weakness in the New Covenant that as in the Old Covenant. The things of the New Covenant were to be spiritual and not material, external, and ritualistic, as in the old one. It would have brought about a needless issue between the Jews and Christians on a mere formal matter, and would have resulted in more harm than good to the new religion of Jesus and would have destroyed its higher, spiritual purpose. The greater and higher values of the new religion were experienced by multitudes before controversy between the two orders made it necessary to condemn the Sabbaths and other rituals of the old law (Acts 15; Gal. 2; 4:9-11; 5:1-5; Col. 2:14-17; Eph. 2:15).

6. *The typology of the Old Covenant makes prominent the first day of the week.* At least the feasts of First-fruits and Pentecost were typical of the resurrection and descent of the Holy Spirit, each of which took place on the first day of the week. Other feasts were held on Sunday also. At least, the feasts of unleavened Bread and Trumpets were held on one and perhaps two Sundays, for they were seven and eight day feasts (Lev. 23:6-14; 34-39), so the old theory of modern law keepers that no religious service was ever held on the first day of the week is unscriptural.

The regular feasts were on set dates every year and not on certain days of the week. The feast of First-fruits, or the harvest of grain, had to be on the 16th of April each year, and the Passover on the 14th, so the Sabbaths had to be changed so that they would not fall on these dates, for they were work dates. No work could be done on the Sabbath. The year had to be a 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ - day year like our year in order that the harvest could be reaped at the same time each year. If the year was only 360 days long as some believe, the natural seasons would soon be irregular with the feasts, and the grain would rot in the field (Lev. 23:4-14). Hence, the feasts were on set dates and the weekly Sabbath was changed each year to a different day for seven years, so that it would never fall on these work days.

The seasonal Sabbath program could only be carried out in one section of the Earth, so it is further proved that Christians in all parts of the Earth could not observe the Old Covenant for seasons are different in various lands. Even Israel was not to observe these feasts and Sabbaths out of their own land (Lev. 19:23; 23:10; 25:2; 26:32; Num. 15:2, 18; Deut. 26:1).

7. *God honored the first day again by giving John the Book of Revelation on “the Lord’s day,”* which was on the first day of the week, according to the early Church Fathers quoted previously in this lesson. (Rev. 1:10).

8. *God honored the first day of the week by giving His law on that day.* On the 15th day of the third month after leaving Egypt, Israel camped at Sinai (Ex. 19:1; Lev. 23:5; Ex. 12:2-18), and this was on Thursday. Three days later on Sunday, God gave the Law (Ex. 19:1, 3, 11). The Old Covenant was dedicated on Monday (Ex. 24:4-8), and the same day Moses went up in the mount (Ex. 24:9-13), and seven days later on the next Sunday, God again spoke to Moses (Ex. 24:16). God also honored worship to Him on many Sundays in Israel, as seen in 2 Chron. 7:10; 29:17; Ezra 3:6; Neh. 8:14-18).

9. *The early Christians always gathered for worship on the first day of the week.* No record is given where they had a meeting on the Sabbath Christ was in the grave, but the next day we find them gathered with Christ in their midst (John 20:1, 19). We find the disciples in public worship two Sundays during the ten days they waited for the Spirit to come (Acts 1:12-15) and many Sundays when they gathered “daily” after that (Acts 2). In I Cor. 11:17; Heb. 10:25, it is clear that later on the early Christians had a set day for public assembly, and in Acts 20:6-12; I Cor. 16:1-2, it plainly states that the day they gathered was “upon the first day of the week.”

Some people contend that no religious gathering was ever held on Sunday and they explain away John 20:19 as the eating of the evening meal in their own apartment, as if the disciples all lived together in one place, but this is an unreasonable way to get around the plain truth. In Matt. 8:14; John 19:27; 20:10, we read that the disciples had

their own homes, so they would not be living at one place. Regardless of what Adventists say about Acts 20:6-12; I Cor. 16:1-2, the fact remains that it was on “the first day of the week” that Christians were gathered and were to bring their offerings for the poor. Whether it was morning or night, it was still on “the first day of the week,” and this should settle the question as far as honest men are concerned. In Acts 20, the purpose of the meeting was “to break bread” and this refers to the Lord’s Supper (I Cor. 10:16; 11:23-34).

The Anti-Sunday people argue that Acts 20 refers to late Saturday night and that Paul continued his speech until Sunday morning and then traveled all day Sunday to prove that Sunday was a work day and not the Sabbath. They should be ashamed to use such childish argument, that should a man travel on Sunday it could not be the Sabbath, for I know one of these preachers who travels on the average of 170 miles every Saturday to various appointments, and this is about 80 miles farther than Paul traveled on his Sabbath, so if Paul’s traveling proves that the day he traveled was a work day and not a Sabbath, then the traveling of this preacher, and others like him, proves that Saturday could not possibly be the Sabbath. Suppose the disciples did gather on Saturday night, it still proves that it was on “the first day of the week” or Sunday and not on Saturday the seventh day. Any honest person knows that the first day could not be the seventh day, and if Christians had a religious service on the first day or Sunday, then the theory that there is not a record of one religious gathering on Sunday, is entirely mistaken. It matters not what time of the day a meeting is held, it still is on that day and not on another day.

The last Scripture (I Cor. 16:1-2) tells the churches to take collections on the first day of the week, so that no collections would be taken when Paul arrived. How could the Christians take collections in their churches for the poor except when they were gathered together on this first day? Anti-Sunday people may know of a way to take up collections in “churches” without being gathered together, but others have not learned this secret. They can argue that this means to lay by at home something for the poor, but nothing is said about the home. It is an order for “churches” to do this, and it should

be clear to anyone that collections would only be taken in gatherings of the church members.

In The Ante-Nicene Fathers we read that collections were taken up every Lord's day for the poor, thus fulfilling the command of Paul to the churches. Thus we see from both Scripture and history that the early Christians held religious services on the first day of the week instead of on the old Jewish Sabbath. No example is found in history and no command in Scripture states that Christians gathered or should gather on the seventh day, so we conclude that there are many reasons from both the historical and Biblical viewpoint to explain why Christians keep Sunday as the Sabbath.

VIII. Not One Time Does The Old or New Covenant Say or Teach:

1. That Sunday keeping is a human institution.
2. That Christians must keep the old Jewish Sabbath.
3. That Christians are obligated to keep any certain day.
4. That all who keep Sunday have the mark of the beast.
5. That all who keep Sunday are lost.
6. That Sunday keeping is a Roman Catholic Institution.
7. That Christians never held a religious service on the first day of the week or Sunday.
8. That the Ten Commandments were not done away when the Old Covenant was "abolished" and "done away" in Christ on the cross.

9. That the Lord's day is the Seventh day or the old Jewish Sabbath.
10. That the fourth commandment is a part of the New Covenant.
11. That Christians are not to work on Saturday.
12. That the fourth commandment Sabbath is not included in the "Sabbaths" that were abolished on the cross as taught in Col. 2:14-17; Gal. 4:9-11; Rom. 14:1-5; Eph. 2:15.
13. That the fourth commandment Sabbath was for Gentiles except the few who were part of the nation of Israel (Ex. 12:49).
14. That the fourth commandment Sabbath was a sign between God and Gentiles as is stated of God and Israel in Ex. 31:13-17; Deut. 5:12-15; Ezek. 20:12-13.
15. That Saturday is a holy day, the Sabbath, a day of rest, a day of worship, or a day sanctified in the New Covenant.
16. That Saturday was the only day the apostles recognized as a day of rest and worship.
17. That Jesus instituted the old Jewish Sabbath. (The Bible says that God gave the Law and spoke in times past to men, Heb. 1:1-2; Rom. 1:1-3; Acts 3:21-26).
18. That men observed the Sabbath for about 2500 years from creation to Ex. 16, at which time God first commanded men to keep a certain day, according to the record.
19. That Sunday cannot be as holy as any other day sanctified or set apart for the worship of God.
20. That Christians are to be bound to a rigid slavery to any day of the week like men

were bound under the Old Covenant.

IX. Christians Are Free To Keep Any Day.

The New Covenant permits any day to be observed as the day of rest and worship (Rom. 14:5-6; Gal. 4:9-10; Col. 2:14-17). Some Saturday keepers are in the habit of offering money to anyone who will prove that Sunday is the Sabbath. They could offer \$1,000,000.00 to anyone to prove by the New Testament that God commanded Sunday as the Sabbath. We could also offer them the same amount to prove by the New Covenant that God commanded Saturday as the true Christian Sabbath. It does not teach either theory.

People who claim to keep the old Jewish Sabbath do not keep it as God commanded. All cooking (Ex. 16:23), work (Ex. 20:8-10), gathering wood (Num. 15:32), travel (Lev. 23:3), and making of fires were forbidden on the Sabbath under penalty of death (Ex. 31:15; 35:2-5). All so-called Sabbath keepers make or keep fires, travel long distances, and do many things that they were forbidden to do in the Old Covenant. The New Covenant says nothing about how to observe any day, but reveals that if one persists in living under the Old Covenant, they are obligated to do all the law (Gal. 3:10-12; 5:1-4; James 2:10). If so-called law keepers would observe all the law one would be more impressed by them, but when they do not keep it and yet demand all men to keep it or be lost, they have failed to make a point. They claim that in Judea no fire was needed to keep people warm, so they use this as an excuse to build fires and do other things forbidden by the law on the Sabbath. This is no excuse for a law-breaker. It gets cold in Judea as proved in Matt. 24:15-21; John 18:18.

These admissions only prove that they recognize that the law must have been for a special people in a special land, as it would have been impossible to observe certain demands of the law in all lands. For example, to keep the Sabbath as the laws says from sunset to sunset would mean in the far north where there are six months day and six months night, that the Sabbath would be a whole year long every seven years, and

the year of jubilee would be every 350 years instead of 50 years as in Judea.

Then, too, if two men would start from the same point and travel around the world, one going east and the other going west, there would be two days difference in their Sabbaths at the end of their journey when they met again. Which one would be keeping the true Sabbath and still be saved and which one would be lost if keeping every seventh day at the same time over the world is required to be saved?

The word *Sabbath* in Scripture means rest or cessation from labor and was one day long (Ex. 20: 8-11); two days long (Lev. 23:6-8, 15-22); a year long (Lev. 25); seventy years long (2 Chron. 36:21); an eternity long (Heb. 4:9), so it is foolish to demand us to rest for any length of time in order to be saved.

It is true Christ did not command men to keep the first day because He came to make the New Covenant without any requirement concerning days. This is also why He did not command man to keep the seventh day holy. He kept the old Jewish law Sabbath in a sensible way because He came to fulfill the law and to do away with it as we have already seen in previous Scriptures in this lesson. Hence, for people to offer money for proof that Christ kept Sunday, or that He commanded men to keep the first day is wholly deceptive and a play upon the ignorance of the average person who has little knowledge about the New Covenant teaching on observing certain days.

Scriptures recording that Christ observed the old law Sabbath are no proof of what men are to do in the New Covenant which was not made until Christ fulfilled the Old Covenant. Even Christ did not observe the old Sabbath like the Jews did. He proved He was Lord of the Sabbath and was not bound by it to the exclusion of good works on that day. The word "Sabbath" is used 60 times in the New Testament. It is used 50 times before the New Covenant was made, so these passages should not be considered as proof concerning the Sabbath of the New Covenant. Of the 20 passages where the subject is mentioned in the New Covenant, ONE (Acts 1:12) is ignored by people who claim that they keep the old Sabbath because it mentions travel on the

Sabbath as being limited to less than a mile. Since they could not carry on even Gospel work on Saturday if they obeyed this, it is best to ignore it and travel all they please with the excuse they are doing God's work. FIVE of the other nine passages refer to Paul going into Jewish synagogues on their Sabbath, so that he could preach Christ to them while they were gathered together (Acts 13:14, 42, 44; 17:1-2; 18:4). This is the same policy of Sabbath keeping preachers or anyone else who desires to contact the people by preaching in various lands. TWO of the other four passages refer to "Moses" as the law and "the prophets: being read, not to Christians, but to the Jews in their synagogues on their Sabbath days (Acts 13:27; 15:21). ONE of the other two passages refers to Paul going out of a city to preach to the crowds who gathered by a river (Acts 16:13). THE LAST ONE definitely says that all "Sabbaths" were abolished in Christ on the cross (Col. 2:14-17).

Thus, not one passage in the New Covenant on the Sabbath records a gathering of Christians on the old Jewish Sabbath. Not one commands Christians to gather on this day. The purpose of preaching on the Sabbath in all the passages above was to give Paul the opportunity to reach the people wherever they were gathered. There was no Christian congregation in any of these places referred to until Paul preached to the people. Christian congregations were mentioned after this and not one thing was said about Christians gathering to worship as a separate congregation from the Jews on the Jewish Sabbath. On the contrary, when Christians were mentioned any time as being gathered to worship it was on the first day, as we have already seen in previous Scriptures in this lesson. In the above passages of Scripture the preaching was in "the synagogue of the Jews" and not in a Christian church.

Law keepers make much of Paul preaching in Corinth 78 successive Sabbaths in Acts 18:4, but it does say that he preached this many Sabbaths in the Jewish synagogue during his 18 months there. On the contrary, he preached a few Sabbaths (no one knows how many) to the Jews in their synagogue, and when they rejected his message, he went into the house of Justis where a Christian congregation was started. It was here that he continued while at Corinth and it does not say that the Christians gathered

on the same day that the Jews did (Acts 19:4-19). If Paul obeyed his own teachings it would not have been on the Jewish Sabbath that Christians gathered for he taught Gentiles to get as far away from the law as possible, as we have seen in Rom. 14:5-6; Gal. 4:9-10; 5:3-4; Col. 2:14-17.

X. The Law of God and The Law of Moses Are The Same.

Some people argue that the Law of Moses was only the ceremonial part of the law; that the law of God was the moral law or the Ten Commandments; and that Moses' Law was written in a book and God's law was written on two tables of stone.

If this theory be true, then we do not have God's law any more and have not had for over twenty-five centuries since it disappeared with the Ark. We do have the Ten Commandments in two books written by Moses, thus proving that they were part of the Mosaic Law (Ex. 20; Deut. 5). God said that the whole law of moral and ceremonial laws made 'ONE LAW' (Ex. 12:49; Lev. 24:33; Num. 15:16, 29). Every law of Moses was a commandment, so there were more than Ten Commandments (Ex. 7:2; 19:7-8; 32:8; Lev. 7:38; 25:1). The ceremonial laws were given on Sinai as well as the Ten Commandments (Ex. 19:1-23; 24:12-18; Lev. 7:38; Num. 3:1; 15:22-23; Heb. 8:5).

The following terms in Scripture are used interchangeably of the same law: "A *law*" (Deut. 34:2-4; Ps. 78:5); "*the law*" (194 times in Scripture, Josh. 1:7-8; 8:31-35; 22:5; 2 Kings 17:13; Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 23:23; John 1:17; Heb. 7:11); "*My (God's) law*" (Ps. 89:30-31; Prov. 3:1; 7:2; Ezek. 22:26; Hosea 8:12-13); "*The law of the Lord*" (1 Chron. 16:40; Ezra 7:10; Luke 2:22-39); "*the book of the law of God*" (Josh. 24:25-26; 2 Chron. 17:6-9; Neh. 8:1-13; 9:3; 10:29); "*the book of the law of Moses*" (Josh. 8:31; 23:6; 2 Kings 14:6; 2 Chron. 34:14-19; Neh. 8:1); "*the law of God*" and "*the law of Moses*" (Acts 13:39; Rom. 7:22-25; Heb. 10:28); "*the law of commandments*" and "*the handwriting of ordinances*" (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14-17); "*the statutes...ordinances...and the law and commandment, WHICH HE (God) WROTE FOR YOU*" (thus God wrote more than the Ten Commandments, Ex. 24:12; 2 Kings 17:34-37; 2 Chron. 14:4); "*THE*

WHOLE LAW....by the hand of Moses” (2 Chron 33:8; 2 Kings 17:13; 21:8; Gal. 5:3); *“Moses” and “the old testament”* (Acts 15:21; 2 Cor. 3:6-15; Heb. 8:6-10).

Many other terms are used of the one law of God and of Moses but these are enough to prove there was only one law. The Ten Commandments are spoken of as part of the Law of Moses, as is clear in Matt. 22:36-40; Rom. 2:21-22; 7:7-16; Ex. 20; Deut. 5). That God’s law was written in a book as well as on tables of stone is clear from Josh. 24:25-26. We find many statements such as “the Lord said” and “the Lord spake,” which are used 46 times in Exodus; 36 times in Leviticus; 72 times in Numbers; and 50 times in Deuteronomy, thus proving the ceremonial laws were laws of God as well as were the Ten Commandments.

XI. Could Sunday Worship Be A Part Of The New Testament?

People who keep Saturday as the Sabbath argue that Sunday worship was instituted or came just three days too late to be a part of the New Testament. The theory is, to quote from these people, “Everything in the New Testament that was for Christians had to be SPOKEN AND WRITTEN BEFORE CHRIST DIED, for a will cannot be written after death....A covenant is of no force while that which establishes it lives. Observance of the first day as a day of worship came into force three days after the death of Christ, the Testator of the New Testament, and therefore it is three days too late to become part of the New Testament. The Lord instituted the Lord’s Supper before His death in order that it might be included in the New Testament as a Christian rite. If Jesus had waited until after His death, He could not have added it to the New Covenant.”

This theory that nothing that was said or done by the Lord and the apostles after the death of Christ could be a part of the New Testament, and that everything that was a part of the New Covenant had to be spoken and written before Christ ratified the New Covenant by His own death on the cross in order to be a part of the New Testament is unscriptural. *If this theory be true we would have to believe the following:*

1. That not one word of the New Testament is in force, for none of it was written before the death of Christ, and much of it was not spoken before that time.
2. That Christ had no authority even after He was made alive from the dead to add to the New Testament. But anyone knows that any man who had died and then came back to life again could change any will he had made, and he could take possession of his own property due to his being alive again.
3. That all the commandments given by Christ to His apostles after He was resurrected from the dead could not be in force as part of the New Testament, but this is contradicted by the fact that most of the New Covenant laws and teachings were given after He was made alive (Acts 1:1-3; John 16:13-15; I Cor. 2:10; Eph. 3:1-6; Gal. 1:11-12).
4. That the Great Commission to preach and all other things commanded by Christ and the Holy Spirit after Christ's resurrection are not in force, therefore, Saturday keepers or no one else has a right to preach the New Testament (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; John 20:21; Acts 11:1-11).
5. That the decrees ordained by the apostles as well as all their writings are not inspired and in force for Christians (Acts 15:28-29; Gal. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Peter 3:2; I John 2:1; 1 Cor. 7:10; I Thess. 4:2; 2 Thess. 3:4). These and other fallacies we must reject as being unscriptural.

The above theory really destroys the Saturday Sabbath foundation based upon the Ten Commandments written on the two tables of stone, for these stone tables never were ratified except as part of the Old Covenant. They were not present when the Old Covenant was ratified. It was after the ratification of the Old Covenant of Ex. 19:1-24; that God wrote a copy of the Ten Commandments upon stones and gave them to Moses (Ex. 24:6-18). These were broken and other stones had to be made and written upon and these were further from the ratification of the Old Covenant that were the first

stones (Ex. 32:19; 34:1-35). Therefore, it is inconsistent to build a whole doctrine upon something that was not ratified in particular as a separate law from the Law of Moses, as some teach. Sunday worship could be just as much a part of the New Covenant as any other addition made to it after it was ratified by the blood of Christ. Such is not commanded but it was practiced by the early church, as we have seen in many passages of Scriptures in this lesson.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX