

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM
RENOUNCED

AFTER AN EXPERIENCE OF TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS
BY
A PROMINENT MINISTER AND WRITER OF THAT FAITH

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT.
OTSEGO, MICHIGAN.

“Ye know not when the time is.” Jesus, Mark 13:33.
“Beware of false prophets.” Jesus, Matt. 7:15.
“Keep my commandments.” Jesus, John 14:15.

KALAMAZOO:
KALAMAZOO PUBLISHING Co. PRINT.
1888.

COPYRIGHTED 1887,
BY D. M. CANRIGHT.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

MKA 6 AUBURN
YC 22

INTRODUCTION.

BEING profoundly convinced that Seventh-Day Adventism is a system of error, I feel it my duty to publish what I know of it. I do it in the fear of God, knowing the sorrow it has brought to my heart and to thousands, I must warn others against it. I do not question the honesty of the Adventists, but that does not sanctify their errors. I have had to speak plainly, but, I trust, kindly. To avoid writing a large book I have had to treat each subject briefly, and leave many untouched. I have taken up a few of the main pillars of that faith; if these fail, the whole system must go down. I have put the book in this cheap form that it may have a wide reading.

The Adventists, instead of answering my arguments, have attacked me personally. This has compelled me to defend myself. When Paul was attacked, he defended himself by recounting what he had done. He says: "Ye have compelled me; for I ought to have been commended of you." 2 Cor. 12:11. I have done as he did.

THE EXTENT OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST WORK. Few are aware of how extensive this work is becoming. Their Year Book for 1888 shows 409 members, 889 churches, 25,841 members, tithe \$192,720.00 yearly. Last year they gained 30 ministers, 91 churches, and 2,270 members. They have churches in nearly all the states and territories, in Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, England, Australia, New Zealand, Pacific Islands, Central America, South America, Africa, Germany, Russia, etc. They have six printing houses, large and well equipped, where they publish about twenty periodicals and a list of nearly two hundred books and tracts. By means of their Tract Societies these works are distributed widely over all the earth. Last year they sent out nearly \$200,000 worth. They have two colleges and one academy. An intense zeal to propogate their doctrines and make proselytes to their church is the one leading passion of them all; hence in proportion to their numbers, they do a large amount of work.

WHAT WILL BE THEIR END? In 1856, 32 years ago, Mrs. White prophesied that some there would live till Jesus came. Testimonies, vol. 2, p. 132. So they argue that those who saw the stars fall in 1833, 55 years ago, will live to the end. When these limits are passed, all must know that they have been deceived. Then will come doubt, discouragement, divisions, apostacies, and ruin to souls. This end is inevitable. The wider their influence now, the more terrible the disaster then. These wild, enthusiastic, fanatical moves which end in failure are the delight of Satan, as they bring disgrace upon the cause of Christ and end in infidelity. That such will be the end of Adventism, I have not a doubt; but it will take another generation to see it.

HOW SHALL WE MEET IT? Meet it squarely and quickly as soon as it enters a place. Preach on it. Enlighten the people. Give them reading matter against it. Visit those being led away and labor with them personally. Nine out of ten could be saved from that error if this were done in time. Very generally ministers make the mistake of waiting till the Adventists have worked weeks before they say anything. Then it is too late. I always observed that where ministers and members united right on the start and worked against it publicly and privately, we could do but little. If it once gets a foothold, you will have a thorn in the flesh for years to come.

The author has plainly stated his views on the Sabbath, the Law, and other subjects discussed in this book. He does not expect all his

JUL 5 1928

48641

readers to agree with him on all points; but he asks them to candidly weigh the arguments advanced.

LACK OF EDUCATION AND TALENT AMONG THE ADVENTIST LEADERS.

The men whom God has chosen to lead out in the great religious movements of the past have, with few exceptions, been men of high education, refinement, and great talents. Moses, the founder of Judaism, "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and was mighty in words and in deeds." Acts 7:22. Nehemiah, who restored Jerusalem after the captivity, was cup-bearer to the king. Neh. 2. So Daniel, the great prophet, had "knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom." Dan. 1:17. He was prime minister of a mighty empire for many years. Paul was so renowned for his learning that the king said to him, "Much learning doth make thee mad." Acts 26:24. He did for Christianity ten times more than all the other apostles together. It is to him, and not to the other apostles, that the Gentile world is indebted for Christianity. Then the twelve, though uneducated, had the advantage over all other reformers, that they were taught directly by the Son of God and could work miracles.

St. Augustine, A. D. 353-430, the father of Christian theology, to whom the church owes almost as much as to Paul, was highly educated. As is well known that Luther was a thorough scholar, educated in the best schools of his day and filled a professor's chair in a university. So Calvin and Melancthon were both profound scholars, occupying professor's chairs in halls of learning. Zwingli, the great Swiss reformer, was celebrated for his learning and scholarship. Wiclif, the "Morning Star of the Reformation," was a graduate of old Oxford, England, and a doctor of divinity. Cranmer, the great English reformer, was a graduate, a doctor of divinity, archbishop, and regent of the kingdom. Wesley, the father of Methodism, was a graduate of Oxford, a man of vast reading, the author or editor of commentaries, grammars, dictionaries, etc.

Now look at the founders of our heretical sects. Joanne Southcott was wholly illiterate, a mere washer woman. Ann Lee, the foundress of the Shakers, received no education, worked in a cotton factory, and was cook in a hospital. Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, received no education, and Brigham Young very little. The Fox girls with whom modern Spiritualism originated, were of the same class. Not one of these persons were of influence in the world, outside of their own deluded followers.

How is it with the leaders of Adventism? Wm. Miller, the founder of the party, was reared in the backwoods, in poverty, and received only the poor advantages of a common district school. Except some general reading, this was the extent of his education. Nearly all the prominent men in Miller's move were as uncultured as himself. Eld. White, the leader of the Seventh-Day Adventists party, only secured sufficient education to teach a common district school. He was no student of books. In all my travels with him I seldom saw him read half an hour in any book. Of the languages or the sciences he knew nothing. Mrs. White received no school education except a few weeks when a child. She like Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee and Joseph Smith, is wholly illiterate, not knowing the simplest rules of grammar. Not one of the leading men in that work ever graduated from college or university and some of the most prominent ones are illiterate as Mrs. White herself. Eld. J. N. Andrews, Eld. Smith and one or two more have by diligent study and reading out of school, became well informed men in their line. Eld. G. I. Butler, the present leader of the body, has only a common school education and is unacquainted with the languages or the sciences, and is very narrow and

bigoted in his views; poorly prepared to lead out in a great reformation in this educated age. Not a man among them has now, or ever had, a particle of influence in the world, or any office or responsible position in state or nation. How different from the great reformers of the past who often had extensive influence for good, not only with the masses, but with the great men and kings of earth. Hence from whatsoever side we view Adventism, it has none of the marks of a genuine reformation sent of God to bless the world.

On the condition of things among the first-day Adventists, Eld. A. A. Phelps, Lima, N. Y., for years editor of the "Bible Banner," one of their papers, says: "Still another minister, who for years labored among the Adventists, thinks my entire statement 'ought to be published in many papers,' because it is a 'true picture,'" He adds: 'My experience has been similar to yours. He regrets the same things that I deplored, and the necessity which drove him out—as many others have been—to work on other lines and with another denomination. I can count up at least a dozen ministers—including some of the best I ever knew—who are now preaching outside of the Adventist ranks. There must be some serious reason for this state of things. What is it?'

"I watched and waited and working, with patience, meekness and loyalty, in hearty co operation, and with an earnest desire to see such unity, enterprise, breadth, and moral power as ought to characterize a scriptural and heaven-inspired movement. How slowly and reluctantly I yielded to the conviction—forced by sad facts and illustrations that I have not even dared to detail—that I was only throwing away my life in stemming such waves of discord, indolence, looseness, narrowness, dogmatism, and spiritual death as I could not overcome."

Reader, if you are still outside of this spiritual Babylon, take warning from those who have been through the mill, and stay out.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Otsego, Mich., Aug. 13, 1888.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Advent Theories Examined, page 9.—Testimonies to my character, 9, 10.—Summary of my labors among them, 11.—Positions I held when I left them, 12.—A yoke of bondage, 13.—Sad condition of their church, 14.—Nineteen objections to the Advent system, 15-17.—Mistakes of Adventists, 17.—Origin of Adventism, 18-20.—Fruit of Millerism, 20.—S. D. Adventists and time setting, 21.—The two horned beast, 20-29.—The mark of the beast, 29.—Absurdities of their position, 30.—The three messages, 33-35.—God's Seal, 35, 36.—The Sanctuary, 37-42.—Their position on the Nature of Man, 42.

CHAPTER II.

The Visions of Mrs White, page 43.—Her inspiration, 43, 44.—Her mistakes, 45-48.—Reform dress, 48.—Influenced by others, 49.—Philosophy of her visions, 49-51.—What harm does she do? 52.—She becomes rich, 53.—Other false prophets, 53-55.

CHAPTER III.

Why Christians keep Sunday, page 56.—Historical proof, 56, 57.—Testimony of lexicons, 58.—Jesus is Lord, 59.—Facts about Sunday, 60.—John 20:26—Pentecost, 62—Acts 20:7, 62—Why I gave up the 7th day, 64.

CHAPTER IV.

Did the pope change the Sabbath? page 66.—What S. D. Adventists claim, 66, 67.—Justin Martyr, 68-70.—Barnabas, 70.—Dionysius, Bardesanes, and Clement, 71.—Tertullian, Origin, and Apostolical Constitutions, 72.—Anatolius, Peter and Cyclopedias, 73-75.—Pagan Romans never kept Sunday, 76 Constantine and his Sunday law, 77.—Where the Adventists locate the change of the Sabbath, 78-81.

CHAPTER V.

Why not found out before, page 82.—The Sabbath controversy not a new thing, 83, 84.—Keeping the 7th day not a success, 85-87.

CHAPTER VI.

The Sabbath on a round world, page 88.

CHAPTER VII.

The Sabbath in the New Testament, page 94.—Jesus kept the seventh day, 96.—Sabbath in Acts, 97-101.—Mark 2:27, 28, 101.—Matt. 24:20, 101.—Matt. 28:1, 102.—Luke 23:56, 102.—Paul at Corinth, 102.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Law, page 103.—“The law” embraces all the law of Moses, 100.—The Two Laws, 104.—Decalogue never called “law of God,” 105.—The

law was given by Moses, 106.—Not given till Moses, 107.—Only to the Jews, 107.—Not given to Gentiles, 108.—God's great law always existed, 109.—Moses' law founded on this, 110.—The law of Sinai given to restrain criminals, 110.—Letter of the law not binding, 112.—The law changed, 113.—The decalogue is the old covenant, 113.—The whole system ended at the cross, 113.—Sabbatarians do not keep the Sabbath, 114.

CHAPTER IX.

If the decalogue is abolished, is there any law against sin? page 116.—What are the commandments of God? 118.—“The Jewish Sabbath,” 119.—The Jewish Sabbath abolished, 120-130.

CHAPTER X.

The Decalogue Examined, page 131.—Applied only to the Jews, page 131.—Catholic division of the decalogue, 135.—Luther and others on the abolition of the decalogue, 136.—Not under the law, 137.

CHAPTER XI.

The Sabbath in the Old Testament and special texts examined, page 140.—The Sabbath in Genesis, 140.—Testimony of eminent men, 140.—The Sabbath at the Exodus, 141; in the historical books, 141; in the prophets, 141; special texts considered, 142; Gen. 26:5; 1 Chron. 16:15-17; Ps. 19:7; 89:34; 119; Prov. 28:14; Eccl. 12:13; Isa. 42:21; 66:22, 23; Dan. 7:25; Matt. 5:17-19; 19:16-21; Rom. 3:31; 7:12; Romans and Galatians compared, 147; James 2:8-12; 1 John 3:4.

CHAPTER XII.

An experience of twenty-eight years in Adventism, page 152.

CHAPTER I.

TESTIMONIES TO MY CHARACTER AND STANDING.

As Seventh-Day Adventists now make a desperate effort to break down my character and so destroy the influence of what I write, I will give a few testimonies on that point.

OTSEGO, MICH., Feb. 21, 1888.

WE, the undersigned, are acquainted with Rev. D. M. Canright, who has resided in this village for the past seven years. As a citizen, he is held in respect by the community and in moral character and Christian integrity, he stands above reproach.

Hon. W. C. Edsell, Banker and Ex-senator.
Rev. J. Chaplin, Pastor of Congregational Church.
J. D. Woodbeck, Editor of *Otsego Union*.
H. L. Miller, M. D.
C. A. Bowles, Post-master.
Hon. J. M. Ballou, Member of State Board of Education.
Geo. Smith, Ex-township Clerk.
P. W. Travis, Merchant.
Milton Chase, M. D. and J. P.
L. E. Clark, M. D.
H. C. Stoughton, Attorney at Law.
P. G. Hoag, Merchant Miller.
Sherwood Bros., Meat Market.
G. A. Osinga, Supt. of Schools.

OTSEGO, MICH., May 6, 1888.

This is to certify that Rev. D. M. Canright has been a faithful and efficient pastor for us the past year, and that God through him, has accomplished a glorious work for our church. He won the love and confidence of his people. We were glad to secure his services for another year.

Done by order of the church. MRS. IDA M. WHEELER, Clerk.

SAGINAW, MICH., March 2, 1888.

I take pleasure in saying that I have known Rev. D. M. Canright, late of the S. D. Advent denomination, for twenty three years, and that I regard him as a man of most excellent gifts as a preacher, studious, earnest and efficient; that he has an unblemished character and is eminently worthy of the confidence and sympathy of ministers and people of all denominations. THEO. NELSON, Pastor First Baptist Church.

The *Otsego* (Mich.) *Union* says:

Mr. Canright has long been known in the church, as one of the very ablest ministers in the Advent society. We publish a letter from the reverend gentleman this week. Mr. and Mrs. Canright are held in the highest esteem by our whole people.

The *World's Crisis*, Boston, Mass., March 23, 1887, says:

This letter will be a pleasant surprise to those *Crisis* readers who have known Elder Canright to be an able, zealous and remarkably

successful advocate of Seventh-Day Adventism. Probably he has made more converts to that system in New England than any other person ever did, or ever can.

The *Christian Oracle*, Des Moines, Iowa, May 5, 1887, says:

It is idle for Adventists to say that he is not the peer of any man they have ever had in their ranks. I have for a number of years been referred to Mr. Canright as the man that could defend their doctrine against anything that I might bring against it. At the very mention of debate last summer in this city, he was the choice of all men who were heard to say anything on that side of the subject.

The *Christian Herald*, Detroit, Mich., April 28, 1887, says:

Rev. D. M. Canright was for many years one of the leading ministers among the Seventh-Day Adventists, and until his change of denominational relationship, he was professor of Biblical exegesis in their college at Battle Creek. He is the author of more than a score of books and pamphlets published in the interest of that denomination.

"The Adventists count Eld. Canright among their big guns, he having labored with marked success as an evangelist in different parts of our country."—*Wisconsin State Journal*, May 20, 1878.

"Eld. Canright has labored as an evangelist in nearly every State in the Union, and is a very popular lecturer."—*Cincinnati Commercial*, Aug. 29, 1878.

And here is what my Advent brethren thought of me when I left them:—

"Battle Creek, Mich., July 13, 1881. *Brother Canright*: . . . I feel more interest in you than in any other man, because I know your worth when the Lord is with you, as a laborer. . . . I wish you could go to Madison, Wis. We will go if, you will, and will hold ourselves subject to your orders."—JAMES WHITE.

Battle Creek, Mich., May 22, 1881. . . . It is time there was a change of the officers of the General Conference. I trust that if we are true and faithful the Lord will be pleased that we should constitute two of that board."—JAMES WHITE.

"Battle Creek, Mich., Aug. 6, 1884. . . . You have long been with us, and we all love you."—G. I. BUTLER.

"Martinsburg, Neb., July 14, 1884. . . . You were a power in the world, and did a vast amount of good . . . We need your help in the work greatly. Your precious talent, if humble and fully consecrated to God, would be so *useful*. There are so many places where it would be a great help."—G. I. BUTLER.

"We have felt exceedingly sad to part in our religious connection with one whom we have long esteemed as a dear brother."—*Advent Review*, March, 1887.

"In leaving us, he has taken a much more manly and commendable course than most of those who have withdrawn from us, coming voluntarily to our leading brethren and frankly stating the condition of mind he was in. He did this before his own church in our presence, and, so far as we know, has taken no unfair, underhanded means to injure us in any way. He goes from our midst with no immoral stain upon his character, and chooses associations more pleasant to himself. This is every man's personal privilege if he chooses to take it."—*Advent Review*, March 22, 1887.

"It would be foolish for us to refuse to acknowledge his intellectual ability, his self-made scholarship, his tact, or his energy. . . . While he was with us, I never knew him to misrepresent an opponent, for it was not necessary, and he left us with a fair reputation for integrity.—ELD. T. S. PARMELEE in *Colon Lake* (Mich.) *Breeze*, Sept. 2, 1887.

That is what I was for twenty-eight years while with the Adventists. By uniting with the Baptists, did I suddenly lose all my ability, integrity, and Christianity? Who will believe it? I leave the candid to judge.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY LABORS AMONG SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

I was with them twenty-eight years, from 1859 to 1887, and preached for them twenty-two years. I labored among them in nearly all the States and Territories where they had believers, from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Texas. About 1,000 persons have embraced the Sabbath under my labors, and ten ministers are now preaching for them whom I brought into the faith. I have organized many churches and several State Conferences, assisted in ordaining many of their ministers, have baptized hundreds, and was acknowledged to be among their most successful workers in new and hard fields. This they all know. I was chosen by them to meet their ablest opponents in discussion, having held fourteen set debates. I was once one of the Board of Directors of the Sanitarium, one of the trustees of the Battle Creek College, one of its faculty as teacher on Biblical Exegesis, was president of a Conference, member of the General Conference Committee, vice-president of the International Sunday School Association, member of a State Conference Committee, associate editor of the *Gospel Stickle*, was generally on their most important committees in conference work, wrote extensively for all their papers, wrote twenty-two of their tracts, pamphlets and books, which have been sold by tens of thousands and some of which have been translated into different languages. I was the author of their present system of quarterly meetings, of tithing, and of Sabbath School collections. I say, then, without fear of contradiction, that I understand that people and their doctrines and their proofs for them, their aims, character and influence, perfectly.

What, then, do they say against my conduct while I was with them? Do they accuse me of any immoral or unchristian conduct? No; but they say I was vacillating for the last dozen years on account of my doubts. Exactly, and it was my doubts about their doctrine which made me so. But am I the only one who was troubled that way? No; many of their ministers have gone through the same trials that I have, and scores have left them as I did, while others have fixed it up and remained with them. Elder White himself had doubts. Mrs. White says of him: "He should make it a rule not to talk unbelief or discouragement." "My husband has cherished this darkiness so long by living over the unhappy past, that he has but little power to control his mind when dwelling upon these things."—*Testimonies*, vol. 3, pp. 96, 97. Mrs. White herself was occasionally troubled with infidelity. She says: "In the night I have awakened my husband, saying, 'I am afraid that I shall become an infidel.'"—*Testimonies*, vol. 1, p. 597. Nearly all their prominent ministers had their times of trial, the same as I did, when they ceased preaching and went at other work.

Take, for instance, the case of Eld. Uriah Smith, editor of the *Review* and the author of their ablest works. He has had several periods of "darkness," the same as myself. Hear his own confession: "That I have had, in my experience, *occasional periods of trial*, I do not deny. There have been times when circumstances seemed very perplexing; when the way to harmonize apparently conflicting views did not at once

appear. And under what have seemed, for the time, *strong provocations to withdraw from the work*, I have canvassed the question how far this could reasonably be done, or how much of this work could consistently be surrendered. I have pondered the questions whether this point was not inconsistent, or that absurd, or the other out of harmony with reason and revelation; and whether this feature ought not to be re-adjusted, or the other set aside entirely."—*Review Extra*, Nov. 22, 1887.

This shows that the errors and absurdities of that system have troubled Eld. Smith the same as they did me. But he has fixed it up, "confessed" and gone on again just as I did and many others. But at last I broke away and so may he. Nearly all their leading ministers have gone through a similar process. They would "get into the dark," as they call it, quit the work, flounder around awhile, confess and return to their old bondage again; while others would finally break away and leave them as I have. More ministers with leading talent have left them than they have with them to-day.

They now report that I left them four or five times before and then went back. This is utterly false. From the time I joined them in 1859 till I withdrew in March, 1887, I remained in good standing in that church. After I was licensed to preach in 1864, my credentials were renewed each year except one when I was farming and did not ask for them. Till I left them last year, I never preached nor wrote against them once, nor did I unite with any other church, nor teach any doctrine contrary to theirs. Let them deny any of these statements if they can. They say I may yet return to them. They know better. I would sooner burn at the stake. The moment I took my stand decidedly, that matter was settled forever.

POSITIONS WHICH I HELD WHEN I LEFT THEM.

Notwithstanding it was well known to all that during the last twelve years of my connection with them, I frequently had serious doubts about their faith, so much so that three times I quit preaching for awhile, yet as soon as I took hold with them again, each time they immediately put me forward and set me at the most important work. Eld. Butler says: "He doubtless would have been (elected to important office) had he not proved himself unreliable in so many instances. His ability would have justified it."—*Review and Herald Extra*, Nov. 22, 1887. Suppose now that I had been an office seeking man, caring more for place and position than for truth and conscience, what would I have done? I would have gone right along pretending to be full in faith and in harmony with them. But instead of this, time and again, I went directly to their influential men, Elders White, Butler, Haskell, etc., and told them my doubts. Let candid men judge of my motives.

The day I left them I held the following position: Was teacher of theology in their college at Battle Creek where I had a class of nearly two hundred of their best young people; was associate editor of the *Gospel Sickle*, was writing the lessons for all their Sabbath Schools throughout the world; had the charge of some eighteen churches in Michigan, was member of the executive committee of the International Sabbath School association, member of the executive committee of the Michigan State Sabbath School association, and at the last session of the general conference was chairman of the International Sabbath School association, and was on nine different committees, several of them the most important in the conference as the one on distribution of laborers over all the world, the theological committee, the one on camp meetings, on a special course of study in our college, on the improvement of the ministry, etc. This shows what they thought of my ability. I had just gotten out a new pamphlet, "Critical Notes" of which they printed an

edition of 10,000 after I left them. Eld. Smith in the "*Extra*," page 4, says I left them when my withdrawal embarrassed them more than it would have done at any other time. This confesses that I was becoming more and more useful to them, and all know that I was.

At the time I left I was getting higher pay than ever before and was on friendly terms with all. All the leading men as Butler, Haskell, Smith, etc., were my warm personal friends, ready to do all in their power to assist me. Had I desired office or better position, all I had to do was to go right along without wavering, and positions would come to me faster than I could fill them. But if I left them, where could I go? What could I do? How even make a living? I took this all in and it required all the courage and faith in God I could master to take the risk.

It cost me a terrible struggle and a great sacrifice, for in doing it I had to leave all my life-long friends, the cherished hopes of my youth, the whole work of my life, all the means of my support, every honorable position I held, and bring upon myself reproach, hatred and persecution. I had to begin life anew among strangers, with untried methods, uncertain where to go or what to do. No one who has not tried it can ever begin to realize the fearful struggle it requires. It is the dread of all this which holds many with them who are yet dissatisfied where they are. I know that this is so, for many have confessed it to me and yet remained where they were.

Anyone of candor and fairness can see readily that self-interest and personal ambition would have held me with them. Yet, as soon as I did leave them, though I went out quietly and peaceably and let them entirely alone, and even spoke favorably of them, they immediately attributed to me all sorts of evil motives, base sins, and ambitious designs. They seemed to feel it a sacred duty to blast my reputation and destroy my influence if possible. "Apostate" was the epithet all applied to me. I was compared to Baalam, to Kora, Dathan and Abiram, to Judas, Demas, and a whole list of evil characters. Not one honest or worthy motive was granted me. The meanest and wickedest reports were circulated as to what I had done or said—things that I would despise even to think of. Yet all were eagerly accepted and believed as undoubted truth. But I expected it, for it is the way all are treated who dare to leave them.

HOW I SOUGHT POSITION AND POPULARITY AFTER LEAVING THEM.

They said I must have left them for popularity, position and pay. Did they know my heart? Had they any evidence of this? No, they made it up and said it because they could say nothing else. It was utterly false; for the truth is, I really feared I should be ruined financially by the change. But as soon as I had left them, I received warm invitations from ten different denominations to unite with them, promising me good positions. But in Otsego, where I had lived for six years and was well known, there was a small Baptist church, in debt and unable to hire a pastor. They invited me to preach for them, but said they could offer me next to nothing as a salary. Here was a church needing help, just such as I felt I could give. I rejected all the other offers and accepted this, and have been their pastor ever since. I leave honest men to judge of my motives. God has greatly blessed my labors here; many have been converted, all debts are paid off, and now they are able to pay a fair salary. I have engaged to remain another year at least.

IT IS A YOKE OF BONDAGE.

Largely people are drawn into the seventh-day doctrine through *fear*, fear of being damned if they refuse. Once in they try to feel

happy, but very few of them really are. With a large class, the more intelligent ones, there are so many doubts and fears, such a sensible want of something which they do not find, that they are unhappy. I know that this is so, for many have confessed it to me and yet remained where they were. I will quote a few words from letters received: "I have had many blue times in my experience because of these doubts. . . . Once I decided that I must follow the convictions of my own judgment in these things; but when the time came the pressure was so strong that I tried to convince myself that I was wrong. . . . The facts are, I am just miserable. . . . It seems like a terrible thing to take a course that will cause all the cherished friends of this world to look upon you as one fallen from grace; and here I am bound with these chains." Another writes: "It seems to me that the views held by Seventh-Day Adventists are so burdensome that they will crush me. They are a yoke of bondage which I cannot stand up under. Still I do want to be right." Another minister, D. H. Lamson, writes: "How am I straightened, while the fetters are being forged for most unwilling limbs! . . . What distress we *are* in as a people! how miserable! and is there no relief?" And still another talented minister, W. C. Gage, writes me: "Our ministers, and people as well, are growing to be a denomination of hypocrites, by a slavish fear of expressing an honest belief. . . . I am sick and disheartened. . . . The basis of confidence is gone, and I shall only await the come-out of the matter." Still another, Uriah Smith, writes: "There is a fear on the part of the powers that be, of free thought and free discussion. So far as this is the case it is a shame and disgrace to us." And yet these brethren patch up the matter some way, and go right on as though nothing were wrong. I know how to pity them, for I myself have passed through precisely the same experience. And another writes: "I wish I had never heard the Advent doctrine preached. Previous to that I know that I did enjoy the blessing of God. I was not troubled about doctrine. . . . I think I then had some influence for good over others, but I fear my change of faith had a bad influence over my children."

These are fair samples of how scores among them feel, from men in leading positions to the humblest in the church. Largely they keep it to themselves, but occasionally it will out. Many of them almost get out, and then fall back to linger along in bondage all the rest of their lives. But if these persons are in such bondage, why don't they get out and be free? Who would harm them? Be it remembered that there is a bondage worse than African slavery—the bondage of fear and superstition. I was held there for twelve years and know its power. Now that I am free, I am astonished at myself that I was held there so long after my better judgment was convinced that it must be an error.

THEIR CHURCH IN A SAD CONDITION.

That a great share of their numbers are in a sadly back-slidden condition is confessed by their leaders. Eld. G. I. Butler in the *Advent Review*, May 10, 1887, says: "A terrible stupor like that which enveloped the disciples in the Saviour's agony in the garden seems to hang over the mass of our people." Mrs. White in *Testimonies*, vol. 1, says: "The Spirit of the Lord has been dying away from the church," page 113, "The church have nearly lost their spirituality and faith," page 119; "I saw the dreadful fact that God's people were conformed to the world with no distinction, except in name," page 133; "Covetousness, selfishness, love of money, and love of the world are all through the ranks of Sabbath-keepers," page 140; "Vital godliness is lacking," page 153; "There is but little love for one another. A selfish spirit is manifest. Discouragement has come upon the church," page 166; "Spirituality and devotion are rare," page 469. Many of them are not even honest. She

says: "As I saw the spirit of defrauding, of over-reaching, of meanness, even among some professed Sabbath-keepers, I cried out in anguish," page 480; "There is but little praying. In fact, prayer is almost obsolete," page 566; "Not one in twenty of those who have a good standing with Seventh-Day Adventists is living out the self-sacrificing principles of the word of God," page 632. Of the Battle Creek church she says: "I can select family after family of children in this house, every one of whom is as corrupt as hell itself." "Right here in this church corruption is teeming on every hand," vol. 2, pages 360, 361; "Sin and vice exist in Sabbath-keeping families," page 391; "We have a dwarfed and defective ministry," vol. 4, page 441.

I could quote whole pages of such confessions as these from Mrs. White and their leading men. They are compelled to say it. It is common in their camp-meetings to see half their members forward as backsliders. Their preaching is largely scolding their members for their coldness. In fact, the thing is a practical failure in whatever way you look at it. Are they any better, any more spiritual, than the regular churches which they denounce so? No, as the above shows. After being well acquainted with both, I say confidently that there is more life, devotion and spirituality among the evangelical churches than among Adventists.

MY OBJECTIONS TO THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST SYSTEM.

1. It is a system of popery—one-man power. From the first Eld. White took this position and molded the whole system to fit it. He would and did rule and dictate in everything in all the field. He would make it hot for one who dared to start anything which he had not bossed. He was head and president of everything. So now, two or three run everything. Their word is law. By a stroke of the pen they move and change things all around the world. It is contrary to the gospel and will result in great harm.

2. From the start Elder and Mrs. White would take up publicly the faults, real or imaginary, of any one and every one, ministers, editors and all, and expose them before the whole congregation. If any objected, they were "rebels." All this was then printed in her "Testimonies" as inspired and circulated for all to read. This has taken the manhood out of them and made them to be despised by themselves and the church. It has begotten in all a habit of criticising and fault-finding which is terrible. Anyone might have foreseen that it would result in this. Mrs. White herself says: "There has been a picking at straws. And when there were no real difficulties in the church, trials have been manufactured."—*Testimonies*, vol. 1, p. 144. "Love for one another has disappeared, and a fault-finding, accusing spirit has prevailed. It has been considered a virtue to hunt up everything about one another that looked wrong, and make it appear full as bad as it really was," page 164. Mrs. White herself has set the example and she is largely followed, till they are a denomination of fault-finders.

3. It is a fundamental doctrine with them that all the other churches are apostate and corrupt. Hence they are eagerly on the watch for every evil thing they can pick up against them. This is poor business, and it begets in themselves a hard, unlovely spirit.

4. They are constantly on the watch for all the evidence they can gather showing that the world is rapidly growing worse. This again has a bad effect upon themselves, tending to make them sour and gloomy.

5. Their ministers are mere lecturers, going from place to place, staying only a few weeks at a time, and repeating the same old sermons over and over. As a consequence they become narrow and small and dry. Their preaching is almost wholly doctrinal and argumentative. This makes them hard and combative, instead of tender and charitable.

6. Their churches are very small, generally numbering from 15 to 40. They have no pastors, and seldom any preaching. Their meetings are held on Saturday, when others are at work, hence not a soul attends except themselves. So their meetings are small, and dull and tiresome, specially to youth and children. Never mingling with other churches, they soon fall into a rut and become very dry. The great mass of them are uncultured, and their local leaders are farmers or mechanics. The decorum seen in other churches is generally wanting in theirs. Their children are noisy, and often the members are too. This is not good.

7. Their theory compels them to be narrow and uncharitable. They cannot work at all with other Christians in anything. This is another bad feature of that system.

8. In a community they have no influence whatever over the irreligious. Not one of them attends their meetings; not a child outside of their own families attends their Sabbath schools. Other churches, by their public meetings, sermons and schools on Sundays, have a mighty influence for good over the unconverted.

9. Their work is largely proselyting. Truly, "they compass sea and land to make one proselyte." They will work just as hard to get a good old Christian out of another church as they will to convert a sinner. They tear down more than they build up.

10. Their "missions," of which they boast so much, are not to convert the heathen of foreign lands, nor the drunkards, wretched and degraded of our cities, but to proselyte or work among people already in fair circumstances. Thus of their "mission" in London, Eld. Haskell says: "Thirteen have taken their stand on the Sabbath. . . . These have come principally from the Church of England."—*Review*, April 10, 1888. Yes, their converts are always "principally" from other churches. I became sick of such work.

11. By their arguments they confuse the minds of many so that they know not what to believe. They set them against other churches, and so they drift away from all and are entirely lost. Adventists have done a large amount of this work, and their influence in that line is fearful.

12. Many of their children come up to keep neither Saturday nor Sunday, nor to attend any church. Hence they grow up irreligious.

13. Sunday-breakers who hunt, fish, sport or work that day, are encouraged in it by the arguments and examples of the Adventists. This certainly is bad. A community where Sabbatarians live has no quiet rest day at all.

14. The power of God does not attend the Advent work as it ought if it is His special work. During my long experience with them, I was impressed with the fact that, as a rule, the work was exceedingly dry and powerless. This disheartened me greatly. I saw that it was so with all their ministers, from large to small.

15. After from two to four persons have labored in a tent or hall six weeks the result will be about this: Once out of three times they will fail entirely after much expense and much hard work. Once out of three times they will raise up a company of from eight to fifteen who will meet awhile in a private house or little hall, till in a year or so they die out entirely. The third time they will get from twenty to forty, or more. These may do tolerably well for a few years; but in more than half the cases they grow smaller instead of larger and finally fall into a cold, lifeless condition. This is the case with nine out of ten of all their churches. Scores of their largest churches which were once strong and flourishing are now either extinct or nearly so. In old fields where they have been the longest and are the best known, there they have the least success. I have been to all their fields and know. It is in new fields where they are the least known that they have success. This looks

badly for them. The thing does not wear. I could name state after state where this is true. Right in Battle Creek, the headquarters, with all the influence of their great institutions, I think they have not made thirty converts outside of their own ranks, in thirty years.

The apostles, the reformers, and others whom God has sent, have built up large societies and wielded a great influence for good in society. But the Adventists never do this. They have no influence for good on society. This feature of the work often troubled me.

16. I came to see that the great burden of Adventists was about merely speculative theories concerning which they can not *know* positively that they are correct after all. Such are their theories about the sleep of the dead, destruction of the wicked, the sanctuary in heaven, the time when Jesus will come, their interpretation of the image beast of Rev. 10:11-18, the mark of the beast, etc. Do they *know* that they are right about these? No, they think they are, and others equally honest, pious and intelligent, think differently. I came to feel that it was foolish for me to spend my life over what after all I did not know was really so. But we do know that it is right to evangelize the heathen and the vicious of our cities, to save the drunken and fallen, to preach Christ and convert sinners, and to work for every thing that will improve the condition of men and society *now*. But with Adventists these things are secondary or neglected entirely, while they constantly put their pet theories first and dwell upon them most of the time.

The moment a person becomes a thoroughly converted Seventh-Day Adventist, he is spoiled for any further usefulness in society. This is their record everywhere, as all will testify who know them. To convert men to their doctrine is the all-absorbing passion of their lives, leaving them neither interest, time nor means for anything else.

17. All in their system that has been a blessing to them is held also by all evangelical churches, such as faith in God, in Jesus and the Bible, a pure heart, a holy life, self denial, etc. Nothing good has come to them or to the world by those doctrines which are peculiar to Adventists, as the *time* of the advent, the condition of the dead, the Sabbath, the visions, etc.

18. Having been disappointed so many times and so long, taking so gloomy a view of things generally, they are as a class a very discouraged and unhappy set of people.

19. They always wash feet when they have the Lord's supper. As this is an inconvenient and unpleasant job, it leads to a neglect of the communion by many and destroys the enjoyment of it for all.

MISTAKES OF ADVENTISTS.

A people who have made as many mistakes as Adventists have, ought to be very modest in their claims and ought to see that they have been led by men and not by the Lord.

1. They set the time for the end of the world in 1843 and failed.
2. They set it again in 1844 and failed.
3. Eld. White, the leader of the Seventh-Day Adventists, set 1845 for the end and failed again.
4. They held in 1844 that the earth was the sanctuary, another mistake as they admit now.
5. They all held for some time after 1844 that probation for sinners was ended—a fearful mistake. See Chapter 3 of this book.
6. For ten years Seventh-Day Adventists began the Sabbath at 6 p. m., instead of at sunset as now. Thus they broke the Sabbath every week!
7. They kept their children out of school for years because time was so short they would need no education! Those children now have grand-children!

8. They gave away their goods in 1844 because they would not need them after that!

9. They would not vote, for that was like the fallen churches. Now they vote freely.

10. They held that it was wrong to take a church name for that was Babylon. Now they have a name.

11. Church organization was wrong, for that was like Babylon. Now they organize.

12. For years they said it was denying their faith to set out trees for they would never grow to bear fruit.

13. Led by a revelation from Mrs. White, the sisters put on the short dress with pants. None of them wear it now.

14. For 30 years they would not take up any collection on the Sabbath. Now they do it every week.

15. For 50 years they have been expecting the end of the world to come inside of five years and it has not come yet.

They say that the Israelites were just as badly disappointed when they failed to reach Canaan immediately, but had to wander in the wilderness forty years. But Moses plainly told them right in the beginning that they must wander there forty years. Num. 14:33. They say Jonah was disappointed because Nineveh did not fall as he preached. But the whole city repented, and God forgave them. Jonah 3:10. The world did not repent at Miller's preaching, but ridiculed it. They say the disciples were also disappointed at the death of Christ. Yes, but Christ had told them plainly, over and over that he must die. Then he rebuked them for their blindness in not believing him. Luke 24:25, 26. So none of these cases are at all like the Advent failure of 1844.

These are only samples out of numerous mistakes the Adventists have made; and this they have done with an inspired prophetess right at their head for 44 years! These simple, undeniable facts alone should be enough to open the eyes of all to see that the Lord has not led them in their fanatical work.

ORIGIN OF ADVENTISM.

The Adventists of whatever party, all originated in the well known movement of Wm. Miller, who set the time for the end of the world in 1843-4. This was the origin of the Seventh-Day Adventists, who claim now that Mr. Miller's move was right and in the providence of God. They claim to be simply carrying on the same work which he begun. In all their books and sermons they point to 1844 as their origin and endorse the work of the Millerites in 1843 and 1844. The following from Mrs. White will settle the point:

"I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as he wanted them; that his hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures."—*Early Writings*, page 64. God helped them make the mistake! "I saw that God was in the proclamation of the time in 1843."—page 36. So God wanted them to set that time! "I saw that they were correct in their reckoning of the prophetic periods; prophetic time closed in 1844."—page 107. "They [these predictions of the Millerites] were given at the right time, and accomplished the work which God designed to accomplish by them."—page 108. Eld. White says: "We hold that the great movement upon the second advent question, which commenced with the writings and public lectures of William Miller, has been, in its leading features, in fulfillment of prophecy. Consistently with this view, we also hold that in the providence of God Mr. Miller was raised up to do a specific work."—*Life of Miller*, page 6.

So it will be seen that Seventh-Day Adventists still believe in, and defend, the Millerite movements of 1843 and 1844. Indeed, they claim

that all other churches who did not accept and endorse Miller's work were rejected of God on this account. Thus Mrs. White: "As the churches refused to receive the first angel's message [Miller's work], they rejected the light from heaven and fell from the favor of God."—*Early Writings*, page 101.

Here, then, we have the origin of Seventh-Day Adventism, the fountain from which it flowed. As a stream will be like its fountain, let us examine it. Elder and Mrs. White, Elders Bates, Andrews, Rhodes, Holt, Edson, and all the founders of the Seventh-Day Adventist church were in the movement of Miller and helped in setting and preaching the time in 1843, 1844, and carried the Advent work right on afterwards.

The work of Mr. Miller is so well known that I need but refer to the facts about it. He claimed that he had discovered by the prophecies the exact time, the very year, and, finally, the very day when Christ would appear and the end of the world would come. He succeeded in converting about one hundred thousand people to his views. The first date fixed was 1843. It failed. Then he fixed a day in October, 1844, and that failed. Many other times have since been fixed by Mr. Miller's followers, and all have failed. Over 40 years have come and gone, and the end has not come yet.

What was the one great burden of Miller, the one point on which he differed from the evangelical churches? All these churches believed in the personal second advent of Christ just as strongly as Miller did. They loved Jesus and preached the second advent, even teaching that it was near at hand. But the Millerites said they knew the *time* when it was to be, and that time was 1843-4. They staked all upon this. The issue was plain and definite. All who did not endorse their *set time* were "opposers," "enemies," "in the dark," "evil servants," rejected of God and lost, just because they would not believe in setting a time for the end.

But their set times came and passed without the least regard to their figures and facts, proofs and demonstrations, prayers and predictions. Remorseless old Time, the true tester of every theory, marched right on and demolished them all. This demonstrated the folly and error of the Adventists. Miller's prediction was a falsehood. He preached and propagated a falsehood. All his work wherein he differed from evangelical churches was a falsehood. He preached that the world would end in 1843, and it didn't. He set 1844 for it to come, and it didn't. If ever a religious movement on earth was demonstrated to be a humbug and a failure it was Millerism. But if Millerism was a failure then Seventh-Day Adventism is also, for that was the fountain from which this has flowed; that was the foundation on which this is built. Deut. 18:22: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken." This, surely, is a simple and fair test. By this rule the Lord was not in Miller's move.

But were not the Adventists in 1843-4 very confident that they were right? Confident is no name for it. They were *sure* that they were right, they *knew* they were right, for they proved it all by the Bible, every word of it, positively. The Bible just said so; to deny it was to deny the Bible. But it failed all the same. It is just so with Seventh-Day Adventists now. They are the most positive people in the world, though they have made scores of terrible blunders.

That no one will know the *time* of the second advent is as plainly taught as words can teach. Read the following: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only;" "Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come;" "Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not

the Son of man cometh;" "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh."—Matt. 24: 36, 42, 44; 25: 13. "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is."—Mark 13: 33. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power."—Acts 1: 7. Jesus said, "Ye know not when the time is;" Miller said, "We know when the time is." Jesus said, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons;" Miller said, "We know all about them." Jesus said, "No man knows the day;" Miller said, "We know the exact day." Which was right? The disappointments of the Adventists time and again during the past 50 years in setting the date for the end of the world have clearly demonstrated their folly. The whole Advent move was conceived in error, born in a mistake, has grown up in folly, and must die in disgrace. But were not the Millerites honest? There is no doubt of it, but that proves nothing as to their correctness.

THE FRUIT OF MILLERISM.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." Millerism, for about four years, in a few States, created a great excitement. Churches were divided and broken up, pastors left their flocks to "lecture" on "time," while argument and strife were the order of the day. As the set time drew near, in thousands of cases the Adventists not only left their work and their business, but gave away their property. Crops were left ungathered, goods were distributed freely, so that many who had been well to do were left penniless. After the time passed, these were destitute, and their families suffered. Many had to be arrested and put under guardians, to protect their families. Then the wildest fanaticism broke out here and there, which brought shameful disgrace upon the very name of religion. Many said the Lord had come, probation was ended, it was sin to work, all property must be held in common, all the churches were apostate, Babylon, etc. Some Adventists had spiritual wives, some went to the Shakers, many went back in the churches, some into despair and hundreds into doubt and infidelity—just what might have been expected. The glorious doctrine of the second advent was covered with shame, the devil rejoiced, while the cause of Christ was greatly injured. For proof of these facts, I refer to the testimony of thousands now living, and to the published works of the Adventists themselves. Thus Eld. U. Smith is compelled to say: "The Advent body were a unit [in 1844] and their testimony shook the world. Suddenly their power was broken, their strength scattered, their ranks divided, and their testimony paralyzed. They passed the point of their expectation, and realized not their hope. That a mistake had been made somewhere none could deny. From that point the history of the majority of that once happy, united people has been marked by discord, division, confusion, speculation, new mistakes, fresh disappointments, disintegration and apostasy."—*The Sanctuary*, pages 13 and 15.

Paul said, "God is not the author of confusion," I Cor. 14: 33. Then surely He was not the author of Adventism, for the confusion it produced is unparalleled in religious history. Ten souls were ruined by it where one was saved. Immediately after 1844 they split up into numerous parties, each contradicting and condemning all the rest. Instead of renouncing the whole thing, as sane men ought to have done, each one set himself to find some "explanation" of their mistake. Hardly any two agreed, while each one was sure he had the true explanation. Their utter confusion is well illustrated by the following anecdote told by Mr. Miller himself: The first person in his own parish who fully embraced his views was an old woman, a humble Christian. Mr. Miller sent her his papers when he had read them. One week he received sixteen different sheets, all purporting to be Advent publications, but the most of

them advocating contradictory sentiments. He sent them to the old woman. Soon she sent for him, and on his arrival she began:

"Have you read all these papers?"

"I have looked them over."

"But are they all Advent papers?"

"They profess to be."

"Well, then," said she, "I am no longer an Adventist. I shall take the old Bible and stick to that."

"But," said Mr. M., "we have no confidence in one-half there is advocated in these papers."

"We?" exclaimed the old lady, "who is *we*?"

"Why," replied Mr. M., "*we* are those who do not fellowship these things."

"Well, but I want to know who *we* is."

"Why, all of us who stand on the old ground."

"But that ain't telling who *we* is. I want to know who *we* is."

"Well," said Mr. Miller, in relating the story, "I was confounded, and was unable to give her any information who *we* were."—*History of Second Advent Message*, pp. 414, 415.

And so it has continued unto this day. What do Adventists believe? Go ask what language was spoken by the people after the Lord confused their tongues at Babel. Adventism is a second Babel. But Seventh-Day Adventists say, "We are united; we believe alike." Yes, but they are only one branch of this Advent Babel. Such a brood of errors and heresies as has resulted from Adventism cannot be found in the history of the church before. Time-setting, visions, miracles, fanatics, false prophets, sleep of the dead, annihilation of the wicked, non-resurrection of the wicked, future probation, restoration, feet-washing, community of goods, denial of the divinity of Christ, no devil, no baptism, no organization, etc., etc.—Gracious! And these are the people sent with a "message" to warn the church! They had better go back and learn and agree on what their "message" is, before they run to deliver it.

Look at this fact: Adventists have set the time for the end of the world in 1843, 1844, 1847, 1850, 1852, 1854, 1855, 1863, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1877, and so on till one is sick of counting. Learning nothing from the past, each time they are quite as confident as before.

This fanatical work has brought disgrace upon the doctrine of the second advent so that it is not dwelt upon as much as formerly in other churches. The study of the prophecies has been brought into disrepute by the unwise course of the Adventists. No thoughtful man can fail to see this.

S. D. ADVENTISTS AND TIME SETTING.

It is the one constant boast of the Seventh Day Adventists that *they* never set time; *they* don't believe in it. But they deceive themselves and deceive others when they say so. Eld. White, their leader, engaged in preaching three different set times for the Lord to come, viz: 1843, '44, '45. Here are his own statements on this: "I found myself happy in the faith that Christ would come about the year 1843." *Life Incidents*, p. 72. Then he tells how he preached it. Of 1844, he says: "I stated my conviction that Christ would come on the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month of that year [1844]." Pages 166, 167. "It is well known that many were expecting the Lord to come at the seventh month, 1845. That Christ would then come we firmly believed. A few days before the time passed, I was at Fairhaven and Dartmouth, Mass., with a message on this point of time." "A Word to the Little Flock," by Jas. White, p. 22. So their leader was a time setter. 2. Mrs. White, their prophetess, was in the time setting of 1843 and 1844. Of the first date she says: "With carefulness and trembling we approached the time

when our Saviour was expected to appear." Then she tells her disappointment. Testimonies, Vol. 1, page 48. Again: "Our hopes now centered on the coming of the Lord in 1844." Page 53. She was a time setter. 3. Elders Bates, Andrews, Rhodes and all the first crop of Seventh-Day Adventists were in the time setting of 1843-4. 4. They still endorse Miller's time setting of 1843-4 as right and approved of God. How much truth, then, is there in their assertions that they never set time?

Again they endorse Mr. Miller's work as of God. But Miller is responsible for all the time setting done by the Adventists since his times, because they are the legitimate outgrowth of his work. He began setting time. He did it the second time. He taught them how to do it. He fathered the idea. He inculcated it in all his followers. They then simply took up and carried on what he had begun. Seventh-Day Adventists claim to be the original Adventists and endorse Miller's work. In doing this they endorse time setting and should justly bear all the odium of that fanatical business.

THEIR DISAPPOINTMENTS EXPLAINED.

But don't Seventh-Day Adventists rise to explain why they were disappointed in 1843, and again in 1844 and for 40 years since? O, yes; but we naturally become a little suspicious of the man who is compelled to be constantly explaining his conduct. Straight work needs no explanation. They say the Lord caused them to be disappointed in 1843 on purpose to test their faith, that was all! In 1844 they made just one little mistake, that was all! They then taught that the earth was the sanctuary. Come to find out, the sanctuary is up in heaven and Jesus did really go into the most holy there to cleanse it that very year! So they were all right after all. Don't you see? Clear as day. Now they have the whole matter removed from the troublesome facts of earth where we can test them, to the beautiful theories of heaven, where no one can go to report on facts which might spoil their theories. Now they can speculate and argue in safety.

But sober, thinking men see through all this. It is merely a make shift to get out of a difficulty.

WILL THERE BE A SPECIAL MESSAGE OF WARNING BEFORE THE END OF THE WORLD?

Adventists claim that there must be a special message of warning about the end near, just before Jesus comes. The time has now come. The orthodox churches are asleep and won't give it; so they are raised up by God for this purpose. How do they prove this? This way: It is to be as it was in the days of Noah (Matt. 24:37-39). But the text simply says that they will be eating, drinking, etc., as they were in the time of Noah. It says nothing about a warning. Noah was a "preacher of righteousness" (II Pet. 2:5). There is not a particle of evidence that he ever preached a sermon about the flood. That is all assumed and imagined. So this is slim evidence. The case of Lot: it is to be as it was in his days (Luke 17:28-30). Here again not a word is said about a warning. They are to eat and drink up to the last day, as they did in Sodom. Did those cities have any warning? Not a word: see Gen. 19. Even Abraham did not know it till the day before (Gen. 18). Lot did not know it till midnight before the morning the city was destroyed, and then he only told his own children (Gen. 19:14). So the city had no warning at all. This proof fails. Jonah warned Nineveh. Yes; and they repented, and the city was not destroyed. This is not like the end of the world at all. So this fails. John the Baptist warned them before the first advent of Christ. But not till Jesus had already come, was

grown up to manhood and was ready for His work. So this is a failure, for the warning was after He came, not before. In fact, there is not a particle of proof that there will be any such message before the end. Rev. 4:6-16 is claimed as proof. See it examined on another page.

In fact, Christ plainly taught that there neither would nor could be any such warning. "Ye know not when the time is."—Mark 13:33; "Watch ye therefore, and pray always."—Luke 21:36; "Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping."—Mark 13:36. This was to be the position of His waiting church from the day He left them till He returns. "Occupy till I come" (Luke 19:13) was His command. What shall we do to be ready? Just attend faithfully to the every-day duties which lie right in our pathway, and be ready any moment to welcome the dear Lord. This is just what evangelical Christians have done, and God has blessed them in it. This is just what Adventists have not done, and shame and confusion have followed them.

THE TWO HORNED BEAST OF REV. 13:11-18.

Seventh-Day Adventists lay great stress upon their interpretation of this symbol. Their theory of the mark of the beast, and his image, the seal of God, the third angel's message, and all their special work about the Sabbath is built upon their assumption concerning that beast. If they are mistaken here, their whole system collapses. They claim that this beast is the United States and that soon we shall have here church and state united, the image and the beast, the papacy. The mark of the beast is Sunday keeping. A law will enforce this upon Seventh-Day Adventists. They won't obey. Then they will be outlawed, persecuted, and condemned to death! Of all the wild Advent speculations in the prophecies, this deserves to stand among the most fanatical.

1. Does the Bible *say* that this beast is the United States? Oh, no, they have to assume and then argue out all this.

2. Do they *know* that their arguments on this are infallibly correct? No.

3. Were they not quite as sure in 1843 and then again in 1844 that they were right? Yes, and yet they failed both times.

4. Have they not made many mistakes in interpreting the prophecies? Yes, lots of them.

5. Did not Eld. White, their leader, set three different times for the end of the world and fail in all?

6. May they not then *possibly* be mistaken also in this? Of course, as they must admit. So their system rests upon an uncertainty.

7. Do our hopes of heaven depend upon such uncertainties as these? Would it not be safer and better to follow the plain precepts of Christ, (Matt. 7:24, 25.) than to run after these uncertain speculations? Better than to follow the lead of Adventists who have been mistakes over and over again for forty years? "Take heed that no man deceive you." Jesus, Matt. 24:4.

I will offer a few out of many facts showing that their application of this symbol is not correct.

While Seventh-Day Adventists largely quote and follow the leading commentators and Protestant churches in their application of the other beasts, here they take a wild leap into the dark, unsupported by one single Biblical scholar.

Evidently this lamblike beast represents the Papacy, or the spiritual and ecclesiastical power of the Roman church, and is so applied by every commentator I have consulted. Thus: "This beast is the spiritual Latin empire, or, in other words, the Romish hierarchy."—Clarke, on Rev. 13:11. "It was, therefore, the emblem of the Romish hierarchy."—Scott, on Rev. 13:11. "The generality of interpreters confine this second beast to the papal power."—Eclectic Commentary on Rev. 13:11-18. "An ex-

act description of the rise of the spiritual power of the Papacy.—Notes on Rev. 13:11 by the American Tract Society. “The beast with ten crowned horns is the Roman Empire, as divided into ten kingdoms; the beast with two horns like a lamb is the Roman hierarchy, or body of the clergy, regular and secular.”—Joseph Benson.

“The two-horned beast or Romish church.”—Bishop Newton. Albert Barnes the same. Indeed, there is a perfect agreement among all commentators that this lamblike beast represents the Papacy. For the argument on this I only need refer the readers to the commentaries.

Against this unanimous agreement of all Protestant churches and authorities, you have the unsupported speculations of the Adventists, who have made so many mistakes before. The proofs that this lamblike beast is the papacy are many, clear, and easily seen; while the effort to apply it to the United States is labored, and the arguments strained, long, and far-fetched. Thus, in U. Smith's *Thought on Revelation*, he devotes only *eleven* pages to the dragon of Chapter 12:1-17, and only *eight* pages to the leopard beast of Chapter 13:1-10, but wades heavily through *over one hundred* pages on the eight verses relating to the two-horned beast! This alone is proof of the desperate task he had on hand to prove that it was the United States.

Beginning with Rev. 11:19 and ending with Rev. 14:5 is a line of prophecy reaching from the first to the second advent—the dragon, the leopard beast, and the lamb-like beast. The dragon, Chap. 12:1-17, is the pagan Roman empire. So all agree, Seventh-Day Adventists as well. The dragon had “seven heads and ten horns,”—verse 3. This is succeeded, Chap. 13:1-10, by the leopard beast with “seven heads and ten horns.” What is this? Evidently the same Roman empire, the same ten kingdoms of Europe, with merely a change in religion from pagan to Catholic. Thus Dr. Clarke: “The beast here described is the Latin empire, which supported the Romish or Latin church.”—on Rev. 13:1. So Scott and all I have seen. This was the civil or political power of the ten kingdoms after professing Christianity. That this ten-horned leopard beast is not the papacy nor the Catholic church is shown by Rev. 17:1-5, where the same beast is again introduced with a woman riding on and ruling over it. The beast is the civil power, while the woman is the church. Even Eld. Smith has to confess this. He says: “We here have the woman, the church, seated upon a scarlet-colored beast, the civil power, by which she is upheld and which she controls and guides to her own ends as a rider controls a horse,” (on Rev. 17:1-5). So, then, the leopard beast is the civil power. Just what it is in Rev. 17 is what it is in Rev. 13. Did the papacy have ten horns? Did it have seven heads? No; but political Rome did.

That the lamb-like beast of Rev. 13:11-18 is not the United States at all, but is the papacy or ecclesiastical spiritual power of the Romish church, is manifest.

1. Rev. 17:1-5, where the woman, the church, is distinct from the ten-horned leopard beast and rules over it, shows that the beast is not the papacy.

2. Just so, the lamb-like beast of Rev. 13 rules through the power of the leopard beast.

3. Whatever the woman is in Rev. 17, that is what the lamb-like beast is in Rev. 13. Hence both are the papal power of Rome.

Notice the similarity of the two: a woman in one place, a lamb in the other, both having the appearance of gentleness and innocence. The church is represented by a pure woman (II Cor. 11:2) and by lambs (John 21:15); false religious teachers are represented by bad women (Rev. 2:18-23) and by beasts clothed like sheep (Matt. 7:15). The woman and the beast work together, in Chap. 17; so the lamb-like beast and the leopard beast work together in Rev. 13:12, 14. The woman is drunk

with the blood of saints (Rev. 17:6): the lamb beast causes the saints to be killed (Rev. 13:5). The woman is burned with fire (Rev. 18:8): so is the lamb beast (Rev. 19:20). The woman sits upon the beast guiding and ruling it (Rev. 17:3): so the lamb beast "exerciseth all the power of the first beast" (Rev. 13:12). It does not simply exercise *similar* power, or *as much* power, as the beast, but it uses the power of the beast itself, the same as the woman did. He does not himself kill anyone, but *causes* them to be killed (Rev. 13:15). This is exactly what the papacy did. It ruled over the kings of earth (Rev. 17:18) and "caused" heretics to be put to death, by the secular power. "He exerciseth all the power of the first beast."

It has ever been the boast of the Roman church that *she* never puts heretics to death. She simply anathematizes them, turns them over to the civil powers, and by her influence with these, *causes* them to be killed by the secular powers. How exact is the language of the prophecy: he "causeth" it to be done; "he exerciseth [or useth] all the power of the first beast."

Seventh-Day Adventists argue that the leopard beast (Rev. 13:1-10) is the papacy, because it does the same work as the little horn of Dan. 7:8, 25, which is agreed by all to be the papacy. But they overlook the fact that the leopard beast does all its work simply as directed by the church, the woman in Rev. 17, and the lamb-like beast in Chap. 13.

Notice the inseparable connection between the leopard beast and the two-horned beast, the Roman civil government and the Papacy. 1. The lamblike beast controls all the power of the first beast.—Verse 12. 2. He does this in the presence and in the sight of the beast.—Verses 12, 14. This shows that both occupy the same territory. 3. He causes men to worship the beast.—Verse 12. 4. He causes men to make an image to the beast.—Verse 14. 5. He causes men to receive the mark of the beast.—Verses 16, 17. 6. The two beasts are working together when Christ comes.—Rev. 19, 20. 7. Together they go into the fire.—Verse 20. Evidently, then, these two beasts co-operate together in all their work. This is precisely what the Catholic church and the Catholic political powers of Europe have done for ages as all know. Has the United States ever thus co-operated with the Papacy? Emphatically, no. Is any man fanatical enough to believe that it ever will?

The Papacy has exactly fulfilled every specification of the lamblike beast.

1. It came up in the right place "in his presence."—Draglott, Bible Union, Living Oracles, etc.

2. It came up at the right time after the wounding of the head.—Rev. 13:3. The interpretation adopted by Clarke, Scott, and the best authors, "refers it to the extinction of the old Roman Empire under the imperial form in the latter part of the fifth century and its revival again under Charlemayne."—Notes of Am. Tract Society.

3. The Papacy came up in the right manner, peaceably and quietly.

4. It had the appearance of a lamb.

5. It has spoken like a dragon.

6. It has exercised all the power civil Rome.

7. It brought the earth in subjection to Rome.

7. By its great signs and wonders it has deceived millions for ages.

9. It has made an image to the beast.

10. It has caused millions to be killed.

11. It has imposed its worship and its mark upon all.

12. It has prohibited heretics from buying or selling. This is too well known to require proof.

The lamblike beast is not the United States; because,

1. This two-horned beast symbolizes a religious or ecclesiastical government. The false prophet of Rev. 19:20 performs the same work as this beast (see verse 14,) and therefore must be identical with it. This is admitted by Seventh-Day Adventists. Now, as a prophet is a religious teacher, a false prophet must be a false religious teacher; and as this applies to a government it must therefore apply to an ecclesiastical government. Such the United States is not, for its government is *purely* political; for one clause of its constitution is as follows: "Congress shall *make no law* respecting an establishment of *religion*, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

2. The manner of its rise. The lamblike beast comes up quietly and peaceably "out of the earth," (Rev. 13:11), while the other beasts come up out of the troubled sea.—Rev. 13:1. So the Papacy came up quietly at first with all the appearance of a lamb, but afterwards it spoke like a dragon. Witness its persecutions and tyranny. Not so with our nation. It was born in a terrible war of seven years. Then followed the war of 1812, the war with Mexico, the war of the Rebellion and war with Indians almost every year. Not very peaceable.

3. It was to exercise *all* the power of the first beast. Seventh-Day Adventists say that the first beast is the Papacy which put to death over fifty million people, ruled over other kings, and over the consciences of men. Even Adventists do not believe that the United States will do this.

4. Church and state must be united. This is against one of the fundamental principles of our government. The constitution expressly forbids it, consequently it must first be changed. And will the intelligent voters of these United States, with the history of past ages before them, deliberately change one of the main pillars of our government, and raise up the Inquisition, the block, the rack, etc., and thus put to death many persons, simply for their religious faith? It does not look reasonable. Besides, all the tendency of the age is against a union of church and state.

ARGUMENTS ANSWERED.

1. "The two-horned beast must be the United States, because it can apply nowhere else." *Answer*: It applies nicely to the papacy.

2. "There must be some symbol to represent this great nation." *Answer*: There is none for Russia, for Mexico, Brazil, Japan, China, and a dozen other nations where Christians are too.

3. "The United States came up at the right time, about 1798, when the head received its deadly wound (Rev. 13:3)." *Answer*: This very point overthrows the argument for the United States; for that wound was given at the very rise of the leopard beast, more than 1200 years before 1798. Look at verses 3-10: all the work of the beast comes *after* the wound and *not before*. This locates the rise of the lamb-like beast just when the papacy arose.

4. "The United States came up in the right place." That is exactly what it *didn't do*. The beast is located in Europe, and a whole ocean rolls between the two; whereas the two-horned beast was to come up "in his presence," in Europe, not in America.

5. "Our government has 'come up' from small beginnings to a wonderful nation." *Answer*: The papacy began much smaller, and has "come up" to be much larger.

6. "Our government is lamb-like." So was the papacy in its rise and all its professions. A lamb in appearance, a dragon at heart, fits Rome much better. Our government does not put on sheep's clothes to hide wicked designs. It acts openly and boldly. But the papacy professed outwardly to be a humble follower of the Lamb, while inwardly it was a dragon,

7. "No crowns on his horns. Hence it must be a republic—the United States." *Answer:* The ten-horned beast of Dan. 7 had no crowns, yet all were kingly governments. So the dragon (Rev. 12:3) had no crowns on his ten horns, yet all were kingly governments. So there were crowns upon his seven heads, yet several of these heads represented forms of government that had no crowns. So this argument fails.

6. "Spiritualism has wrought the miracles here." The miracles of spiritualism are a humbug, nor are they in any way recognized or used by our nation in making laws. But in the prophecy the miracles are wrought by official authority, and not by private individuals, wrought to secure and enforce laws for persecution (verse 14). Spiritualism does not do this. And surely our nation will never get down to working miracles by official authority! But papal Rome has abounded in lying miracles; by which she deceived her followers for ages.

Our nation is now over 100 years old, and, according to Adventists, five or ten years more will end its work. But out of eight verses of the prophecy only *one* is yet fulfilled:

1. The beast was to come up. Fulfilled.
2. He was to come out of the earth. Fulfilled.
3. Was to have two horns. Fulfilled.
4. Was to look like a lamb. Fulfilled.

But all these specifications are much better fulfilled by the Papacy than by the United States.

5. Was to speak as a dragon. Not fulfilled.
6. Was to exercise all the power of the first beast. Not fulfilled.
7. Must cause the earth to worship the first beast. Not fulfilled.
8. Must do great wonders. Not fulfilled.
9. Must bring fire from heaven. Not fulfilled.
10. Works miracles. Not fulfilled.
11. Is to make an image to the beast. Not fulfilled.
12. The image is to speak. Not fulfilled.
13. To cause all to be killed who do not worship the beast. Not fulfilled.
14. To cause all to receive the mark. Not fulfilled.
15. To prohibit all from buying or selling who do not have the mark. Not fulfilled.

Out of *fifteen* points only *four* have been fulfilled, and these relate simply to its rise. Of all the work it was to do, not a thing has been done yet. Adventists are always saying that the rest is just about to be done. But in the past forty years not one single point has been fulfilled, nor is there the least prospect that it ever will be. Unless God works a miracle, no such thing as they are looking for can be accomplished anyway.

The mark was to be enforced upon bondmen, verse 16; but slavery is abolished and that can not be fulfilled here, but it was fulfilled under papal Rome. Souls were beheaded for not worshipping the beast.—Rev. 20:4. This was all fulfilled under the Papacy, but Seventh-Day Adventists themselves say no one will be killed here.

We have now proved conclusively that the two-horned beast is not the United States. This being so, then Seventh-Day Adventists are wrong on the image of the beast, the mark of the beast, the Third Angel's Message, and the Sunday question, and hence their whole theory collapses.

THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST. WHAT IS IT?

In Rev., 13:14-17; 14:9-11; 15:2; 19:20; 20:4 great prominence is given to "the image of the beast." God's wrath is threatened against all who worship it. It must, then, be some very wicked thing. Seventh-Day

Adventists claim that the image will be formed by a union of church and state in our nation. That will be an image to Catholicism, the beast, they say. See "Thoughts on the Revelation," page 581. Their great mission is to warn men of this coming image. Sunday keeping, the pope's Sabbath, is to be the chief feature of this image. After thorough investigation, I am satisfied that there is no truth in this claim.

1. If a union of church and state constitutes an image to the beast, then this image has been formed ages ago and by different nations, wherever there has been a union of church and state as in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, Norway and Sweden, Mexico, Brazil, Abyssinia, Puritan New England, etc. But this would overthrow the Seventh-Day Adventist theory that the image has never yet been formed.

2. If they say it must be a union of Protestantism and the state, then they have that in several of the nations above as in England, etc.

3. If they say it must be Protestantism and Republicanism united, they have that in Switzerland.

4. They say that the Papacy is the beast to whom the image is formed. Eld. Smith thus defines the Papacy: "The Papacy, then, was a church clothed with civil power." Thoughts on Revelations, page 585. Is this definition correct? No, it is utterly false, as every scholar knows. It was made to fit a theory as false as the definition. Look at any dictionary. "Papacy. 1. The office and dignity of the pope. * * * 2. The popes taken collectively."—Web. The Papacy existed long before it was clothed with civil power. It has no civil power now, yet it is the Papacy still. So, then, an image to the Papacy does not necessarily include civil power or a union of church and state at all. On this false assumption is built the Advent theory of the image.

5. What is the Papacy? See Webster above. It is that ecclesiastical system of worship of which the pope is head. Union with civil power is not necessary to it as it has existed before and since it had civil authority. The distinguishing marks of the Papacy are these: 1. Popes. 2. Cardinals. 3. Monks. 4. Nuns. 5. Celibacy. 6. The Mass. 7. Worship of the virgin. 8. Worship of saints. 9. Worship of images. 10. Sign of the cross. 11. The confessional. 12. Use of incense. 13. Holy water. 14. The inquisition. 15. Claim of infallibility. 16. A gorgeous worship, and the like. This is the Papacy as known to everybody the world over. Now unite our Protestant churches with our state, pass a Sunday law and fine Sabbath-keepers, and how many of the above distinguishing features of the Papacy would you have? *Not one.* In order to have an *image* to the Papacy, you must have at least the main features of it as above. But even Adventists do not expect to see any of the above items in their Sunday law. Their idea of the image to the beast is a senseless, unscriptural affair from the first to last.

6. A stringent national Sunday law such as Adventists expect, would by no means constitute an image to the Papacy; because the Catholics never had nor taught such a Sunday institution as that would be. Their Sunday is, and always has been, a loose holiday, a day for games, sports, beer gardens, saloons, dancing, voting, and even work, with a little church service and Mass in the morning. Look at the Sunday in any Catholic country or community. Such a strict Sunday as Adventists expect would be no more like that than a sheep is like an ox; hence not an image to it. The Adventists themselves have shown that the doctrine of a strict Sunday did not originate with Catholics, but with the Presbyterians and Puritans in the 16th century. History of the Sabbath, Chap. 25. So, then, their Sunday law would constitute an image to the church of Scotland instead of the church of Rome!

Moreover, an image to any thing must look like that thing in all its main features. Simply one point of resemblance would not constitute it an image. Is Sunday keeping the distinguishing feature of the Catholics? Is it spoken of or thought of that way by any one? No, for the Greek, Armenian, Abyssinian, Lutheran, English, and all churches except a few Sabbatarians, keep Sunday. Hence Sunday keeping would be just as much an image to these churches as to Rome. Or, even if this was like the Papacy, it would only be one point of likeness, and not enough to make an image. So their theory breaks down on all sides.

7. All this on the supposition that the papacy is the leopard beast to which the image is to be made. But we have proved beyond doubt that the leopard beast is not the Papacy, but the civil power of Rome under the ten kingdoms after their adoption of Christianity. But their conversion was only nominal. They brought with them very largely their pagan doctrines, customs, religious rites, images, gods, shrines, temples, and pomp of worship. This became the model after which the Papacy was gradually but finally formed. The Papacy in its full and final development was an image of these half heathen, half Christian, worldly kingdoms.

THE DEADLY WOUND AND HOW IT WAS HEALED.

The utter fallacy of the Seventh-Day Adventist theory of these beasts is shown by the fact that they locate the deadly wound of Rev. 13:3 in 1798 at the *end* of the 42 months of verse 5, after nearly all the work of the beast is done. But in the prophecy it is distinctly located at the very *beginning* of the work of the leopard beast. Read Rev. 13:1-10 and see where the wound was made, verse 3. The worship of the beast, his power, his blasphemies, his persecutions of the saints, his 42 months, his 1260 years reign, the subjection of all the earth to him—all these come *after* the wound is healed, not before. On the overthrow of paganism, the breaking up of the empire by the northern barbarians, and the final extinction of the western empire, it looked as though the Roman empire was about to be entirely extinguished. But right here christianity conquered those barbarians, and brought them under the rising influence of the Papacy. New life was infused into the old carcass, the empire was revived, the wound was healed. See Barnes, Clarke, Scott, etc.

THE MARK OF THE BEAST: WHAT IS IT?

1. *Seventh-Day Adventists* assert in the most positive manner that the Pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday. "The Pope has changed the day of rest from the seventh to the first day."—Mrs. White, *Early Writings*, page 55.

2. Then they affirm that "Sunday-keeping must be the mark of the beast."—*The Marvel of Nations*, by U. Smith, page 153; "The Sunday Sabbath is purely a child of the papacy. It is the mark of the beast."—*Advent Review*, vol. 1, No. 2, August, 1850. They thunder this into the ears of people and threaten them with God's wrath if they keep Sunday, till they frighten ignorant souls to give it up.

3. This change in the Sabbath, they say, was made by the Popes at the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364 (*Review and Herald*, Dec. 13, 1887, page 780). This was over 1500 years ago.

4. All who keep Sunday, they assert, worship the beast and receive his mark. "Sunday-keeping is an institution of the first beast, and all who submit to obey this institution emphatically worship the first beast and receive his mark, 'the mark of the beast.' . . . Those who worship the beast and his image by observing the first day are certainly idolaters as were the worshippers of the golden calf."—*Advent Review*

Extra, pages 10 and 11, August, 1850. This language is too plain to be mistaken. All who keep Sunday have the mark of the beast.

5. But, strange to tell, they now all deny that anyone has ever had the mark of the beast. "We have never so held," says Smith (*Marvel of Nations*, page 184). All right, though this is a square denial of what they once taught, as above. It is a common thing for them to change their positions and then deny it. We proceed:

6. The United States will soon pass a strict Sunday law and unite church and state; then all who still keep Sunday will have the mark. (*Marvel of Nations*, page 185.)

ANSWER.

Does the Bible say that the mark of the beast is keeping Sunday? No indeed. That is only another one of their assumptions. To establish this they have to make a long, round-about set of arguments, built upon inferences none of which are true. Their theory is false, because:

1. The Jewish Sabbath was abolished at the cross. [Col. 2:16.] Hence it was not changed by the pope.

2. Sunday is the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10.

3. The pope never changed the Sabbath. This point I have proved beyond all question in another chapter. This fact alone upsets their whole argument on the mark of the beast.

4. The Papacy is not the beast to whom the image is made, as they assume. Here again their whole theory is demolished.

5. Merely keeping Sunday would not be an image to the Papacy any way, as I have shown.

6. The two-horned beast is not the United States at all but is the Papacy, as I have clearly proved.

7. The image to the beast was made years ago by the Papacy. So every one of their arguments for the mark of the beast fails.

THE ABSURDITIES OF THEIR POSITION.

1. The change of the Sabbath to Sunday, A. D., 364, by the Catholics, they say, is the mark of the beast. But they claim that the Papacy existed long before that; hence there was a long time when it had no mark or sign of its authority!

2. Sunday keeping has been the mark of the beast for 1500 years, but still as yet has never been enforced upon a single soul!

3. Sunday keeping has been the mark of the beast for 1500 years. During all this long time millions have kept Sunday on the sole authority of the Roman church and yet no one had the mark!

4. The keeping of Sunday has been time and again and in many countries enforced by law and severe penalties just as they say it will be in the future here, and yet none of those who have kept it as thus enforced have had the mark of the beast!

5. Church and state have been united in various countries and have enforced this institution of the Papacy as they call it, and yet it was not enforcing the mark of the beast!

6. For over 1500 years, taking their own dates, all the pious of the earth, the martyrs, the reformers, the Luthers, Wesley's and Judson's, have observed Sunday and enjoyed the blessing of God, but now all at once the whole world, Christians and all, are to be damned and drink the wrath of God for doing just what all holy men have done for ages! Of Sunday keeping in the future, Mrs. White says: "That must be a terrible sin which calls down the wrath of God unmingled with mercy." Great controversy, page 282. This terrible sin is just what all the church

of Christ has practiced for ages and yet have had God's blessing! How absurd.

7. It is attempted to dodge this point by saying that those of other ages did not have the light on the Sabbath. I have shown the falsity of that on other pages. Luther, Bunyan, Baxter, Milton, all had the "light" on the Sabbath question and rejected it and wrote against it. Then I can do it too and not have the mark of the beast if they did not.

8. If it is worshipping the beast to rest from physical labor on Sunday after one knows that Sunday is the pope's Sabbath, then many Seventh-Day Adventists are worshippers of the beast. Why? Because they often rest on Sunday. Book agents, colporters, teachers, drummers, persons visiting relatives, ministers in new places, etc., all frequently rest on Sunday and even go to church all day! Are they worshipers of the beast? Why not? Do you say they only do it for convenience or from policy? Just so they can rest on Sunday for the same reason when the law shall require it and not worship the beast any more than they do now.

9. Deny it as they may, the Seventh-Day Adventist teachings do make all Sunday keepers, both now and in past ages, worshipers of the beast, having the mark of the beast. This will make them squirm, but they must take it for here is the proof in their own words.

(1). The pope changed the Sabbath. Sunday is only the pope's day. See above.

(2). "The mark of the beast is the change the beast made in the law of God," in the Sabbath. *Marvel of Nations*, page 175. Then the mark of the beast existed as soon as the change was made, which they locate 1500 years ago. Is not this conclusion inevitable? If the mark of the beast is the change of the Sabbath which was made by the Papacy in the 4th century, then that mark has existed ever since. There is no getting away from this conclusion.

(3). All who have kept the law since that date, as changed by the beast, have been keeping the law of the beast, not the law of God; have been worshipers of the beast, not worshipers of God. Here is their own argument for it: Referring to the prophesy that the papacy should "change times and laws" (Dan. 7:25), which they claim the pope fulfilled A. D. 364, by changing the Sabbath to Sunday, Eld. Smith says: "When this is done [which was 1500 years ago], what do the people of the world have? They have two laws demanding obedience—the law of God and the law of the pope. "If they keep the law of God as given by Him, they worship and obey God. If they keep the law as changed by the papacy, they worship that power. . . . For instance, if God says that the seventh day is the Sabbath, on which we must rest, but the pope says that the first day is the Sabbath, and that we should keep this day and not the seventh, *then whoever* observes that precept as originally given by God, is thereby distinguished as a worshiper of God; and he who keeps it as changed is *thereby marked* as a follower of the power that made the change. . . . From this conclusion no candid mind can dissent."—*Marvel of Nations*, page 174 and 175.

Then, for the past 1500 years all who have kept Sunday have been "marked" as followers of the beast and have worshiped him! From their own argument does not this inevitably follow? Of course it does. When they try to deny and evade this abominable conclusion, they simply contradict and stultify themselves. Either their argument is a fallacy, or else this conclusion must follow. Look at this hideous Moloch which they have set up to frighten the ignorant. The pope in the fourth century changed the law of God by changing the Sabbath to Sunday. This change is the mark of the beast; whoever after that keeps that law as thus changed is keeping, not the law of God, but the pope's law; is worshipping, not God, but the pope. But all Christians for 1500

years have kept Sunday, the pope's Sabbath, the mark of the beast, and, as Smith says, were "*thereby marked* as followers of the power that made the change." From this conclusion there is no escape. And so all Sunday-keepers have had the mark of the beast and have it now.

But they say that they do not teach that anyone as yet has had the mark of the beast. This shows the absurdity of their argument. Sunday keeping is the mark of the beast, yet Sunday keepers have not got the mark of the beast! For instance: I have a hundred counterfeit bills; I pay them out to fifty men in Otsego and they take and keep them, yet not a man of them has a counterfeit bill! Isn't that clear—as mud? But they don't know that they are counterfeit bills and so are not guilty for having them. But have they not got counterfeit bills for all that? Certainly. So, if Sunday keeping is the mark of the beast, then every man that keeps Sunday has the mark of the beast, whether he knows it or not. God may not hold them guilty for it, but they have it just the same. Now, as soon as these fifty men are informed that their bills are counterfeit, are they not guilty if they use them after that? Yes. So, as soon as a man is informed that Sunday is the mark of the beast, if he keeps it after that, has he not the mark of the beast as truly as ever he can have it? and if he still keeps Sunday voluntarily, is he not just as guilty before God as though the law compelled him to keep it? Yes, and more so, because now he has no excuse, while then he could plead that he was compelled to do it. So, then, it needs no Sunday law to give men the mark of the beast. All Sunday keepers have it already, and as soon as they are informed that Sunday is the mark of the beast, then they are guilty as worshipers of the beast. But Seventh-Day Adventists have already informed thousands upon this point. Then if they have not the mark of the beast, why not? Surely *I* have been enlightened on it, and yet I keep Sunday, the pope's Sabbath, the mark of the beast. Have I the mark of the beast? Let them answer if they dare. Remember that Luther, Milton, Baxter, Bunyan and Miller were all informed on the Sabbath question, and still wrote against it and kept Sunday. Reader, this Advent mark of the beast is an absurdity and only a scarecrow. Don't be frightened. It's not alive. I have been close to it and examined it. It is only a stuffed carcass, stuffed with Advent sophistries.

Even if the pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday, that would not make Sunday *his* mark. The mark of any person was that which he used to mark things as belonging to him. In Bible times a master would put his mark on the right hand or forehead of his slaves. Heathen gods had their worshipers marked so. This custom is referred to and used here as an illustration. So the worshipers of the beast would be required to do something which would mark or distinguish them as his followers. But keeping Sunday does not distinguish a Catholic from members of other churches, for all churches keep Sunday, the Greek, Armenian, Abyssinian, Waldenses, etc. The pope has never used Sunday to distinguish his followers from others, nor as proof of his authority as head of the church. He does point to the keys of St. Peter and his regular apostolic succession from him as proof of his authority. Says Dowling: The popes assert "*their divine right* of supremacy in consequence of claiming to be the successors of the Apostle Peter."—*History of Romanism*, page 44. On this, not on Sunday keeping, they base their claim to power. Some obscure catechism is quoted claiming authority for the church to "command feasts and holy days," because that church has made Sunday holy. This falls infinitely short of making Sunday the proof of all their authority, the one "mark" of that church.

WHAT, THEN, IS THE MARK AND WORSHIP OF THE BEAST?

Eld. Smith himself has stated this as clearly as need be. "Just what will constitute this worship, it will perhaps be impossible to deter-

mine till the image itself shall have an existence. It will evidently be some act or acts by which men will be required to acknowledge the authority of that image and yield obedience to its mandates"; "So the mark of the beast, or of the papacy, must be some act or profession by which the authority of that power is acknowledged."—*Marcel of Nations*, pages 169 and 172. Exactly—only the beast is not the papacy. Any act or acts by which men show their reverence for the beast or his image, any form of worship by which they acknowledge his authority, that would be worshipping the beast and his image and receiving his mark. Dr. Clarke says: "The Latin [Catholic] worship is the universal badge of distinction of the Latin church from all other churches on the face of the earth, and is, therefore, the only infallible MARK by which a genuine papist can be distinguished from the rest of mankind." (on Rev. 13:16. This is the position taken by Protestants generally, and I believe it to be correct. A conformity to the system of worship set up by the papacy, that great anti-Christian power, the image to the beast, would be worshipping the beast and his image and receiving his mark. Or the mark of the beast would be any act which would show a personal allegiance to the beast.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE IMAGE AND MARK.

So we have seen, the dragon, (Rev. 12:3-17), was the Roman empire under its pagan form. The leopard beast, (Rev. 13:1-10), is the same empire under corrupted christianity, beginning about the 5th century and extending to the close of time. The two-horned beast is the Papacy existing contemporary with the beast to the end. Hence the last conflict of the church is with the beast and his image and his mark. Rev. 13:11-18; 14:9-12; 15:2; 19:20. This is the very conflict in which the church is now engaged and has been for ages past. The third angel's message is the warning which all Protestants have been giving against the Papacy and its work for the past three hundred years, and which will continue till Christ comes. Rev. 14:9-16. I have not a doubt of this.

THE THREE MESSAGES, REV. 14:6-12.

The one great claim of Seventh-Day Adventists is that they are preaching the three messages of Rev. 14:6-12. This is their constant theme. But there is not a particle of foundation for the claim. Read the first message, verses 6, 7. An angel is seen preaching the gospel to every nation, saying, "Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." This was fulfilled by the apostles and early christians as they preached the gospel to all nations. Jesus said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."—Mark 16:15. The angel in Rev. 14:6, 7, is seen preaching the gospel to every nation as Jesus commanded. Compare Paul's sermon to the idolatrous heathen at Lystra (Acts 14:15) with the words of the first message (Rev. 14:7) and they will be seen to be almost identical. Said Paul: We "preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein." So Rev. 14:7 says: "Worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea." This, then, was a message to idolators announcing to them the living God who made all things, but of whom they had been ignorant. This is exactly what the early church preached to the heathen nations till idolatry was overthrown.

Adventists claim that Wm. Miller preached this message in 1840-4. He did no such thing! The burden of his preaching was that the end of the world would come in 1843 and then in 1844. But he preached a false-

hood both times as we know. Does God send men to make such blunders as that? Miller did not preach the hour of judgment come. That was an afterthought, an interpretation put upon his work which was not thought of at the time.

It is claimed that the apostles could not have preached this message as the judgment did not come in their day. Let us see. Jesus preached thus: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out."—John 12:31. Jesus said "Now is the judgment." Who will contradict him and say it wasn't? Peter said, "For the time *is* come that judgment must begin at the house of God."—1 Pet. 4:17. Then the judgment did begin there. Here are two direct testimonies and that is enough. So in exact harmony with these, the first angel announces "The hour of his judgment is come."—Rev. 13:7. If any one wants to see the truth, this is clear enough; if they don't want to, there is no use arguing with them further.

SECOND MESSAGE, VERSE 8.

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." What is Babylon, that great city? It is fully described in Rev. 17 and 18 and is regarded by all Protestants as the Roman church. Adventists themselves agree with this, though endeavoring to make Babylon also include the Protestant churches. Even with their view Babylon, "the great," must refer primarily to Rome and only include other fallen churches as a secondary idea, as her daughters. Seventh-Day Adventists claim that this message was preached by the Millerites in 1844. When the churches refused to believe Miller that the end of the world would come in 1844 and that he could tell the very day, then and for this unbelief, all these churches were rejected of God and fell. Says the *Advent Review*, vol. 1, no. 2, Aug., 1850: "Babylon, the nominal church, is fallen. God's people have come out of her. She is now the synagogue of satan."—Rev. 3:9. Mrs. White says: "Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body. . . . Their profession, their prayers, and their exhortations, are an abomination in the sight of God."—*Early Writings*, page 135. What awful thing had they done to fall so? Why, Miller said the world would end in 1844, and they said it wouldn't. He was wrong and they were right, but God damned them and blessed the Millerites! This is a fair illustration of the egotism and inconsistency of Adventists. Did they preach what Rev. 14:8 says? No! They said Babylon was fallen *because* she rejected Millerism; but the message gives a far different reason. Babylon fell "because she made all nations drink of the wine of her fornication." The Bible gives one reason, Adventists give another. So they never preached this message. Just a few of the churches in the eastern states heard and rejected Millerism; for this all the tens of millions of church members throughout the whole world, who never even so much as heard of Miller, were rejected of God! What an abominable position. Again, Babylon must at least include Rome. Did the Catholic church fall in 1844? No, for she fell ages ago, as every Protestant knows. So, then, the fall of Babylon does not mean what Adventists say nor did they preach what the message says.

A thousand times more probable is the application of this message to the work of Luther and the Reformation. Till the time of Luther the Papal church was supposed to be the true church, and as such it ruled over the kings of earth and the consciences of men. Luther startled the world with the bold proclamation that the Roman church was the "Mother of harlots," "Babylon the great," of Rev. 17:1-6 and that she was fallen as stated in Rev. 14:8; 17:1-4. October 6, 1520, he

published his famous book on the "Babylonish Captivity of the Church." See "History of the Reformation," vol. 1, p. 130, by D'Aubigne. Said he: "I know that the Papacy is none other than the kingdom of Babylon," (page 131). "I have attacked the court of Rome. . . . It is more corrupt than Sodom and Gomorrah," (Page 139). "Rome for many years past has inundated the world with all that could destroy both soul and body," (Page 140). This was the final act which separated him from Rome. He raised a mighty cry of warning against the corruptions of Rome, and called upon Christians to "come out of her" as predicted (Rev. 18:1-4). Luther's message exactly fulfilled, Rev. 18:1-4—"The earth was lightened with his glory."

In all the history of the world such a mighty religious move had never before been seen. It shook the world, moved millions and, gave birth to Protestantism—a protest against the sins and corruptions of "Babylon the great," (Rev. 14:8). The reformers preached that Rome had made all nations drunk with her wine, was fallen, and God's people should come out of her, which they did. Here was a move worthy of being noticed in prophecy, one which exactly fulfilled the second message of Rev. 14:8, "Babylon is fallen."

Consider this fact: While Adventists find hundreds of prophecies, whole chapters of them, applying to their little work, they find none foretelling the great religious movement of the Reformation which revolutionized the world! It illustrates how they interpret everything to fit themselves. No; the second message of Rev. 14:8, the fall of Babylon, applies to the Catholic church, not to Protestants, and was given 350 years ago by Luther, not by the Millerites in 1844.

THE THIRD MESSAGE, REV. 14:9-12.

This warning against the worship of the beast and his image and his mark has been given by all the Protestant churches for the last 300 years. Look at the multitude of books against popery and the corruptions of Catholicism. From press and pulpit has been thundered one continual warning against apostate Rome. Never was a prophecy more plainly fulfilled than this. For an explanation of the beast, the image, and the mark, see other pages of this book.

Seventh-Day Adventists say that they are giving this message. Never was a claim more absurd.

1. They are mistaken entirely as to what the beast, image, and mark are, as I have shown.

2. According to their own showing, they have been preaching for forty years against a thing which does not exist—the image, which they say is yet to be made!

3. For forty years they have been warning men against receiving the mark of the beast, when no man is in danger of receiving it, for it is yet future.

4. That part of the message about the torment of the wicked, their smoke going up for ever and ever, etc., they never preach, for it is just what they don't believe.

5. Their egotistical claim that they are the only ones who "keep the commandments of God" is shown to be false on other pages of this book.

These few brief points are sufficient to show that their application of the three messages is entirely wrong.

IS THE SABBATH GOD'S SEAL?

Seventh-Day Adventists claim that "the seal of God is His holy Sabbath."—*Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation*, page 452. They are now sent to "seal" the 144,000 of Rev. 7:1-8 ready for translation. Not a soul

living on earth when Jesus comes will be saved unless he is a Seventh-Day Adventist and belongs to this 144,000 (*Early Writings*, page 11.)

1. Does the Bible say that the Sabbath is the seal of God? No; this is another Adventist assumption which they claim to prove by a long, round-about, far-fetched set of inferences.

2. The word "seal," as a noun and a verb, is used sixty-five times in the Bible, but not once is it said to be the Sabbath.

3. They argue that *sign* and *seal* are synonymous terms, meaning the same thing; and, as the Sabbath is called a sign (Ex. 31:17), it is therefore a seal. To this I object, because (1) *Seal* is never defined by the word *sign*, nor *sign* by the word *seal*, nor is one term ever given as the synonym for the other. I have carefully examined fourteen different dictionaries, lexicons and cyclopedias, and find no exception to this statement. (2) The original term for seal (Hebrew *chotham*, Greek *sphragis*) is never rendered sign. (3) The original word for sign (Heb. *oth*, Gr. *semeion*) is never rendered seal. Hence they are not synonymous terms.

4. Rom. 4:11 is used to prove that a sign is a seal; but it does not prove it. Anything may be put to two entirely different uses, as I may use my cane for a staff or for a pointer, but is therefore a staff and a pointer the same? No. So in Rom. 4:11 circumcision was used as a sign and also as a seal; but this does not prove that a sign is a seal. So the Sabbath is a sign (Ex. 31:17). Possibly God *might also* use it as a seal, but does He? Where is the proof?

5. The Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel (Ex. 31:17). So was circumcision (Rom. 4:11). But neither is a sign to Christians.

6. The Sabbath was abolished at the cross (Col. 2:16). Hence it cannot be God's seal now.

7. If the Sabbath is God's seal, with which he seals his people for translation, then every one who has the Sabbath is sealed and ready for translation. When God puts his seal upon a man, that must settle it that he is God's. Paul says, "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit."—Eph. 1:13. Would God seal a wicked man with the Holy Spirit? No. So in Rev. 7:2-4, where the angel sealed a man with the seal of God, did he not thereby become one of the 144,000 who were "without fault?" (Rev. 14:1-5). Yes. Then, if the Sabbath is the seal, all who keep it are sealed. But, (1) the old Pharisees all kept the Sabbath strictly; (2) millions of Jews keep it now; (3) all Seventh-Day Baptists keep it; (4) the Marion party, who bitterly oppose Seventh-Day Adventists, all keep it; (5) many Seventh-Day Adventists keep it who have been expelled from their churches for their sins. Are all these sealed and ready for salvation? No. Then the Sabbath as a seal, as the proof of God's favor, as a test of character and fitness for heaven, fails entirely. Hence it cannot be God's seal.

8. The 144,000 who are sealed, in Rev. 7:1-8, all belong to the twelve tribes of Israel, for so it is expressly stated. Then they are not Gentiles.

9. Adventists argue that the Sabbath is the seal to the decalogue. They say there is nothing else in the ten commandments to tell who gave that law. The assertion is utterly false. The very first words of the decalogue tell who gave it: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me."—Ex. 20:2, 3. This tells as plainly as possible who gave that law, and cuts up by the roots the Advent argument on the seal.

WHAT, THEN, IS GOD'S SEAL (REV. 7:2)?

No one supposes that Almighty God has a seal, which he uses as men use a seal. Seal is simply used as an illustration. It may be differ-

ent things at different times. God once used circumcision as a seal: "He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness" etc. (Rom. 4:11). God's knowledge of his people is called a seal (2 Tim. 2:19). Paul expressly says that the saints "were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise;" and "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed" (Eph. 1:13; 4:30. Then at that time the Spirit was the seal which God gave to every saint. That was an infallible evidence that he was a child of God. Just what may be illustrated by the "seal of God," in Rev. 7, we may not now be able to decide; but for reasons above given we see that it cannot be the Sabbath.

THE SANCTUARY.

Seventh-Day Adventists make everything turn upon their view of the sanctuary. It is vital with them. If they are wrong on this, their whole theory breaks down. The reader should, therefore, study this subject carefully. They dwell upon it constantly, and affirm that they are the only ones in all Christendom who have the light on the subject. I will devote only a few pages to it, just enough to show the fallacy of their system.

They based their time of 1844 on Dan. 8:14. The sanctuary was the earth. It was to be cleansed by fire at the second advent. The 2300 days ended in 1844. Hence Christ must come that year. They proved it all by the Bible; so there could be no mistake, they said. But Christ didn't come. Now what? Fanaticism dies hard, positive men don't like to yield. So they now find that "the sanctuary" does not mean the earth at all, as they had said, but a real building in heaven, just like the tabernacle which Moses built. That was a tent with two rooms, the holy place, containing the table, candlestick, and golden altar; the Most Holy, containing the ark, in which were the tables of stone, and over which was the mercy seat and cherubim.—See Heb. 9:1-7. The priests ministered in the first place every day in the year, but only the high priest went into the Most Holy, and he only on the last day of the year.—Lev. 16. On that day he cleansed the sanctuary of the sins confessed there during the year. All this was a type of just such a building in heaven, where Christ ministers (Heb. 8:1-5; 9:1-9, 24). In 1844 he left the first place and entered the Most Holy to cleanse the heavenly sanctuary, which, really, is the judgment. This explains their disappointment. Jesus went into the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to begin the judgment in 1844 instead of coming to the earth as they first expected and preached! To prove all this they make long, roundabout arguments which are open to objections on all sides.

1. Do the Adventists *know* that they are right about this question? No.

2. If this subject is as plain and as important as they say it is, it is strange that nobody ever found it out before.

3. After being perfectly familiar with their view of it and knowing all their arguments for it, I feel sure that they are mistaken about it.

1. God sent the Adventists with a last solemn message to earth upon which the destiny of the church and the world depended. The very first thing they did was to get the wrong year, '43 instead of '44. Then, when they got that fixed up, instead of announcing the real event to take place, the change in Christ's work in the sanctuary in heaven, they said he was to come to earth, raise the dead, and burn the world, when nothing of the kind was to occur!

2. Not one in fifty of the Millerite Adventists ever found out the real mistake they had made. Not even one of the leading Adventists, like Miller, Hines, Litch, etc., ever accepted this sanctuary explanation. Only a mere handful out of the great mass of 1844 Adventists found out

the truth about the sanctuary and these were men of no note in Miller's work.

3. Miller himself opposed the Seventh-Day Adventists' move, rejecting the idea of the sanctuary, the Sabbath and the third angel's message. Mrs. White confesses this: "I saw leading men watching Wm. Miller, and fearing lest he should embrace the third angel's message and the commandments of God. . . . At length Wm. Miller raised his voice against the light from heaven."—Early Writings, p. 120. What a mixed up mess that Advent work was! What if Moses had opposed Joshua, and John the Baptist had opposed Christ? Miller was sent to do a work, got it wrong, and then opposed those who did finally get it right!

4. Instead of receiving the "light" on the sanctuary question from Mrs. White's visions, they got it from O. R. L. Crosier. But he soon gave it all up as an error and has opposed the Seventh-Day Adventists for many years. It looks badly for a theory when the very authors of it renounce it.

5. Seventh-Day Adventists at first adopted the sanctuary theory to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844, a theory which Mrs. White and all of them held at that time. (See chapter three of this book). Here is my proof on this point:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., Dec. 1, 1887.

Eld. D. M. Canright:—"I kept the seventh day nearly a year about 1844. In 1846 I explained the idea of the sanctuary in an article in an extra double number of the *Day Star*, Cincinnati, O. The object of that article was to support the theory that the door of mercy was shut, a theory which I and nearly all Adventists who had adopted Wm. Miller's views, held from 1844 to 1848. Yes, I *know* that Ellen G. Harmon—now Mrs. White—held the shut door theory at that time."

Truly yours, O. R. L. CROSIER.

Now listen to Mrs. White: "Topsham, Me., April 21, 1847. . . . The Lord showed me in vision more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light on the cleansing of the sanctuary, etc., and that it was his will that Bro. C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day Star* (extra), Feb. 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that extra to every saint. . . ."—E. G. White, in "A Word to the Little Flock," pp. 11, 12. Here you have the origin and object of that sanctuary theory. Before me lies "The Pre-Truth," vol. 1, No. 6., Dec., 1849, by James White. "The Shut Door Explained," is the leading article, in which it is argued from the type (Lev. 16:17), that when the high priest entered the Most Holy there could be no more pardon for sin. "On this day of atonement he is a high priest for *those only* whose names are inscribed on the breast of judgment,"—page 44. No more salvation for sinners, is what their sanctuary theory was then used to prove. The whole volume is full of this idea.

6. Their argument from the type on this point was right; in the type no sin could be confessed and conveyed into the sanctuary after the high priest entered the Most Holy.—Lev. 4:1-7; 16:17, 23, 24. So if this was a type of the entrance of Christ into the Most Holy in heaven in 1844, then truly the door of mercy did close there and all sinners since are lost.

7. No work whatever was to be done on the day of atonement, or day when the sanctuary was cleansed.—Lev. 23:27-32. The law was very strict. If the Advent argument on the sanctuary is correct and the day of atonement began in 1844, then they ought not to have worked a day since. Hence many Adventists after 1844 held that it was a sin to work; but time starved them out and they had to go at it again.

8. Finally being compelled to abandon the position that the door of mercy was entirely shut against sinners in 1844, they next taught that

only those could be saved who *knew* of the change which Christ made in the sanctuary in heaven in 1844. Thus Eld. Smith in "Objections to the Visions Answered" (pp. 24-26), says: "A knowledge of Christ's position and work is necessary to the enjoyment of the benefits of his mediation. . . . A general idea of his work was then (previous to 1844) sufficient to enable men to approach unto God by him. . . . But when he changed his position (in 1844) to the Most Holy place . . . that knowledge of his work which had up to that point been sufficient, was no longer sufficient. . . . Who can find salvation now? Those who go to the Savior where he is and view Him by faith in the Most Holy place.

This is the door now open for salvation. But no man can understand this change without definite knowledge of the subject of the sanctuary and the relation of type and antitype." Now they may seek the Saviour as they have before sought Him, with no other ideas of His position and ministry than those which they entertained while he was in the first apartment; but will it avail them? They cannot find Him there. That door is shut!" So Mrs. W.: "They have no knowledge of the move made in heaven, or the way into the Most Holy, and they cannot be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there. . . . They offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus has left."—*Early Writings*, page 123. What abominable doctrine! No one can be saved unless they know of the change which Christ made in heaven in 1844! But no one except Seventh-Day Adventists have the slightest idea of that change. Reader, think of this.

9. But now they have abandoned this view of the sanctuary and hold that all who honestly seek God may be saved without any of this "light" on the sanctuary. Thus they have already held four different positions upon the sanctuary question: 1. It was the earth; 2. The door of mercy was shut to all sinners in 1844; 3. It was open only to those who learned about Christ's change in 1844; 4. It is now open to all. What will they hold next?

After carefully and thoroughly investigating the whole subject of the sanctuary, I feel sure that they are in a great error on that point.

1. God's throne, or the symbol of his presence, was always in the most holy place of the sanctuary, between the cherubim, never once in the holy place. Eld. Smith admits that it was *usually* there (*Sanctuary*, p. 127). For proof on this point see Ex. 25:22; Lev. 16:2; Num. 7:89; 1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Kings 19:15. Smith argues that God's throne was sometimes in the holy place, and refers to Ex. 33:9. This was an exceptional case, and does not disprove the *rule* that his presence was in the most holy place. But in Ex. 33:9 the Lord appeared *outside* the tabernacle and not in the holy place at all. So his text fails him.

2. When Jesus ascended to heaven, 1800 years ago, he went directly to the right hand of God and sat down on his throne (Heb. 8:1; Eph. 1:20; Acts 2:34; Rev. 3:21. Hence he must have entered the most holy then instead of in 1844.

3. Jesus entered "within the veil" at his ascension (Heb. 6:19, 20). But this term "within the veil" always means within the most holy place, behind the veil which divided between the holy and the most holy. "Before the veil" was in the holy place, just outside the veil which hid the ark from view. Proof: Heb. 6:19, 20; Ex. 26:33-35; 27:21; 30:6; 40:22-26; Lev. 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 20:1, 2; Num. 18:7; Matt. 27:51. Any candid reader who will examine these texts carefully will be satisfied that "within the veil" is within the most holy place, where the ark is. Now, as Jesus entered "within the veil" 1800 years ago (Heb. 6:19, 20), he certainly went into the most holy place then and not in 1844, as Adventists claim.

4. "Before the throne" (Rev. 1:8).—Eld. Smith asserts that "the throne of God was in the first apartment of the sanctuary," because it is

said that the seven lamps and the golden altar were "before the throne," (Rev. 4:5; 8:3). It is a desperate cause which seizes upon such proof. The same argument would prove that the ark and God's throne were always in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary, which we know to be false. As there was only a veil which divided the holy from the most holy, where God's throne was, things in the holy place were said to be "before the Lord," as they were so near to the throne, which was just behind the curtain. Proof: Ex. 27:20, 21; 30:6-8; 40:23-25; Lev. 4:6, 15-18. Even outside of the tabernacle entirely, where the beasts were killed, was "before the Lord," as Lev. 4:15 shows. Abraham walked "before the Lord," (Gen. 24:40) yet he was on earth and the Lord was in heaven.

5. Not a single text can be found in all the Bible where the ark and cherubim and throne were in the holy place of the earthly sanctuary, the type; yet in the antitype they have the throne of God in the holy place, not on some special occasion, but all the time for 1800 years, just contrary to the type!

6. Adventists always assume and say that "the temple of God is the most holy place."—*Sanctuary*, page 234, by U. Smith. But this is false. The most holy place, or the oracle was a room in the temple, but it was not the temple itself. In fact the Scriptures carefully distinguish between the temple and the oracle or most holy. See 1 Kings 6:5, 16, 17, 19, 23; 7:50. The temple was the house, the whole building, (1 Kings 7:50; 2 Kings 11:13; 1 Sam. 3:3; Matt. 21:12; Luke 1:9; Rev. 11:19).

7. When was the temple in heaven opened (Rev. 11:19)? Adventists use this text to prove that the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary was not opened till 1844. But it fails them: 1. Because, as we have proved above, the temple is not the most holy place, but the whole building; 2. Because the heavenly temple was opened when Christ began his ministry there 1800 years ago (Heb. 8:1, 2; 9:8-12); 3. Because verse 19 of Rev. 11 properly belongs with Rev. 12 and begins that new line of prophecy instead of closing the line in Chap. 11. The Syriac thus divides it. Clarke, Barnes, Scott, and every commentator I have consulted connects this verse with Chap. 12 as the introduction. Says Scott: "V. 19.—This verse introduces a new subject, and should have been placed at the beginning of the next chapter." Certainly; for when was the temple in heaven opened? When Jesus went there to begin his ministry, of course, (Heb. 9:8:12). Thus fails the main pillar of the Adventists' sanctuary theory.

Thus far I have argued on their own grounds that there is a real building up in heaven just like the sanctuary on earth. But that whole thing is extremely questionable.

1. As children are taught moral truths by object lessons, so God taught the Jews spiritual truths by the object lessons of the types of their worship. Hence it does not follow that in Christian worship there must be just such material things used up in heaven. Rather the presumption is against it.

2. The whole temple service was for the Aaronic priesthood; but Christ is not a priest after the order of Aaron, but is after that of Melchisedec (Heb. 7:11). Melchisedec had no temple nor temple service; so Christ should have none.

3. Paul directly states that the types of the law were "NOT the very image of the things" they represent (Heb. 10:1). But Adventists make their argument on the assumption that they were exact images of things in heaven, thus ignoring Paul's statement.

4. Paul says that Christ is a minister of a greater and more perfect tabernacle (Heb. 9:11). Then it must differ from the earthly one.

5. Paul says it is one "not made with hands," (Heb. 9:11). This shows that it is not a material building.

6. Paul says that Jesus' flesh is the veil (Heb. 10:20.) This shows that the temple was only figurative.

7. Scarcely one of the types had an antitype just like it. Thus lambs and oxen were the types of which Jesus was the antitype. But he was a *man* and they were *beasts*. The bodies of those beasts were *burned* (Heb. 13:11, 12), but Christ the antitype was not burned. They were slain at the door of the sanctuary (Lev. 17:3, 4), but Jesus was not slain at the door of any sanctuary. Their blood was carried into the temple and put on the altar (Lev. 4:6, 7), but the blood of Christ was spilt on the ground. The Levitical priests made offering daily, but Christ only once for all (Heb. 9:25, 26, 28; 10:10, 12, 14). The law regulating the service of the priests and the temple was changed (Heb. 7:12). Then certainly it is not carried out in heaven now. Adventists would have the whole Levitical law of the sanctuary service transferred to heaven and carried out there! This is the absurdity of their system. In Heb. 7:11-28 Paul marks many points of difference between the types and the antitypes. The table of the Lord was in the temple in the Jewish age (Mal. 1:7), but now the Lord's table is in the church (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:20). The seven lamps in the temple in heaven "are the seven spirits of God" (Rev. 4:5). Then they are not literal lamps. So it is more than probable that none of the things mentioned as being there are literal. In one place it is said that the saints in heaven are "clothed with white robes" (Rev. 7:9), but in another place this is explained to be the righteousness of saints (Rev. 19:8).

In Rev. 8:3 it is said that the prayers of all saints are offered upon the golden altar. Most evidently, this is not to be taken literally, but only as a reference to the Jewish mode of worship. Col. 2:16, 17 says that the meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and Sabbath days were a shadow of Christ. Reasoning as the Adventists do about the earthly sanctuary (Heb. 8:5), we would expect to find something in the gospel exactly like them, meats, drinks, yearly feast days, monthly holy days, and Sabbaths. But where are they? In the gospel there is nothing at all just like these types.

Paul says directly that the place into which Jesus went was "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," (Heb. 9:24). The simple truth of the whole matter is that the age of types, object lessons, exact forms, set ceremonies, consecrated places and holy vessels—all this ended at the cross (Col. 2:17). The answer of Jesus to the woman at the well is exactly to the point. She said: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."—John 4:20-24. Under the gospel one place is no more holy than another. With the holy places went all the holy vessels, sacrifices, incense, tables of stone and all. Peter states it all in a word: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."—1 Pet. 2:5. To the same effect, Eph. 2:20-22; 1 Cor. 6:19. Now we are under a new covenant (Heb. 8:6-13), an high priest of a new order (Heb. 7:11), we come to God by a new way (Heb. 10:20), by new ordinances (Mark 15:15-16, 1 Cor. 11:23-26), by a different temple, and a better sacrifice. Hence there is no need of a temple in heaven just like the old Jewish one.

The Adventists idea of the sanctuary in heaven is an absurdity. In Early Writings, pp. 114, 115, Mrs. White was taken to heaven and shown all about it. She saw the building exactly like the one on earth. In it

was the candlestick, the table of show bread, the altar, the curtains, the ark, and "in the ark were tables of stone containing the ten commandments." Think now: what use for a literal candle in the immediate presence of God whose glory is above the light of the sun. "They need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light."—Rev. 22:5. And what use for a literal table of showbread there? Do the angels or the Lord eat the bread? Then real tables of stone in heaven! and the Lord sitting on the ark over them! What puerile ideas. Hear Paul veto that idea: "Not in tables of stone but in fleshly tables of the heart."—2 Cor. 3:3. Then think of the absurdity of having the Almighty God and all the "ten thousand times ten thousand" (one hundred million) angels around his throne dwelling in a literal building! It would need to be larger than a whole State. Let Adventists read this: "Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands."—Acts 7:48.

But does not Paul say that the Jewish temple was a shadow, figure, a pattern of heavenly things (Heb. 8 and 9)? Yes; and so he says the offerings and holy days of the old covenant were shadows of Christ (Col. 2:16, 17). But where are your feast days, new moons, meats, etc., under the gospel? Nowhere, only in a spiritual sense. So Paul says the earthly temple was only a "figure" of a "tabernacle not made with hands" (Heb. 9:9, 11). How could he say more plainly that the heavenly are not literal? Did Christ minister in a literal temple in heaven from Adam till the cross, 4,000 years? No. Did Melchisedec have a temple? No, (Gen. 14:18-20). As Christ is a priest after his order, he needs no literal temple. According to the Adventists, the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary was entirely empty and unoccupied from the ascension of Jesus till 1844. Even Christ did not enter it once! Finally, their whole argument on the sanctuary depends upon proving that the 70 weeks of Dan. 9 are a part of the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14. But does the Bible say that they are? No; nor can they prove it. The very best they can claim is to make it plausible that they are.

THEIR POSITION ON THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN.

They have claimed great light on the subject of the sleep of the dead and the annihilation of the wicked. They say that their views are very beneficial, as they will convert infidels and save men from spiritualism, universalism, etc. Facts prove the reverse to be true. Eld. Dobney of England, Elders Blaine and Storrs of America, the most prominent leaders in that doctrine, all three came out universalists, I believe. As the fruit of this doctrine among the Adventists, various parties have come up, some holding that the wicked will never be raised at all, others that there is no devil, others holding to future probation, others to restoration of all, and minor heresies. Large numbers have gone from Adventism into spiritualism and infidelity. Hence their doctrine of immortality is not what is claimed for it. My observation is that it simply furnishes a question for dispute and contention, instead of leading to peace and devotion. I have seen much evil, but little good come out of a discussion of this question. I have not space to investigate it here, so do not attempt it.

CHAPTER II.

THE VISIONS OF MRS. WHITE.

Mrs. E. G. White, wife of the late Elder White, leader of the Seventh-Day Adventists, claims to be divinely inspired, as were the prophets of the Bible. This claim is accepted by the whole denomination. They defend her inspiration as earnestly as they do that of the Bible. Year after year, in their State and General Conferences, ironclad resolutions are unanimously adopted, endorsing her revelations in the strongest manner. Among themselves they quote her as we do Paul. A text from her writings is an end of all controversy in doctrine and discipline. It is common to hear them say that when they give up her visions they will give up the Bible, too.

Her visions, or "testimonies," as they are called, are so inseparably connected with the whole Seventh-Day Adventist doctrine that a person cannot consistently accept the one without accepting the other. Besides, they are so constantly urged upon their people in every possible way, that a person cannot long feel comfortable among them unless he, too, accepts them. Any one who rejects or opposes them is branded as a rebel fighting against God. Thus Mrs. White herself says: "If you lessen the confidence of God's people in the testimonies he has sent them, you are rebelling against God as certainly as were Kora, Dathan and Abiram," ("Testimony No. 31," p. 62). She claims that every line she writes, even in a private letter, is directly inspired by God—"the precious rays of light shining from the throne," (page 63). Of her own words she says: "It is God, and not an erring mortal, that has spoken," ("Testimonies," vol. 3, page 257). Thus she states over and over that those who doubt or oppose her are fighting against God, sinning against the Holy Ghost. Thus: "fighting the Spirit of God. Those . . . who would break down our testimony, I saw, are not fighting against us, but against God," (p. 260). I could quote scores of passages like these.

These inspired "testimonies" now embrace ten bound volumes. Thus they have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons do. They have to read our old Bible in the light of this new Bible. Any interpretation of the Bible found in these "testimonies" settles its meaning beyond further dispute. She says: "I took the precious Bible and surrounded it with the several testimonies to the church," (vol. 2, p. 605). Exactly; and by the light of these "testimonies" that old Bible must now be read. She continues: "God has, through the testimonies, simplified the great truths already given." Yes, we must now take the Bible as thus simplified by her! Swedenborg, Mrs. Southcott, Ann Lee, Joseph Smith and Mrs. White have each done the same thing—had a new revelation, written inspired books, and started a new sect with a new religion.

There is not a doctrine nor a practice of the church, from the observance of the Sabbath to the washing of feet, upon which she has not written. That settles it. No further investigation can be made on any of these matters, only to gather evidence and construe everything to sustain it. How, then, can their ministers or people be free to think and investigate for themselves? They can not, dare not, and do not. How often I have seen some intelligent thought extinguished with this re-

mark: "That contradicts Sister White." This ends the matter. Everything she writes, whether in a private letter or newspaper article, is inspired. Thus: "God was speaking through clay. . . . In these letters which I write, in these testimonies I bear, I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision—the precious rays of light shining from the throne," (p. 63). There you have it, simon pure: every word she writes is ray of light from the throne of God. Reject that, and you are rejected of God.

Thus it will be seen that Mrs. White claims the very highest inspiration, the voice of God speaking directly through her. Her followers contend that she must either be a true prophetess or else a consummate hypocrite; but she is neither. Few are aware of what a powerful influence an excited religious imagination will have over a person. Enthusiasts and fanatics are always the most honest and earnest of people. Mrs. White is simply a religious enthusiast and a fanatic. This I shall prove by stubborn facts.

That she is not inspired is plainly shown by many facts. She has never wrought a single miracle. The old prophets and the apostles wrought miracles freely, to prove that God had sent them. In all these forty years, in all her ten volumes, not a single prediction has she ever made that has come to pass. This is astonishing, considering that she dwells almost wholly in predictions about the future. It seems as though she ought to have blundered into many things which could afterward be construed into a fulfilled prophecy. But not one can be found. This shows how wild and utterly wrong her theories have been.

She says in "Spiritual Gifts," vol. 2, page 293: "I am just as dependent upon the Spirit of the Lord in relating or writing a vision as in having a vision." Here she claims that the very *words* in which her visions are recorded are of divine inspiration. But I do positively know that the words in her written "testimonies" are not inspired; for—

1. When writing them out she will often change what she has written, and write it very differently. I have seen her scratch out a whole page, or a line, or a sentence, and write it over differently. If God gave her the words, why did she scratch them out and alter them?

2. I have repeatedly seen her sit with pen in hand and read her manuscript to her husband for hours, while he suggested many changes, which she made. She would scratch out her own words and put in the ones he suggested, sometimes whole sentences. Was he inspired, too?

3. As she is very wordy and wholly ignorant of grammar, of late years she has employed an accomplished writer to take her manuscript and correct it, improve its wording, polish it up, and put it in popular style, so her books would sell better. Thousands of words, not her own, are thus put in by these other persons, some of whom were not even christians. Are their words inspired, too?

4. She often copies, without credit or sign of quotation, whole sentences, paragraphs and even pages, word for word, from other authors. Compare "Great controversy," page 96, with "History of the reformation," by D'Aubigne, page 41. Indeed, her last book, "Great Controversy," which they laud so highly as her greatest work, is merely a compilation from Andrew's History of the Sabbath, History of the Waldenses by Wylie, Life of Miller by White, Thoughts on Revelation by Smith, and other books. I have compared many pages from all these and find that she has taken from these word for word and page after page. She gives no credit to these authors but claims it all as a revelation from God! She is a literary thief. Webster says: "Plagiarism:—A thief in literature; one who purloins another's writings and offers them to the public as his own." Exactly what she does.

5. Several passages in the earlier editions of her works have been suppressed in the later editions because they contradict what they now believe. For thirty years they have writhed under this charge of suppression, yet they keep right on doing it. If they dare publish these suppressed passages, why don't they do it? Why?

6. In 1885 all her "testimonies" were republished in four volumes, under the eye of her own son and a critical editor. Opening hap-hazard to four different pages in Vol. 1, I read and compared them with the original publication which I have. I found on an average *twenty-four changes of the words on each page!* Her words were thrown out and other words put in and other changes made, in some cases so many that it was difficult to read the two together. At the same rate in the four volumes there would be 63,720 changes!

Taking, then, the words which were put in by her husband, by her copyist, by her son, by her editors, and those copied from other authors, and probably they comprise from one-tenth to one quarter of all her books. Fine inspiration that is! The common reader knows nothing about these damaging facts, but I could not avoid knowing them, for I have been where I saw it myself.

MRS. WHITE'S MISTAKES.

I could fill a volume with proof of her mistakes, for all of her books are full of them. I will select but a few.

The shut door. For several years after 1844, Mrs. White had visions saying that probation ended in that year, that there was no more salvation for sinners. Of course she has to deny this now, but the proof is overwhelmingly against her.

1. I have conversed with several individuals who affirm positively that they heard her teach this repeatedly. There are hundreds now living who will swear that they heard her teach it.

2. *Written testimony.* John Megquier, Saco, Me., a man noted for his integrity, writes: "We well know the course of Ellen G. White, the visionist, while in the state of Maine. About the first visions she had were at my house in Poland. She said God had told her in vision that the door of mercy had closed, and there was no more chance for the world." *The True Sabbath*, by Miles Grant, p. 70. Mrs. L. S. Burdick, San Francisco, Cal., was well acquainted with Mrs. W. She writes: "I became acquainted with James White and Ellen Harmon (now Mrs. White) early in 1845. At the time of my first acquaintance with them they were in wild fanaticism, used to sit on the floor instead of chairs, and creep around the floor like little children. Such freaks were considered a mark of humility. They were not married, but traveling together. Ellen was having what was called visions; said God had shown her in vision that Jesus Christ arose on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, and shut the door of mercy; had left forever the mediatorial seat; the whole world was doomed and lost and there never could be another sinner saved." L. S. Burdick, "True Sabbath," p. 72. O. R. L. Crosier kept the Sabbath with them in 1818. He writes: "Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 1, 1887. Yes, I *know* that Ellen G. Harmon, now Mrs. White, held the shut door theory at that date." Then he gives his proof. These persons knew the facts and have put their testimony on record.

3. Seventh-Day Adventists are compelled to admit that for some time after 1844 their people did hold that probation was ended. Even Mrs. White admits it. She says: "After the passing of the time of expectation, in 1844, Adventists still believed the Saviour's coming to be very near; they held that . . . the work of Christ as man's intercessor before God had ceased. Having given the warning of the judgment near, they felt that their work for the world was done, and they lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners. . . . All this

confirmed them in the belief that probation had ended, or, as they then expressed it, 'the door of mercy was shut.'"—Great Controversy, p. 268. This statement of Mrs. White herself is enough to settle the point that the Adventists believed "the door of mercy was shut" in 1844. Notice here that the "shut door" means the end of probation, the close of mercy for sinners.

Elder G. I. Butler, in the *Review and Herald*, March 3, 1885, says: "As the time passed there was a general feeling among all the earnest believers that their work for the world was done;" "There can be no question that for months after the time passed it was the general sentiment that their work of warning the world was over;" "Their burden was gone, and they thought their work was done." Yes; that is just what they did believe.

4. We wish to present the combined testimony of nine of the ministers of the Seventh-Day Adventist church, placed upon record, touching the very point at issue: "Our views of the work before us were then mostly vague and indefinite, some still retaining the idea adopted by the body of Advent believers in 1844, with Wm. Miller at their head, *that our work for the world was finished, and that the message was confined to those of the original Advent faith.* So firmly was this believed that one of our number was nearly refused the message, the individual presenting it having doubts of the possibility of his salvation, because he was not in the '44 move. [Signed,] M. E. Cornell, J. N. Loughborough, Joseph Bates, J. H. Waggoner, James White, E. W. Shorridge, Moses Hull, John Byington, J. B. Frisbie."—*Review and Herald*, vol. 18, No. 3, June 11, 1861. The above is ample testimony to prove that the Seventh-Day Adventist church, as a body, for years after 1844, did not believe in the possibility of the conversion and salvation of sinners.

The Present Truth, James White, editor, Oswego, N. Y., May, 1850, has an article by the editor on the "Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and the Shut Door." Eld. White says: "At that point of time [1844] the midnight cry was given, the work for the world was closed up, and Jesus passed into the most holy place. . . . There can be no other place for the shut door but at the autumn of 1844. . . . When we came up to that point of time, all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased, and the unanimous feeling and testimony was that our work for the world was finished forever. . . . He [Jesus] is still merciful to his saints, and ever will be; and Jesus is still *their* advocate and priest. But the sinner, to whom Jesus has stretched out his arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offers of salvation, was *left without an advocate* when Jesus passed from the holy place and shut that door in 1844." Any honest man can see that the shut door meant no salvation for sinners, and this is what Eld. White taught in 1850. In a report of labor in the *Advent Review*, May 15, 1850, Eld. White, in noticing the death of a Sister Hastings, says: "She embraced the Sabbath in 1846, and has ever believed that the work of warning the world closed in 1844." This shows that they held to the shut door idea for years after 1844.

What a fanatical and abominable doctrine that was for Christians to teach! Mrs. White was right with them and in full harmony with them on this all these years. She had revelations almost daily. If they were of God, why did she not correct them in this fearful error? Even if she had said nothing confirming this delusion, yet the simple fact that she had no revelation contradicting it during all those years, is enough to destroy her claim to inspiration. But the fact is, she taught this error as strongly in her visions as the brethren did in their arguments.

Here are her own words: "March 24, 1849, . . . I was shown that the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ,

relating to the shut door, could not be separated. . . . I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse, *for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people, but if their hearts could be seen they would appear as black as ever.* My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their salvation is past," ("Present Truth," pages 21 and 22, published August, 1849).

Here you have the shut door and no mercy for sinners just as clear as language can make it. Every candid reader knows what it teaches. It is pitiable to see the shifts and turns, evasions, dodges, quibbles, if not out and out lying, resorted to on this passage to save Mrs. White's visions. But there it stands, to mock at all their efforts. Here is another passage teaching the same doctrine: "*It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the city, as all the wicked world which God had rejected.*" ("A Word to the Little Flock," page 14, published in 1847). At this time, then, God had rejected the wicked world—shut door, you see. Again: "The excitements and false reformations of this day do not move us, for we know that the Master of the house rose up in 1844 and shut the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle; and now we certainly expect that they will 'go with their flocks' 'to seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself [within the second veil] from them.' The Lord has shown me that the power which is with them is a mere human influence and not the power of God," ("Present Truth," p. 64, March, 1850.) Here again she teaches that sinners cannot be converted, and gives as the reason the shut door theory of 1844.

Here is another vision in which she teaches the horrible doctrine of the shut door in its very worst form, that is that after 1844 not one ray of light comes Jesus to the wicked but they are all turned over to the devil to whom they now pray instead of to God. After Jesus left the holy place she says: "I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after he arose and they were left in perfect darkness. . . . Satan appeared to be by the throne trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne and pray, Father give us thy spirit; then Satan would breathe upon them an unholy influence."—Early Writings, pp. 46, 47. Not one ray of light has come to sinners since 1844 but all are left to the Devil! What is the use of their denying that she taught this doctrine? She certainly did and she knows it. This fact and the bold denial of it now, brand her as a false teacher.

I will briefly notice some other mistakes she has made, enough to show that she is wholly unreliable.

1. For over forty years she, herself, has been constantly expecting the end of the world, and it has not come yet. This alone ought to open the eyes of all to see that she has no knowledge of the future.

2. Slaves. In 1849 she foretold what would happen when Jesus comes, and said: "I saw the pious slave rise in triumph and victory and shake off the chains that bound him, while his wicked master was in confusion." (Experience and views," p. 18.) But now there are no slaves. She had not then dreamed of the abolition of slavery.

3. Nations angry. "The nations are *now* getting angry." (Early Writings, p. 29.) That was thirty-eight years ago. It takes a long time for them to get fighting mad! Pshaw!

4. Another mistake. "Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord." (Page 49.) That was thirty-eight years ago, and no Adventist then looked for time to last ten years.

5. Another blunder. "The time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished." (Page 49.) Jesus went there in 1844. Hence, he had then been there six years. She saw that the time for him to be there was nearly finished, but it has continued thirty-eight years since. A false prediction, as any one can see.

6. A few months only in 1849. "Now time is almost finished, and what we have been years [six years] in learning, they [new converts] will have to learn in a few months." (Page 57.) But instead of a few months, they have had thirty eight years!

7. She broke the Sabbath for eleven years. Though she had vision after vision about the Sabbath, yet for eleven years they all began it at six p. m. instead of at sunset as the law requires. (Lev. 23:32.) When they found their mistake, she saw it, too, in vision. She says: "I inquired why it had been thus that at this late date we must change." (Testimony No. 1, p. 13.) A poor leader she.

8. Occasionally, when prominent men have left them, she has ventured to predict immediate destruction to them. In 1855, she predicted this of Elder Stephenson (Testimony No. 1, p. 15), and in 1862 of Moses Hull (Testimony No. 10, p. 457.) But both have lived and grown fat under it!

9. The rebellion. Her predictions about the war are enough alone to destroy all confidence in her revelations. Here are short samples: "Slavery . . . is left to live and stir up another rebellion." (Testimonies, Vol. 1, p. 255.) Has proved false. "It seemed impossible to have the war conducted successfully." (Page 256.) Yet it was. "When England does declare war . . . there will be general war." (Page 259.) England did not declare war at all! "Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided it must fall." (Page 260.) It was not divided not did it fall. "It looked to me like an impossibility now for slavery to be done away." (Page 266.) Yet it was.

I could give scores of such quotations all through her writings, showing how they have failed always and everywhere.

THE REFORM DRESS.

One of the worst blunders Mrs. White ever made, one which plainly showed her fanaticism and that God had nothing to do with her work, was the move she made on dress. First she wrote: "God would not have his people adopt the so-called reform dress," ("Testimonies," vol. 1, page 421). "If women would wear their dresses so as to clear the filth of the streets an inch or two," it would be in harmony with their faith (page 424). Four years passes, and she again writes: "(God would now have his people adopt the reform dress," (page 525). "Nine inches as nearly accords with my views of the matter as I am able to express it in inches," (page 521). Here are two revelations exactly opposite as to the style of dress and the length. God would not have them adopt the reform dress, and then he would; an inch or two, and then nine inches, from the ground is the length. What occasioned this change in the mind of the Lord? The answer is easy: In the time between the two revelations Mrs. White had spent some time at Dr. Jackson's "Home," Dansville, N. Y. Here a short dress with pants was worn, and she fell in with the idea and soon had a vision requiring its adoption as above. That is the whole of it. But the dress was a shame and a disgrace and an utter failure. Think of a modest woman on the streets with pants on, and her dress cut off half way up to the knees! But for about eight years Mrs. W. pushed that dress with all her power, put it on herself as an example, till most of the sisters put it on. But it created a terrible commotion. Husbands swore, brothers refused to walk with their sisters, men sneered and boys hooted. Some of the sisters argued, some

cried, some rebelled, but most submitted. I know, for my own wife wore it for eight years—had to. Finally, Mrs. White quietly dropped it off herself, and now no one wears it. Here they are all living in direct violation of a plain revelation from God! Common sense came out ahead of fanaticism.

HER REVELATIONS INFLUENCED BY OTHERS.

Mrs. White originates nothing. In her visions she always sees just what she and her friends at the time happen to believe and be interested in. Her husband and other leading men first accept or study out a theory and talk it till her mind is full of it. Then when she is in her trance that is just what she sees. One who has been all through the Advent work and well knows, says:

"Let it be further noticed that the visions have brought out no points of faith held by the Seventh-Day Adventists. They, with Elder and Mrs. White, received the Sabbath truth from the Seventh-Day Baptists; the second personal coming of Christ from Wm. Miller; the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, and faith in Christ as the only hope of immortality, from Geo. Storrs; their theory of the sanctuary, and its cleansing commencing in 1844, from O. R. L. Crozier; and their view of the prophetic periods from Wm. Miller." H. E. CARVER.

Mrs. White herself confesses that she is influenced by others in writing her "Testimonies." Thus: "What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it. . . . I yielded my judgment to that of others and wrote what appeared in No. 11. . . . In this I did wrong." (Testimonies, Vol. 1, p. 563.) She here "lets the cat out of the bag." She made such a blunder that she was compelled to blame some one else for it and so to tell the truth that she was influenced by others to do it! Fine inspiration!

Eld. White was well aware of how she was influenced by others to see and write as they impressed her to do. Thus he wrote me: "The pressure has been terribly hard on my poor wife. She has been impressed very much by elders Butler and Haskell." Signed James White, Battle Creek, Mich., July 13, 1881. Again: "I think wife has been more severe than the Lord really required her to be in some cases. Satan has taken great advantage. . . . Elders Butler and Haskell have had an influence over her that I hope to see broken. It has nearly ruined her. These men must not be supported by our people to do as they have done."—James White, Battle Creek, May 24, 1881. I have on file the letters in his own handwriting. That shows the confidence which her own husband had in her revelations.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MRS. WHITE'S VISIONS.

I believe the proof is abundant that Mrs. White's visions are merely the result of nervous disease, a complication of hysteria, catalepsy and ecstasy. That she honestly believes in them herself, I do not doubt. I have personally known four other women, all Seventh-Day Adventists, who likewise had visions. All were excellent, sincere Christians, and fully believed in their own visions. But all were sickly, nervous females, and hysterical. Not being encouraged in them, but opposed by their ministers, they finally gave them up. In every age such cases have been numerous, of whom a few, like Mrs. Southcott, Mrs. Ann Lee and Mrs. White, have become noted for awhile.

Medical books and cyclopedias, under the words "hysteria," "catalepsy" and "ecstasy," give a complete description of Mrs. White's case, as stated by herself and husband. This anyone may see by one day's study. My space will allow me to give but a few points.

1. The sex—a female. "The vast preponderance of hysteria in the female sex has given rise to its name," ("Raynold's System of Medicine," article "Hysteria"). So say all the authorities. See Dr. Kellogg's "Hand-Book." This fits Mrs. White.

2. The age. "Hysteria is infinitely more common among females, beginning usually from fifteen to eighteen or twenty years of age," ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," by Roberts, p. 399).

"In the female sex, hysteria usually commences at or about the time of puberty, *i. e.*, between twelve and eighteen years of age," ("Raynold's System of Medicine," article "Hysteria"). Here again it exactly fits the case of Mrs. White. She had her first vision at the age of seventeen. (See "Testimonies," vol. 1, p. 62.)

At first she had visions almost daily, but they have grown less frequent as she grew older and healthier, till after about forty-five years of age, since which time she has not averaged one in five years, and even these are short and light, till now she has ceased entirely to have them. Now read this: "Hysteria generally attacks women from the age of puberty to the decline of the peculiar functions of her sex," (Johnson's Cyclopedic, article "Hysteria"). Mrs. White's case again, exactly.

3. The cause. Hysteria, catalepsy, epilepsy and ecstasy are all nervous diseases, which sometimes co-exist or alternate or blend together so it is difficult to distinguish them. The causes noted are: "1. Mental disturbance, especially emotional; for example, a sudden fright, prolonged grief or anxiety. 2. Physical influences affecting the brain, as a *blow or fall on the head.*" (Theory and Practice of Medicine," Roberts, p. 393.) "In ten of my cases the disease was due to reflex causes, which consisted in six cases of injuries to the head." (Fundamental nervous disease," Putzel, p. 66.)

This is Mrs. White again, exactly. At the age of nine she received a terrible blow on the face, which broke her nose and nearly killed her. She was unconscious for three weeks. (See her life in "Testimony," vol. 1, pp. 9-10.) This shock to her nervous system was the real cause of all the visions she afterwards had.

4. Always weakly and sickly. "Most hysterical persons are out of health." ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," Roberts, p. 204.) "Fainting fits, palpitation of the heart appear very frequently and are sometimes so severe that persons affected with them seem to be dying." ("Encyclopedia Americana," article "hysteria.") Now read the life of Mrs. White, and she tells it over and over, times without number, about fainting frequently, pain at the heart, and about being so sick that she expected to die. And it is remarkable that most of her visions were immediately preceded by one of these fainting death spells. This shows plainly that they are the result of nervous weakness. Her first vision is a fair sample. "My health failed rapidly. I could only talk in a whisper, or broken tone of voice. One physician said . . . he thought I could not live long; might die very suddenly . . . I would often awake with my mouth full of blood. My first vision"—and then follows an account of it. ("Spiritual gifts," vol. 2, p. 30.) There was the cause of her vision—sickness. It was really a hysterical or cataleptic fit, and that is all. On page 48, same book, she falls from the wagon and has a vision. Pages 51-52, she is insane two weeks, and has a vision. Page 62—sick again, and another vision. Page 83—"Ill and fainted; wrapt in vision." Page 84—"I often fainted like one dead." Page 98—fainted, dying, vision. Same order again. Page 148—"I fainted . . . taken off in vision." Who can fail to see the cause of all these visions? On page after page the same story is repeated by herself. In the account of her last vision, Jan. 3, 1875, she was very sick till it ended in a vision. ("Testimonies," vol. 3, p. 570.) Dreadful sick, almost dead, then a vision—this is the story,

times without number, from her own pen. That tells the story: The vision is the result of her physical weakness.

5. Visions in public. "As a rule a fit of hysteria occurs when other persons are present, and never comes on during sleep." ("Theory and Practice of Medicine," by Roberts, p. 401.) Most of her visions occur in public, and generally while she is very sick or when praying or speaking earnestly. This was the case with her first vision. ("Spiritual gifts," vol. 2, p. 30.) So, again, on pages 37, 48, 51, 62, 83, and many more, she has her visions in the presence of many. I do not know that she ever had a vision while alone, or, if so, only once or twice.

6. Does not breathe. "Stoppage of respiration usually complete." "Generally appears to hold his breath." ("Roberts' Theory and Practice of Medicine," pp. 393-394.) Elder White, describing her condition in vision, says: "She does not breathe." ("Life incidents," p. 272.)

7. Has visions of heaven, etc. "Upon recovering from the spell the patient generally remembers his thoughts and feelings more or less accurately, and sometimes tells of wonderful visions that he has seen, of visits to the regions of the blessed," etc. Mrs. White exactly.

8. Importance of self. "There is a prevailing belief in the importance of self, and the patient thinks that she differs from every other human being." ("Raynold's System of Medicine," article "Hysteria.") Mrs. White to a hair. Hear her laud herself: "It is God, and not an erring mortal who has spoken." "God has laid upon my husband and myself a special work." "God has appointed us to a more trying work than he has others." ("Testimonies, vol. 3, pp. 257, 258, 290.)

Space will not allow me to fill out every particular of her experience by quotations from medical works compared with her own statements; but even these given above are sufficient to show the nature and philosophy of her attacks. They are the result of nervous disease; precisely the same as has been often seen in the case of thousands of other sickly females.

TESTIMONY OF THREE PHYSICIANS.

Dr. Fairfield was raised a Seventh-Day Adventist; was for years a physician in their sanitarium at Battle Creek, where he still resides. He has had the best possible opportunity to observe Mrs. White. He writes: "Battle Creek, Mich., Dec. 28, 1887. Rev. D. M. Canright: Dear Sir:—You are undoubtedly right in ascribing Mrs. E. G. White's so-called visions to disease. It has been my opportunity to observe her case a good deal, covering quite a period of years, which, with a full knowledge of her history from the beginning, give me no chance to doubt her ("divine") attacks to be simply hysterical trances. Age itself has almost cured her.

W. J. FAIRFIELD, M. D."

Dr. Wm. Russell, long a Seventh-Day Adventist, and a chief physician in the sanitarium, wrote July 12th, 1869, that he had made up his mind some time in the past, "that Mrs. White's visions were the result of diseased organization or condition of the brain or nervous system." "When giving to a conference at Pilot Grove, Iowa, 1865, an account of her visit at Dr. Jackson's health institute, she stated that the doctor, upon a medical examination, pronounced her a subject of hysteria."

H. E. CARVER.

Here is the testimony of three physicians, who have personally examined Mrs. White. She joined the Millerites in their great excitement of 1843-4. In their meetings she often fainted from excitement. In the enthusiasm and fanaticism of the time many had various "gifts," visions, trances, etc. She drank deeply of their spirit. The grief and disappointment of the passing of the set time were too much for her feeble condition. Says Dr. Roberts: "The exciting cause of the first

hysterical fit is generally some powerful and sudden emotional disturbance." "Sometimes the attack is preceded by disappointment, fear, violent, exciting, or even religious emotions," ("Library of Universal Knowledge," article "Catalepsy"). Just her case in 1844.

HER VISIONS OF HEAVEN, ANGELS, ETC.

Dr. George B. Wood's "Practice of Medicine," page 721 of vol. 2, in treating of mental disorders, and explaining the cause and phenomena of trances, says:

"Ecstasy is an affection in which, with a loss of consciousness of existing circumstances, and insensibility to impression from without, there is an apparent exaltation of the intellectual or emotional functions, as if the individual were raised into a different nature, or different sphere of existence. The patient appears wrapped up in some engrossing thought or feeling, with an expression upon his countenance as of lofty contemplations or ineffable delight. . . . Upon recovering from the spell, the patient generally remembers his thoughts and feelings more or less accurately, and sometimes tells of wonderful visions that he has seen, of visits to the regions of the blessed, of ravishing harmony and splendor, of inexpressible enjoyment of the senses or affections."

A person perfectly familiar with Mrs. W. could not have described her visions more accurately. Another high medical authority, in describing ecstasy and catalepsy, says: "It often happens that the two diseases alternate or co-exist. In ecstasy the limbs are motionless, but not rigid. The eyes are open, the pupils fixed, the livid lips parted in smiles, and the arms extended to embrace the beloved vision. The body is erect and raised to its utmost height, or else is extended at full length in recumbent posture. A peculiar radiant smile illuminates the countenance, and the whole aspect and attitude is that of intense mental exaltation. Sometimes the patient is silent, the mind being apparently absorbed in meditation, or in the contemplation of some beatific vision. Sometimes there is mystical speaking or prophesying, or singing, or the lips may be moved without any sound escaping. . . . Usually there is complete insensibility to external impressions. Ecstasy is often associated with religious monomania. It was formerly quite common among the inmates of convents, and is now not unfrequently met with at camp-meetings and other gatherings of a similar nature. Many truly devout people are extatics."—G. Durant, M. D.; Ph. D., member of the American Medical Association, fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine, etc., etc., recipient of several medals, etc.

This is Mrs. White's case very clearly. Hundreds of similar ones have occurred in every age and are constantly occurring now.

WHAT HARM DOES SHE DO?

Much, every way:

1. It is an error and a deception.
2. She deceives herself and others.
3. She teaches false doctrines.
4. She has a harsh, uncharitable spirit, and begets this in all her followers.
5. She builds up an isolated sect, and thus destroys all their influence for good.
6. Her teachings make her people narrow, bigoted, and gloomy. Thus she blasts the peace of thousands of souls here.
7. It leads her advocates to deceive. Being afraid that it will hurt them in new places, if it is known in what light they really hold her visions, they deny that it is a matter of importance with them. This is

false and deceptive, for they hold faith in her visions to be as important as keeping the Sabbath, and they hold her visions to be as sacred as the Bible.

8. To defend her mistakes and errors, both she and her apologists have to deny the plainest facts and resort to arguments very questionable.

9. To defend her errors, they compare them to supposed errors in the Bible, and thus destroy faith in that book.

10. She rules her whole people with a rod of iron, and dictates to them in everything, even the smallest and most private affairs of family life. She boasts that her work "is to come down to the minutiae of life," ("Testimonies," vol. 2, p. 608). With this idea, she meddles with everything public and private, and all the affairs of families, till it becomes, to a man of spirit, an intolerable bore.

11. Her severity and harshness have driven many to despair, others to back-slide, and others out of the church. The effort to bind her visions as inspired upon the faith and consciences of the whole denomination has produced continual wrangling, division, and much bitter feeling, right among themselves for the last forty years. Families, churches and conferences have been divided over them, while hundreds, yes, thousands, have been driven from them because they would not accept Mrs. White's visions as inspired.

12. They produce doubts and infidelity. When those who have been led to firmly believe them, finally come to see that they have been deceived, then they are in danger of losing faith in everything, and so becoming out and out infidels or at least skeptical. Large numbers have gone to ruin that way. Some have gone to the Spiritualists, some to the Free Thinkers, some to the Shakers, some to the Mormons, and some to the world. They have nearly driven Mrs. White herself into infidelity, and I would not wonder if she yet really became an infidel. Here are her own words: "In the night I have awakened my husband, saying, 'I am afraid that I shall become an infidel,'" ("Testimonies," vol. 1, p. 597).

MRS. WHITE BECOMES RICH.

There is no example in the Bible where a prophet took advantage of his inspiration to enrich himself. They generally worked hard, had little, and died poor. But Mrs. W. began poverty poor. See her own account of it. Testimonies, vol. 1, pp. 75, 82, 83. But as soon as they became leaders, they managed to supply themselves well. Since I knew them, thirty yeas ago, they have had an abundance, and have used means for themselves lavishly. They would always have the best and plenty of it. Everywhere they went they required to be waited upon in the most slavish manner. Mrs. White is furnished two women to wait on her and all their time and expenses are paid by the conference.

When Eld. White died he left some \$15,000 or \$20,000. He was a sharp, scheming man, and took advantage of his position to benefit himself and family, and she aided him in it by her revelations. How different from Mr. Moody. Mrs. White is sixty years old, is worth many thousands, has a large income, has not a single soul dependent upon her, says that time is about to end, urges all to cut down their possessions, yet she owns more than one good home, takes large wages, and seems as eager for money as others. How is this?

OTHER MODERN FALSE PROPHETS.

Mrs. White is only one out of a large number who, in modern times, have claimed to have divine revelations. Each has found zealous followers. Let us notice a few,

1. Swedenborg. He was born in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1688, and died in 1772.

At the age of fifty-five he began to have visions of heaven, hell, angels, and the spiritual world. He says: "I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most mercifully appeared to me, his servant, in the year 1743, when he opened my sight into the spiritual world and enabled me to converse with spirits and angels." Exactly what Mrs. White claims. This work he continued for about thirty years, and wrote about thirty inspired volumes. He made most remarkable predictions, which were exactly fulfilled.

He founded a new religion based upon his revelations, though the Bible is held to. This church has steadily increased, till it has societies in all parts of the world and in the leading languages. They publish three weeklies, five monthly journals and one quarterly, besides many books. He got the start of Mrs. White just one hundred years. His followers believe in him just as implicitly as hers do in her. In many respects both moves are much alike. The above is condensed from Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopedia.

2. Mrs. Joanna Southcott. She was born in England in 1750, of poor parents, and was wholly uneducated. She worked as a domestic servant till over forty years of age. She joined the Methodists in 1790. In 1792 she announced herself as a prophetess, and "published numerous [over sixty] pamphlets setting forth her revelations." (Johnson's Cyclopaedia, article "Southcott.") She had trances the same as Mrs. White does, and announced the speedy advent of Christ. See Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott." She carried on a lucrative trade in the sale of her books. Strange as it may appear, many learned ministers believed in her, and thousands joined her followers, till in a few years they numbered upwards of *one hundred thousand*. She made many predictions which her followers claimed were fulfilled. "The faith of her followers, among whom were several clergymen of the established church, rose to enthusiasm." (Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott.") The following I quote from Schaff-Herzog's Cyclopaedia, article "Sabbatharians." She "regarded herself as the bride of the Lamb, and declared herself, when sixty-four years of age, pregnant with the true Messiah, the 'second Shilo,' whom she would bear Oct. 19, 1814. She surrounded herself with prophets, and in order to prepare the way for the new dispensation, ordered the strictest *observance of the Jewish law and Sabbath*. A costly cradle was kept in readiness for the reception of the Messiah, and for a long time she waited for his birth. At last a supposititious child was declared to be he. But the fraud was detected.... Joanna died in her self-delusion, Dec. 27, 1814; but her followers, who at one time numbered a *hundred thousand continued until 1831 to observe the Jewish Sabbath*." "A post mortem examination showed that she had been suffering from dropsy." (Johnson's Cyclopaedia.) "Death put an end to both her hopes and her fears. With her followers, however, it was otherwise; and, though for a time confounded by her decease, which they could scarcely believe to be real, her speedy resurrection was confidently anticipated. In this persuasion many lived and died, nor is her sect yet extinct." (Encyclopedia Americana, article "Southcott.") See also almost any cyclopaedia.

Let candid people consider these facts. This movement occurring only thirty years before Mrs. White's work, was much like the present Seventh-Day Adventist move. An illiterate woman is the leader. She has visions, writes numerous pamphlets and revelations, predicts the speedy advent of Christ, and says the Jewish Sabbath must be kept. Her honesty is plainly manifest; her enthusiasm and that of her followers is great. In a short period one hundred thousand accept her "testimonies" and keep the seventh day. The present Seventh-

Day Adventist move is small and feeble compared to that. After forty-three years' effort they number less than one-third as many. And here notice the terrible tenacity of fanaticism when once started. When Joanna died we would have supposed that all sane persons would have given it up; but not a bit of it. They fix it up some way and go right on, and there they are now. So with the followers of Mrs. White. No matter what blunders or failures she makes, they fix them up some way and go right on. They will do it after she is dead and gone.

3. Ann Lee and the Shakers. These are so well known in America that I need say but little about them. Ann Lee, their leader, was born in England in 1736, died in 1784. Like Mrs. White, "she received no education." She joined a society who were having remarkable religious exercises, and soon began "to have visions and make revelations," which, just like Mrs. White, she called "testimonies." "Henceforth she claimed to be directed by revelations and visions," (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, article "Ann Lee"). She was accepted as leader and as "the second appearing of Christ." Like Mrs. White, she required a "peculiar kind of dress," "opposed war and the use of pork," (Johnson's Encyclopedia, article "Shakers"). They have no intercourse with other churches; are renowned for their purity and devotion. They number about 8,000. A careful comparison shows many points of similarity between Mrs. Lee and Mrs. White. The main evidence upon which Adventists rely for proof of Mrs. White's inspiration is the purity of her life and the high moral and religious tone of her writings. They say her revelations must either be of God or Satan. If of Satan, they would not teach such purity and holiness. The same reasoning will prove Mrs. Lee also a true prophetess, for she exceeds Mrs. White in this line, so that "Shaker" has become a synonym for honesty. Adventists, please note this point.

4. Joseph Smith and the Mormons. This prophet and his visions and revelations are so well known that I mention them briefly. Smith was born in 1805, and died in 1844, the year before Mrs. White began her revelations. He came out in a great religious awakening, as Mrs. White did in the Advent move of 1843-4. In 1833 he also began to have "visions" and "revelations" and see angels. The second advent of Christ was at hand, he said, hence the name, "Latter-Day Saints." His mission was to introduce "the new dispensation." They are the "saints," and all other churches are "heathen" or Gentiles. So Mrs. White's followers are the saints; all other churches are "Babylon" and apostate.

The proof of their inspiration beats Mrs. White all to pieces. They work many miracles, as the Adventists themselves own; have the gift of tongues, and can show many predictions strikingly fulfilled. I have met them frequently, seen Smith's son, and know them well. They have increased ten times as fast as the Adventists. They also have a new Bible, a new revelation, have started a new sect, and will have nothing to do with others, but prosylite from all.

So Mrs. White, with her revelations, is only one of many similar cases of late. One fact, which I know to be a fact, has impressed me deeply. It is this: A person who has once fully accepted the doctrines of any one of these modern religions, is as a general rule forever spoiled for anything else. Once a Swedenborgian, or a Shaker, or a Mormon, or a Seventh-Day Adventist, and they are that forever; or else they go into unbelief and are nothing. The exceptions are few. The reason is, because they have first had their confidence in everything else destroyed. Then, when it is shaken in their new faith, they have nowhere to go. Doubt and infidelity are the result. That a few years will bring this fearful catastrophe to the followers of Mrs. White, I feel certain.

CHAPTER III.

WHY CHRISTIANS KEEP SUNDAY.

Almost universally christians regard Sunday as a sacred day. Do they offer for this any adequate reasons? Yes, indeed, and that which has been satisfactory to all the best and ablest christians the church has ever had. After keeping the seventh day and extensively advocating it for over a quarter of a century, I became satisfied that it was an error, and that christians are right in observing Sunday. I will briefly notice a few arguments for first day observance.

The Lord's day in Rev. 1: 10, is Sunday.

That the "Lord's Day" of Rev. 1: 10, is the first day of the week, I believe is clearly proved by facts. If this be so, then all must admit that this day is recognized in the New Testament as a sacred day—a day belonging to the Lord. Sabbatarians, feeling the great force of this, stoutly deny that this means the first day, but claim that it refers to the seventh day, Sabbath.

Let us see. "The Lord's Day" is a term now commonly applied to the first day of the week, in honor of the Lord's resurrection on that day. Thus: "We believe the scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's day. [Baptist church directory, p. 171.] Excepting a few Sabbatarians of late date, all christendom, numbering four hundred and sixteen million people, of all sects and all nations, agree in applying the term, the "Lord's Day" to Sunday. So every dictionary, lexicon, and cyclopedia applies that term to the seventh day. Here is a grand, undeniable fact of to-day. When did this stream begin? Let us trace it up to its head.

Going back over 300 years ago to the reformers, we find all christians calling Sunday the "Lord's Day." Calvin, voicing the universal sentiment of his time, says: "The ancients have, not without sufficient reason, substituted what we call the Lord's Day in the room of the Sabbath." [Calvin's institute book, 2, chap. 8, sec. 34.] Luther, Zwingle, Beza, Bucer, Cranmer, Tyndale, etc., likewise speak of the Lord's Day as the first day of the week. Here is another great fact as to the Lord's Day. It was in existence and universally observed 300 years ago.

Going back again 800 years more, or 1,100 years ago, to A. D., 784, the Archbishop of York, England, wrote: "Let nothing else be done on the Lord's Day, but to attend on God." Andrews Hist., Sab. p. 377.

Passing back to about A. D. 450, we come to the history of the church written by Sozomen. In book 2, chap. 8, p. 22, of Constantine, he says: "He honored the Lord's Day, because on it he arose from the dead." This shows what was meant by Lord's Day in those early times.

Stepping back once more to about A. D. 400, we reach the great theologian of the early church, St. Augustine. He says: "The day now known as the Lord's Day, the eighth, namely, which is also the first day of the week." [Letters of St. Augustine, letter 55, chap. 13.] He says the first day of the week was known as the Lord's Day in his times.

Going back again about 100 years more to the era of Constantine the Great, the first christian Emperor, we reach Eusebius, the "Father of church history," A. D. 324. He constantly and familiarly uses the term "Lord's Day" for the first day of the week. One passage: "They (the

Jewish christians) also observe the Sabbath, and other discipline of the Jews, just like them; but, on the other hand, they also celebrate the Lord's days very much like us in commemoration of his resurrection." [Ecl. Hist., book 3, chap. 27.] Here Lord's Day is distinguished from the Jewish Sabbath, and is said to be kept on account of the resurrection. Speaking of Eusebius, Eld. J. N. Andrews, the great historian of the seventh day says: "In his time, A. D. 324, Lord's Day had become a common designation of Sunday." [Testimony of the Fathers, p. 52.] That is a good confession. So here we have another great fact, showing that Sunday was the Lord's Day at that early time.

This brings us to the era of the early christian Fathers. I quote them as translated in the "Ante Nicene Christian Library," a most valuable and trustworthy work.

A. D. 306. Peter, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt: "But the Lord's Day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it, he rose again." Canon 15.

A. D. 270. Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea in Asia Minor: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day will lead us to celebrate it." Chap. 10.

About A. D. 250. The Apostolical Constitution: "On the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's Day, meet more dilligently." Book 2, sec. 7.

A. D. 250. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in Africa: "The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath and the Lord's Day." Epistle 58, sec. 4.

A. D. 200. Tertullian in Africa: "Of his use of the term "Lord's Day," Elder Andrews, the Sabbatarian historian says: "He speaks of the Lord's Day as the eighth day, and is the second of the early writers who makes an application of this term to Sunday, if we allow Clement to have really spoken of it." [Testimony of the Fathers, p. 63.] Tertullian says: "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradiction to those who call this day their Sabbath." [Apology, chap. 16.] "We, however, just as we have received, only on the day of the Lord's resurrection, ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude, deferring even our business." [On prayer, chap. 23.]

A. D. 194. Clement of Alexandria, Egypt: "He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's Day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself. [Book VII. chap. XII.]

A. D. 180. Bardensanes, Edessa, Asia: "On one day, the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together." [Book of the Laws of Countries.]

A. D. 150. Barnabas: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead." [Chap. 17.]

A. D. 140. Justin Martyr: "But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead." [Apology, Chap. 67.]

A. D. 96. St. John on Patmos: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Rev. 1: 10.

A. D. 60. Luke, Asia Minor: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to bread, Paul preached unto them." [Acts, 20: 7.]

Who can fail to see that the "Lord's Day" and the "first day of the week" are spoken of in the same manner both by the apostles and down through all the fathers and reformers to our day? To every unbiased mind the evidence must be conclusive that the Lord's Day of Rev. 1: 10, written A. D. 96, is the resurrection day the same as it is in every instance where it is used by all the christian fathers immediately following John. Mark this fact. *In not one single instance either in the Bible*

or in all history can a passage be found where the term the *Lord's Day* is applied to the seventh day, the *Jewish Sabbath*. This fact should be, and is decisive as to the meaning in Rev. 1: 10. Even Sabbatarians themselves do not call the seventh day the *Lord's Day*, but always say "Sabbath day."

TESTIMONY OF LEXICONS AND CYCLOPEDIAS.

Webster: "Sunday, the first day of the week; the christian Sabbath; the *Lord's Day*."

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible: "*Lord's Day*. The first day of the week, or Sunday, of every age of the church."

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia: "*Lord's Day*, the oldest and best designation of the Christian Sabbath, first used by St. John." [Rev. 1: 10.]

Buck's Theological Dictionary, art. Sabbath. "It (the first day of the week) is called the *Lord's Day*." [Rev. 1: 10.]

Johnson's New Universal Cyclopedia: "*Lord's Day*, a name for the first day of the week, derived from Rev. 1: 10."

The Greek words rendered "*Lord's Day*," [Rev. 1: 10,] are *Kuriake hemera*. *Kuriake*, the adjective, is from the noun *kurios*, and is thus defined:

"*Kuriakos*—Of, or pertaining to the Lord, i. e., the Messiah; the *Lord's*. 1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 1: 10."—*Greenfield*.

"*Kuriakos*—Pertaining to the Lord, to the Lord Jesus Christ; e. g., *kuriakos deipnon*, the *Lord's supper*. [1 Cor. 11:20;] *kuriake hemera*, the *Lord's Day* [Rev. 1:10]."—*Robinson*.

"*Kuriakos*—Of, belonging to, concerning a lord or master, especially belonging to the Lord (Christ); hence *kuriake hemera*, the *Lord's Day*."—*Liddell & Scott*.

"This is the usual name of Sunday with the subsequent Greek fathers."—*Parkhurst*.

Kuriakos—Pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ; the *Lord* [1 Cor. 11: 20; Rev. 1: 10."—*Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon*.

So we might go through all the lexicons, finding the same definitions in all. Not a single one refers this term to God the Father, but without an exception all refer it to the Lord Jesus. There must be some good reason for this universal agreement.

So the commentators. "*The Lord's Day*. The first day of the week." [Dr. Clarke on Rev. 1: 10.]

"On the *Lord's Day*, which can be meant of no other than the day on which the Lord Jesus arose from the dead, even the first day of the week." [Scott on Rev. 1: 10.]

Dr. Barne's says: "This was a day particularly devoted to the Lord Jesus, for (a) that is the natural meaning of the word *Lord* as used in the New Testament; and (b) if the Jewish Sabbath was intended to be designated, the word Sabbath would have been used."

Prof. Hackett, in his comments on Acts 1: 24, says: "*Kuriakos*, when taken absolutely in the New Testament, refers generally to Christ."

"*Lord's Day*, namely, the first day of the week."—*Burkett's Notes on the N. T.*

"*The Lord's Day*, the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week."—*Eclectic Commentary on Rev. 1: 10*.

"*The Lord's Day*. The first day of the week, commemorating the *Lord's resurrection*." [Family Bible with notes, on Rev. 1: 10.] Go through the whole list of commentaries, and all say the same thing. Have they no ground for this? Yes, good enough to be conclusive.

1. In all the Bible, the seventh day is never once called the *Lord's Day*.

2. "*The Sabbath*" was the term invariably used for the Jewish seventh day. John himself always used that term when speaking of the

seventh day. [See John 5: 9, 10, 16, 18; 7: 22, 23; 9: 14, 16; 19: 31.] Had he meant that day in Rev. 1: 10, he certainly would have said "Sabbath Day," not Lord's Day.

3. The Greek word *kuriakos*, is a new word originating in the New Testament and found only in one other place [1 Cor. 11: 20.] "the Lord's supper." Beyond dispute it here applies to the Lord Jesus.

"The adjective *kuriake* was 'formed by the apostles themselves.' [Winer, N. T. Gram., p. 226.] To the same effect testify Liddell and Scott. Of the mode of dealing with words in their lexicon, they say: 'We have always sought to give the earliest authority for its use first. Then, if no change was introduced by later writers, we have left it with that early authority alone.' (Pref. p. 20.) When we turn to the word *kuriakos*, they give as their first citation, and therefore, as its earliest authority, the New Testament. The question now arises, why form a new word to express a sacred institution, if the institution itself be not new? Winer says: 'Entirely new words and phrases were constructed mainly by composition, and for the most part to meet some sensible want.' (Gram. p. 25.) What conceivable sensible want respecting the Sabbath did the Old Testament leave unexpressed? Clearly the new want arose from a new institution. This position receives additional strength from the fact that the only other New Testament use of *kuriakos* is found in 1 Cor. 11: 20, designating 'the Lord's supper,' which is certainly a new institution." (Peter Vogel in debate with Waggoner, p. 110.)

This is a strong point and should be decisive.

4. As the gospel was a new institution or a new dispensation, it necessitated the use of new terms. So we have "christians," [Acts 11: 26.] as the new name for God's people; "apostles," "evangelists," and "deacons" as the officers of the new church; "baptism" as the initiatory rite into the church, the "Lord's supper" [1 Cor. 11: 20] and the "Lord's Day," as institutions of that church. [Rev. 1: 10.] The new relations originated by the gospel could not be expressed by the old terms of the law; hence new words and new terms had to be used. For 1,500 years "Sabbath" had been the established name of the weekly rest day of the law and was still used by all for the seventh day. Hence if christians were to have a new weekly rest day commemorating gospel facts, they must find a new term for it. Hence we have "Lord's Day."

UNDER THE GOSPEL JESUS IS LORD.

There is good reason why in the gospel the "Lord's Day" is Christ's day. Officially and emphatically he is the one Lord in this dispensation. Thus, "All power in heaven and in earth is given" to him, [Matt. 28: 18.] he is "the head over all things to the church." [Eph. 1: 22.] The Father "hath made him both Lord and Christ," [Acts 2: 36.] so that "he is Lord of all" [Acts 10: 36.] "that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord" [Phil. 2: 11] in the gospel there is "One Lord," Christ, and "One God," the Father. [Eph. 4: 5, 6.] Paul makes this very plain. "To us there is but one God—the Father of whom are all things;" "One Lord—Jesus Christ—by whom are all things," [1 Cor. 8: 6.] Hence as Lord of this new dispensation, all judgment is committed to him [John 5: 22:] all must stand at his judgment seat, [Rom. 14: 10.] we are to keep his commandments, [John 14: 15.] fulfill his law, [Gal. 6: 2.] bear his name, [Acts 11: 26.] be baptized in his name, [Acts 19: 5.] "because ye belong to Christ," [Mark 9: 41.] All through the New Testament, the Lord commonly refers to Christ, for that is his official name and position in this dispensation. Thus: "A Savior, which is Christ the Lord," [Luke 2: 11.] "The Lord appointed other seventy," [Luke 10: 1.] "The Lord is risen," [Luke 24: 36:] "I then your Lord," [John 13: 14:] "My Lord and my God." [John 20: 28:] "Lord Jesus receive my spirit" [Acts 7: 59:] "the brethren of the Lord" [1 Cor. 9: 5:] The Lord's death," [1 Cor. 11: 26:] "Jesus is the Lord," 1 Cor.

12:3:] "James, the Lord's brother," [Gal. 1:19.] "Ye serve the Lord Christ," [Col. 3:24.] The Lamb.... He is Lord of Lords." [Rev. 17:14] The term Lord applies to Christ about four hundred and fifty times in the New Testament. Hence in the gospel all things are commonly spoken of as belonging to Jesus as, "the disciples of the Lord," etc. [Acts 9:1] Now read together "The Lord's body," [1 Cor. 11:29,] "this cup of the Lord," "blood of the Lord," [Verse 27,] "Lord's death," Verse 26,] "the Lord's table" [1 Cor. 10:21,] "The Lord's supper" [1 Cor. 11:20,] "the Lord's day," [Rev. 1:10,] Do not all refer to the same Lord? Of course they do, and who can fail to admit it? Under the official jurisdiction of Jesus the Lord, come of necessity all the institutions now obligatory. Hence Lord's Day is Christ's day, and that is the way it is always used in the early fathers as we have seen.

Objections answered: The seventh day is called the "Sabbath of the Lord," [Ex. 20:10;] "my holy day," [Isa. 58:13;] and Jesus says he was "Lord of the Sabbath day," [Mark 2:28.] Isn't that the Lord's day?

No; for: 1. The word Sabbath is used in each of these three texts but is not in Rev. 1:10. 2. All three texts were spoken before the cross and under the law; but Rev 1:10 is under the gospel. 3. The Jewish Sabbath was abolished at the cross, [Col. 2:16; Rom. 14:5; Gal. 4:10], sixty years before John wrote on Patmos, hence that could not have been the Lord's day when John wrote. 5. The fact that the term "Lord's day" immediately after the time of John, whenever used by the early church, was always applied to Sunday, and never to the Sabbath, settles its meaning in Rev. 1:10.

But it is objected that John and all the other evangelists in the gospels call Sunday simply "the first day of the week," instead of the Lord's day. Hence if John, in Rev. 1:10, had meant that day he would have said "first day of the week," as he did in the gospel. The answer is easy. Jesus predicted that he would be killed and rise the third day. Each evangelist is careful to show that the prediction was fulfilled. Hence they were particular to give the names of those three days as they were called by the Jews; that is, "preparation day," "Sabbath day," and "first day of the week." This is a sufficient answer. Moreover, it is probable that the resurrection day was not immediately called the Lord's day; but by the time John wrote the Revelation, A. D. 96, it had come to be the well known name for that day, as we have shown.

WHY IT IS FITTING THAT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK SHOULD BE THE MEMORIAL DAY OF THE GOSPEL.

Of all things used to commemorate past events, a memorial day is the best. A monument, a statue, a college, and the like are local and only seen by the few; but a day comes to all and regularly. Hence with what enthusiasm every nation celebrates its memorial days, as our own 4th of July. So religion has consecrated memorial days, as the Sabbath, the Passover, Pentecost, and others of the Jewish age. And shall the grandest of all institutions, the gospel, have no memorial day? If so it would be the one only exception among all the religions of the world and a great loss to the church. But why theorize? It is the grandest and best known fact in all the earth to-day that the Christian church has a memorial day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, the Lord's day. It is regularly observed in every nation under Heaven. We have already shown how *this* day has always from the very days of the apostles, been regarded as a memorial day. It only remains to inquire if it was the one day best adapted to this purpose. Study the life of Jesus, scan every noted day in it, in the year, in the month, in the week, and it must be admitted by all that no other than the resurrection day could be thought of for a moment. Think over the days of the week. How meager are

the events of any other day compared with those of the resurrection day. Monday what? Tuesday? Wednesday? Thursday his betrayal; Friday his death; Saturday in the grave. Would we select any of these days as a memorial day for a rejoicing church? Surely not. But now look at Sunday.

1. The resurrection day is the grandest in all the gospel, yes, in all the world, if not in the universe.

2. On this day Jesus established the fact of the resurrection and of a future life and so confirmed all the promises of God and the hopes of the church by his resurrection. See Acts 17:31.

3. On this day he was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead. Rom. 1:4.

4. On this day he repeatedly appeared to his disciples. Mark 16:9-11; Matt. 28:8-10; Luke 24:34; Mark 16:12-18; John 20:19-23.

5. So then it became a day of joy and gladness, John 20:20; Luke 24:41; and as such it has always been celebrated.

6. On this day Jesus blessed them and bestowed upon them the gift of the Holy Ghost. John 20:19-23.

7. On this day the disciples were begotten again to a lively hope by his resurrection. 1 Pet. 1:3.

8. On this day Jesus ascended to his Father and received all power in heaven and in earth. John 20:17-23; Matt. 28:18.

9. On this day many of the dead saints arose. Matt. 27:52-53; death was conquered, the grave overcome, Rev. 1:18; the devil defeated, salvation secured, while earth and heaven rejoiced together.

10. Around this day cluster all the hopes of a lost but redeemed world. Jesus might have suffered and died and still men would have been lost. It was the resurrection that brought life.

Memorable day, one that should stir the heart of every Christian and move sinners to repentance as induced it has done every week from that day on. "The Lord's Day," how appropriate the title for that grand day on which our Lord triumphed over all and laid deep and secure the foundation of the Christian church. Most appropriately, then, has it become the one memorial day of the gospel, the day of gladness and rejoicing. Shall we, then, call it a pagan day? the pope's day? the mark of the beast? a day hateful to God and an abomination to Christ? God forbid.

THE EIGHT DAY OF JOHN 20:26.

I have become satisfied myself that the meeting of Christ with his disciples "after eight days," John 20:26, was on Sunday. He had met with them the previous Sunday evening. Verse 19. Here "after eight days" he meets them again. Sabbatarians count up and satisfy themselves that this occurred on Monday or Tuesday. But compare this with the expression "after three days." The number of the day after his death on which Christ was to rise is given in three ways. 1. "In three days," Matt. 26:61; 27:40. 2. "The third day," Matt. 16:21; 20:19. 3. "After three days," Matt. 26:60; Mark 8:31. All these expressions mean the same. He died Friday and rose Sunday; hence Sunday was "three days," "the third day" and "after three days" in their common way of speaking. In the same way "In eight days," "on the eighth day" and "after eight days" would all be the same, that is the next Sunday, or eighth day.

What strengthens this position is the well known fact that the term, "the eighth day," became a common term for the resurrection day among all the early Christian fathers. Thus Eld. Andrews, the seventh day historian writing of Dionysias, A. D., 170, says of Sunday, "Every writer who precedes Dionysias calls it 'first day of the week,' 'the eighth day,' or Sunday." Testimony of the fathers, p 52. Thus Barnabus, A. D., 150,

says: "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead." Epistle of Barnabas, Chap. 15. Justin Martyr A. D., 140, says: "The first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and [yet] remains the first." Dialogue with Trypho, Chap. 41. And Cyprian A. D., 250., says: "Because the eighth day, that is the first day after the sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give us circumcision of the spirit, the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day." Epistle 58, Sect. 4. Where did the early church get the idea that the eighth day was the Lord's day, if not from the apostles? Evidently, then, the meeting in John 20:26 was on Sunday. The only visits of Jesus with his disciples which the Holy Spirit saw fit to date carefully are those occurring on Sunday,

PENTECOST, ACTS 2.

After the day of resurrection, the day of Pentecost stands out with more prominence than any other day in the New Testament. Never was the power of the Holy Ghost over the hearts of men so mightily manifested as in this opening of the gospel work. That this event occurred on Sunday has been generally belived by the church ever since. Was not this so ordered in the providence of God on purpose to mark that day as a prominent one under the gospel?

ACTS 20:7.

All agree that the disciples had some regular day for meetings. Paul said: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." Heb. 10:25. This implies a regular time and a stated place for meetings. Reproving them for making the Lord's supper a feast, Paul says: "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper," but rather to feast, 1 Cor. 11:20. This indicates that they had a place and a time to come together for the supper. There is not the slightest evidence that the Christians ever had the Lord's supper or held distinctively Christian worship—on the Jewish Sabbath. In every case where meetings on the Sabbath are mentioned it is in connection with the regular Jewish worship. There is no record that Christians ever met alone for worship on that day. They certainly could not have had the Lord's supper in the synagogues on the Sabbath with the Jews. Nor is there the least intimation that it was ever tried. They must, therefore, have met by themselves in some other place than the synagogue and on some other day. Turning to Acts 20:7, we read: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together."

Here they met by themselves, and in an upper room, for the Lord's supper. The time is the first day of the week. The incidental manner in which it is mentioned shows that what they did was a well understood custom among them—"When they came together to break bread upon the first day of the week." Three things are mentioned: 1. They came together. It is mentioned as though all knew it was common for them to do this. 2. To break bread. This again is stated as though all knew that this, too, was a common practice with Christians. 3. Upon the first day of the week. Like the other two items, this is mentioned as a well understood practice among them; hence no explanation is given of it. Notice the further fact, verse 6, that Paul was there seven days, yet no notice whatever is taken of the Sabbath day, not even to name it, while the first day is prominently noticed. The breaking of bread and the as-

sembling on the first day of the week, it will be noticed, are connected together. Notice further, that though Paul was there a whole week and over the Jewish Sabbath, yet the Lord's supper is not administered till Sunday. This shows that for some reason Sunday was regarded by them as the only proper day for it.

Sabbatarians argue that this meeting at Troas was on Saturday evening and hence Paul went on his journey Sunday morning. Even if this were so, it would not prove that Paul did not regard Sunday, for, hastening if possible to be at Jerusalem on Pentecost, verse 16, he had to go when the vessel went whether he liked to or not, for he was only a passenger. See verse 13 and Chap. 21:12. But it is more probable that Luke reckoned time after the Roman method, from midnight to midnight, as John did in John 20:19. "The same day at evening, being the first day of the week. Here Sunday evening is reckoned as belonging to the first day. Luke wrote for the Gentiles, was a learned man himself, and wrote Acts long after the resurrection when Roman ways were coming more to be adopted. Moreover the meeting at Troas was on the first day of the week and they departed "on the morrow," verse 7, which surely could not have been on the same day.

With Acts 20 let us read 1 Cor. 16:1-2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." What Paul here directs the Corinthians to do he had also established among the churches at Galatia, verse 1. And this letter is addressed to "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord," Chap. 1:2. He also says that what he writes must be received as "the commandments of the Lord." Chap. 14:47. Here, then, is an inspired commandment of the Lord Jesus touching the first day of the week and it is to all that call upon his name. This requires a definite act of religious duty to be performed regularly upon each recurring Sunday, for this did not relate to simplify one first day but to each one as it came. They are to lay apart on that day a portion for the poor out of what God gives them. This implies that it would be with them a day of leisure and devotion when they would be at home, have the time, and be in a proper frame of mind to do this benevolent act—an act of worship well pleasing to God. Phil. 4:18. Of old God had said none "shall appear before the Lord empty." Dent. 16:16. On this Dr. Clark remarks: "The apostle follows more the rule of the synagogue; it was the regular custom among the Jews to make their collections for the poor on the Sabbath day." For this purpose they had "The purse of the alms", or what we would term the *poor's box*. This is what the apostle seems to mean when he says, let him lay by him in store; let him put it in the alms purse or in the poor's box." On this text Dr. Barnes truthfully remarks: "There can have been no reason why this day should have been designated except that it was a day set apart to religion and therefore deemed a proper day for the exercise of benevolence towards others." Why did Paul name Sunday rather than any other day of the week if it was not a religious day?

We have now found three things which the disciples did on Sunday. 1. They assembled together. 2. They had the Lord's supper. 3. They gave for the poor. Opening to the very first of the early Christian fathers we find that it was the custom of all Christians to do just these things ever Sunday. Thus Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, in his apology, chapter 67, says: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memories of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read. . . . bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgiving, according to his ability, and the people assent.

saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president,—who succors the orphans and widows.”

This shows that our conclusion from the above texts was correct. That the early Christians partook of the Lord's supper every Sunday, is acknowledged on all hands.

Dr. Scott, on Acts 20:9, says: “This ordinance seems to have been constantly administered every Lord's Day.”

Shaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Art. “Lord's Supper” says: “Originally the communion was administered every day, then every Sunday.”

“It is well known that the primitive Christians administered the Encharest every Lord's Day.”—*Doddridge*.

“In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's supper every Lord's Day.”—*Matthew Henry*.

“Every first day of the week.”—*Carson*.

“All antiquity concurs in evincing that, for the first three centuries, all the churches broke bread once a week.”—*Alex. Campbell, in “Christian System,” p. 325.*

The Apostolic Constitutions, about A. D. 250 says, that on “the Lord's Day meet more diligently . . . [partaking of] the oblation the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food.”—Book 2, sect. 7, paragraph 55. Again, “We solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's day.”—Book 7, sect. 2, par. 36.

Fabian, bishop of Rome, A. D. 250: “On each Lord's day the oblation of the altar should be made by all men and women in bread and wine.”—*Decrees of Fabian, b. 5, chap. 7.*

These testimonies throw great light upon the passages in the New Testament where the first day of the week, the Lord's day, is referred to. They show that a weekly celebration of that day was established in all churches by the apostles themselves.

WHY I GAVE UP THE SEVENTH DAY.

I gave up the observance of the seventh day because I became fully convinced that the evidence was not sufficient to justify its observance, and that the blessing of God did not go with the keeping of it. Like thousands of others, when I embraced the seventh-day Sabbath I thought that the argument was all on one side, so plain that one hour's reading ought to settle it, so clear that no man could reject the Sabbath and be honest. I felt willing to meet the world in its defence. The only marvel to me was that everybody did not see and embrace it.

But after keeping it twenty-eight years; after having persuaded more than a thousand others to keep it; after having read my Bible through, verse by verse, more than twenty times; after having scrutinized, to the very best of my ability, every text, line and word in the Bible having the remotest bearing upon the Sabbath question; after having looked up all these, both in the original and in many translations; after having searched in lexicons, concordances, commentaries and dictionaries; after having read armfuls of books on both sides of the question; after having read every line in all the early church fathers upon this point; and having written several works in favor of the seventh day, which was satisfactory to my brethren; after having debated the question for more than a dozen times; after seeing the fruits of keeping it, and after weighing all the evidence in the fear of God and of the judgment, I am fully settled in my own mind and conscience that the evidence is against the keeping of the seventh day. Now, if others think that they know better about this question than I do, and that they

can settle it in a day, as I once did, I shall not quarrel with them, but pity their credulity.

I will take up briefly the main arguments upon which Sabbatarians rely for rejecting Sunday and keeping Saturday. If these fail, it will not be necessary to spend time on the minor ones as they must fall together.

CHAPTER IV.

DID THE POPE CHANGE THE SABBATH?

The one great point in the Sabbath question upon which Seventh-day Adventists stake the most, upon which they insist the strongest, which they repeat the most frequently and the most confidently, is that the pope of Rome did change the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day. They assert that this is all the authority Sunday keepers have for observing that day. Sunday is the pope's Sabbath, and Sunday keeping is the mark of the beast (Rev. 14:9-12), a terrible sin in the sight of God. See almost any work on the Sabbath published by them. Thus:

"Here we find the mark of the beast. The very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, on the part of the Catholic church, without any authority from the Bible."—*The Mark of the Beast*, p. 23.

"Sunday-keeping must be the 'mark of the beast.'"—*The Marvel of Nations*, by U. Smith, p. 183.

To this claim Mrs. White has set the seal of divine inspiration. She says: "The change of the Sabbath is the sign or mark of the authority of the Romish church." "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark."—*Great Controversy*, Vol. 4, p. 281.

This settles it with every Seventh-day Adventist. My experience is that a belief of this as a fact induces more persons to give up Sunday for Saturday than all other arguments made by the seventh-day people. Convince a man that Sunday-keeping is only a Catholic institution, a rival to the Lord's Sabbath and hateful to God, and of course, if he has any conscience, he will keep it no longer. Every one of them accepts this as a historical fact in fulfillment of Daniel 7:25. Indeed, this is the *one main pillar* in their whole system, upon which all the rest depends. If their position upon this point is false, then their whole system is also false, as they will readily admit. They claim to be raised up in the special providence of God to preach against this charge of the Sabbath by the pope.

The unmingled wrath of God is soon to be poured out upon all who continue to keep Sunday, the Pope's Sabbath. It would seem that such a bold and radical position should be supported by the clearest and most abundant evidence. They claim that it is an actual historical fact that somewhere during the first five centuries after Christ, the pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday. If this be so, of course they should be able to produce reliable historical proof for it, giving the *time, place, manner, persons*, facts and reasons for so remarkable an occurrence. I have before me two books written expressly to prove this assertion. They are: "Who Changed the Sabbath?" 24 pages, and "Marvel of Nations," 282 pages. But the only proof offered is simply quotations from *Catholic Catechisms*, which claim that their church made the change! And is this all the historical (?) proof they can present on this point? Yes, for all that the Sabbatarian writers and scholars for the last 200 years have been able to find is just this and nothing more. Not one single historian in all the annals of the world has ever stated that the pope changed the Sabbath. For twenty-eight years I searched for such testimony, but found it not.

Goaded by my call for proof on this point, the Adventists selected Eld. Waggoner to answer it, to find some author who says that the pope changed the Sabbath. The elder made a desperate attempt, covering twenty-six solid columns in their paper! If he had a passage to the point, he could have quoted it in a few lines. But he had none. Not a single author did he quote saying that the pope changed the Sabbath. So it rests merely on the claim of some obscure Catholic Catechism.

Then if we admit on their mere assertion the boastful claim of the Catholics that they changed the Sabbath, why not also admit their claim that the pope is infallible, that he has the keys of St. Peter, the chair of the apostle, the only true apostolic succession, etc.? Seventh-day people quickly repudiate all these other claims of the Catholics, but eagerly admit their claim that they changed the Sabbath, simply because this suits their theory, for which they can find no other proof.

Moreover, even the claims of the Catholic Catechism are misrepresented. The theory is that some hundreds of years after Christ the pope, by his own authority, changed the Sabbath, and the Catechisms are explained to teach this idea. But not one of them makes such a claim or anything like it. Every one of these Catholic quotations states distinctly that the change in the Sabbath was made, not by the pope, but "by the church" in the days of Christ and the apostles, not several hundred years afterward. Thus:

"Ques. What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy?"

"Ans. 1. The Sunday, or our Lord's day, which we observe by apostolic tradition, instead of the Sabbath."—*Catholic Christiana Instructed*, page 209.

From the same work, we take the following additional testimony.

"Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?"

"Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic church, and apostolic tradition."

Catholics claim that their "church" originated in the days of the apostles, and any change made by the apostolic church was made by the Catholic church. Hence they claim that the "Catholic church" changed the Sabbath in the days of the apostles. Seven-day Adventists in using these quotations from the Catechisms wholly ignore this fact, and carry the impression that the change was made by the apostate popes hundreds of years after the apostles. But the Catechisms claim no such thing, as is seen in the above quotations. Thus even the Catechisms, when fairly read, teach that Sunday observance originated with the Christian church in the days of the apostles—just the truth exactly.

We will now present an abundance of the very best historical evidence, proving that the observance of the first day of the week as a day of worship was universal among Christians in the days immediately following the apostles. If Sunday worship originated here, then it did not originate with the papacy, which came up several hundred years later.

I have before me a small book entitled "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries concerning the Sabbath and First Day," by Eld. J. N. Andrews. It is published by the Seventh-day Adventists. Some years since all the writings of the Christian Fathers, from the very days of the apostles down to A. D. 325, were gathered together and translated into English, under the title of the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library." So all these are now accessible to any English reader who chooses to examine them. Eld. Andrews, whom I personally knew as the best scholar in all the ranks of the Seventh-day Adventists, claims to have copied out of these volumes every sentence relating to the Sabbath. I prefer to quote from this work rather than any other

because it is published by the Seventh-day Adventists themselves. I take the quotations just as Elder A. gives them, and accept the dates as he fixes them. So the utmost reliance can be placed upon the following quotations touching early first-day worship.

JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 140.

I now quote from "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers," by Eld. Andrews:

"Justin's 'Apology' was written at Rome about the year 140." "He is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only forty-four years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos." "It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt." (Pages 33, 36.)

This is the confession which even the historian of the Seventh-day Adventists is compelled to make. The Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded by Christians within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle. And this is proven by the testimony of the very first Christian writer who mentions the first day, after the apostles. Does Eld. Andrews question the genuineness or truthfulness of this statement? Not at all.

Hear Eld. A. again: "We must, therefore, pronounce Justin a man who held to the abrogation of the ten commandments, and that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution which was unknown before Moses, and of no authority since Christ. He held Sunday to be the most suitable day for public worship, but not upon the ground that the Sabbath had been changed to it." Page 44. This is exactly the doctrine that the early church and fathers held. Justin in his "Apology" held them to the emperor fairly represented what Christians generally held then, just as he should have done. Eld. Andrews conveys the impression that Justin represented only a small party of apostate Christians at Rome and that he is quite unreliable. But the facts are just the reverse. He was a Greek, born in Palastine and held his "Dialogue with Treppo" at Ephesus, Asia Minor, in the church where St. John lived and died, the very center of the Eastern church, and only forty-four years after John's death. Of Justin the Encyclopedia Americana says: "One of the earliest and most learned writers of the Christian church. . . . He was also equally zealous in opposing alleged heretics." Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says: "In these works Justin professes to present the system of doctrine held by all Christians and seeks to be orthodox on all points. The only difference he knows of as existing between Christians concerned the millennium. Thus Justin is an incontrovertible witness for the unity of the faith in the church of his day, and to the fact that the Gentile type of christianity prevailed."

Dr. Schaff says of him: "After his conversion Justin devoted himself wholly to the vindication of the Christian religion, as an *itinerant* evangelist, with no fixed abode." Church Hist. vol. 1, p. 482. Not only were his books accepted without dispute as expressing the practice of the church, but his itinerant life, now in Palestine, then in Rome, Greece and Ephesus, enabled him to know this practice, and stamps his testimony with a force equal to demonstration.

So, then, Justin is an unimpeachable witness for the faith and practice of Christians generally a few years after the death of the apostles. That the Jewish Christians continued to observe the Sabbath together with Sunday is true. Thus: The Ebonites, Jewish Christians, "observed the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths." Ruter's Church History, p. 29. Neander says: "Churches consisting of Jewish converts, although they received the festival of Sunday, retained that also of the Sabbath for three centuries." p. 186. Mosheim says: "The seventh day of the

week was also observed, not by the Christians in general, but by such churches only as were principally composed of Jewish converts." Eed. Hist. book 1, cent 1, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 4. It was a question with some whether these Judeizing Christians ought to be fellow-shipped. Justin says if they "yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren." (Dialogue with Trypho, chapter 47). That was liberal, the very thing Paul recommended on the same point. (Rom. 14:1-6). Notice two facts: 1. These Jewish Christians who still cling to the Sabbath were weak brethren to be bourn with. 2. Even they observe Sunday. There was no dispute about that with any, Jew or Gentile Christian.

While there was some difference of opinion about the duty to keep the Sabbath, there was none as to the observance of Sunday. Not one line of discussion, objection, protest, or even doubt as to the duty of observing Sunday can be found in all the writings of the first three centuries, whether by orthodox or heretic, Catholic or Greek, Jew or Gentiles, eastern or western Christians—all agreed in honoring Sunday, whatever else they disagreed about. I know that this is so for I have read every line they wrote on the subject. If our Sabbatarian friends deny this, let them produce one word against Sunday written by any Christian in the first three centuries. Even Elder Andrews is compelled to say: "Those fathers who hallowed the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's day.—*Testimony of the Fathers*, p. 11.

Prof. Stuart says: "The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed as well as the Lord's day; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early Christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred."—*Quotation in Edwards Sabbath Manual*, p. 112.

It is impossible that Sunday-keeping could have thus been universally introduced into all churches without a word of objection, unless it had been started at the fountain-head, with the apostles themselves.

Now hear what Justin says about the first day of the week. Here are the words of his Apology on the subject: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all 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. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, having appeared to his apostles and disci-

ples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration."—*The First Apology of Justin, chap. 67.*

Does Eld Andrews question the genuineness or truthfulness of this statement? No, indeed. What answer does he make to it? Simply that Justin does not call Sunday the Sabbath nor the Lord's day! This is readily answered by the fact that Justin was writing to a heathen emperor who would have been wholly ignorant of the meaning of either of those terms, but who was familiar with the term "Sunday." So Justin of necessity used that term. But there the naked facts stand, clear, positive and undeniable, that within forty-four years after the book of Revelation was written Christians did not keep the seventh day, but did hold their assemblies on Sunday. And Justin says that Jesus taught these things to the apostles. With these undeniable facts before him, it is a marvel how any man can say that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday three or four hundred years after this by the apostate popes. For myself I became fully satisfied that such statements are contrary to all the plainest facts of history, as may be seen by the above unquestioned statement of Justin Martyr.

BARNABAS, A. D. 150.

This epistle was highly prized in the earliest churches, read in some of them as part of Scripture, and is found in the oldest manuscript of the Scriptures, *namely the Sinaitic manuscript.* That it was written by a pious man of learning and influence cannot be doubted. Elder Andrews admits that the epistle of Barnabas (A. D. 150) "was in existence as early as the middle of the second century, and, like the 'Apostolical constitutions,' is of value to us in that it gives some clue to the opinions which prevailed in the region where the writer lived." ("Testimony of the fathers, p. 21).

We will accept the date which Elder A. himself fixes for the writing of this epistle, though others put it much earlier. It stands then, only ten years later than Justin, and within fifty four years of St. John. In this epistle we read: "Incense is a vain abomination unto me, and your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot endure." He has therefore abolished these things (chap. 2). Elder A. admits that "he presently asserts the abolition of the Sabbath of the Lord." ("Testimony," etc., p. 22). This agrees with Justin. Coming to the first day of the week Barnabas says: "Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day, also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead." (chap. 15).

What does Elder A. say to this testimony? He freely admits that it teaches the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath and the keeping of Sunday, and that, too, only fifty-four years after the close of the New Testament. But he argues that such a doctrine is contrary to the Bible; that is, to *his* ideas of the Bible. While I was yet a firm believer in the seventh day, when reading this book, I was struck with the fact that Elder A., all through his book had to oppose and combat the teachings of all these early fathers! The reason is manifest: he held one doctrine and they held another. He believed in the seventh day, and they believed in the first day. Some of them lived early enough to have conversed with the apostles themselves, while he lived eighteen hundred years later! Which would be apt to know the best?

In his "History of the Sabbath" (p. 308), he says: "The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they had no special light on the subject by reason of living in the first centuries, which we in this latter age do not possess." What a confession that is from the ablest historian the seventh day ever had! He freely admits that "the early fathers" "in the first centuries" neglected "the observance of the Sabbath." What further need have we for witnesses to prove that the seventh day was not observed in the first

centuries? But how does this harmonize with the theory that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope several hundred years afterwards? Suppose those early fathers were not good theologians, nor able reasoners; could they not testify to a simple *fact*? Could they not state whether they did or did not keep Saturday? Surely they knew enough for that, and this is all we wish to ask.

DIONYSIUS BISHOP OF CORINTH IN GREECE, A. D. 170.

But we will hear further from these fathers themselves as to whether they kept Sunday. Again I quote from "The testimony," etc. (p. 52): "Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about A. D. 170, wrote a letter to the Roman church, in which are found these words: 'We passed this holy Lord's day, in which we read your letter, from the constant reading of which we shall be able to draw admonition.'"

Elder A. is not certain that the "Lord's day" is the first day of the week; but we have seen and shall see that this term is never applied to any other than the first day. Notice that this witness is from Greece, not Rome.

BARDESANES OF EDESSA, SYRIA, A. D. 180.

Coming down only ten years later we have, says Eld. A., the "testimony of the heretic Bardesanes. Bardesanes, the Syrian, flourished about A. D. 180. He belonged to the Gnostic sect. He says: 'On one day, the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the days of the readings we abstain from [taking] sustenance.'" Book of the Laws of Countries.

Says Eld. A.: "This shows that the Gnostics used Sunday as the day for religious assemblies." ("Testimony," etc., p. 53). Here is another good testimony for Sunday, and another good confession from Eld. A. All parties, orthodox and heretic, kept Sunday as early as A. D. 180. How, then, is it that Constantine and the pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday two to four hundred years later? Elder A.'s own words utterly refute such an idea.

Notice here also a refutation of the idea so strongly urged by Sabatarians, that Sunday-keeping originated at Rome, and was for a long time confined there. Eld. Andrews has to admit that the Gnostics at this date used Sunday as a day of worship. But, 1. The Gnostics were emphatically an eastern sect, originating in Syria, and were most numerous in Alexandria, Asia Minor, and the East. Rome never had any influence over them. Bardesanes himself lived at Edessa, in Mesopotamia. 2. This sect was numerous in the East as early as A. D. 150, or 55 years after the death of John. Eld. A. confesses that the Gnostics used Sunday for their meetings. So we have Sunday-keeping not only at Rome but all over the east as early as A. D. 150, hundreds of years before the pope had a particle of influence there.

CLEMENT, OF ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT, A. D. 194.

Clement was one of the most celebrated of the Christian fathers. He wrote about A. D. 194. Andrews quotes him thus: "He, in fulfillment of the precept, keeps the Lord's day when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself." (Book 7, chap. 12). The Lord's day, it will be seen here and all along is the resurrection day. Clement lived, not at Rome, but in Egypt. So Sunday-keeping was not simply a Roman usage as Adventists claim.

TERTULLIAN OF AFRICA, A. D. 200.

Tertullian (A. D. 200) is one of the most noted of the fathers, his writings being many and well known. He wrote only about one hundred years after the last apostle. Elder A. freely admits that he taught the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath and the observance of Sunday. Thus: "He asserts that the Sabbath was abolished by Christ." "He speaks of the Sabbath as abrogated by Christ." "With the observance of Sunday as the Lord's day he brings him offerings for the dead." ("Testimony," etc., pp. 68, 64). Then he quotes Tertullian as follows: "We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day their Sabbath, and devote it to ease and eating, deviating from the old Jewish customs, which they are now very ignorant of." (Tertullian Apology, chap. 16). Tertullian again declares that his brethren did not observe the days held sacred by the Jews: "We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor in their sacred days." "We, however (just as we have received), only on the day of the Lord's resurrection ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude; deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil." ("Testimony," etc., pp. 65, 66, 64 and Tertullian on prayer, chap. 23).

Does Elder A. or any Seventh-day Adventist deny the genuineness or truthfulness of these statements of Tertullian? They do not attempt to. Tertullian was born at Carthage, Africa, where he was a minister. Johnson's Cyclopedia says: "He was also a representative of the African opposition to Rome." Rome had no influence over him. How this upsets the falsehood that Sunday was kept only at Rome or by those under her influence.

ORIGEN, A. D. 225.

Origen (about A. D. 225) was a man of immense learning, and his writings are numerous. He says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as, for example, the Lord's day, the preparation, the passover, or pentecost." Origen against Celsus, book 8, chap. 22.

This plainly shows that he did observe the Lord's day.

Origen's home was in Egypt but he traveled all over the East and died at Tyre. Notice that witnesses for Sunday came from all parts of the world, not simply from Rome.

THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, A. D. 250.

Of the "Apostolical constitutions" (A. D. 250) Elder A. says: "The so-called 'Apostolical constitutions' were not the work of the apostles, but they were in existence as early as the third century, and were then very generally believed to express the doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important historical testimony to the practice of the church at that time. Mosheim, in his 'Historical Commentaries' (cent. 1, sec. 51), speaks thus of these 'constitutions': 'The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed among the Christians of the second and third centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions.'" ("Testimony," etc., p. 13). Notice again that this work was the product of the Eastern church and hence shows the custom of the church in the East instead of that at Rome.

These, then, will be good witnesses to the practice of the church about A. D. 250. "In section 7, paragraph 59, we read: 'And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus and sent him to

us.' 'Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection. In book 7, section 2, paragraph 30, he says: 'On the day of the resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord's day, assemble yourselves together, without fail, giving thanks to God,' etc. In the same paragraph, in speaking of the resurrection of Christ, the writer says: 'On which account we solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's day,' etc." ("Testimony," etc., pp. 14, 18).

These testimonies are decisive, and do show beyond a doubt that the Christians of those early days used Sunday just as it is used now, for religious worship. Did they, then, have "the mark of the beast" at least 250 years before the beast had arisen, according to the Seventh-day Adventists' theory? These unquestionable facts of history, taken from their own published works and admitted by them to be true, show the utter absurdity of their position that Sunday-keeping is the mark of the beast.

ANATOLIUS, A. D. 270, BISHOP OF LAODICEA, ASIA.

He was bishop of Laodicea, Asia Minor. Not a Roman, but a Greek. Eld. Andrews, page 94, quotes him thus: In his seventh canon he says: "The obligation of the Lord's resurrection binds us to keep the paschal festival on the Lord's day." In his tenth canon he uses this language: "The solemn festival of the resurrection of the Lord can be celebrated only on the Lord's day." In his sixteenth canon he says: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's day will lead us to celebrate it on the same principle."

See how all these early Christians call the resurrection day "the Lord's day" and how they honor it. How entirely different from our Sabbatharians who can hardly find terms mean enough by which to express their contempt for Sunday! Why is this difference and what does it show?

PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, A. D. 306.

Eld. A., page 108, quotes him thus: "But the Lord's day we celebrate as a day of joy, because on it he rose again, on which day we have received it for a custom not even to bow the knee."—Canon 15.

He gives the same reason 1581 years ago for keeping the Lord's day that Christians give now. This was more than 200 years before the pope came into power. Notice that these witnesses for Sunday are from all parts of the world, from Africa, Asia and Europe, not simply from Rome as S. D. Adventists untruthfully say. These show that Sunday-keeping was as wide spread as the Christian church itself, and that from the earliest days.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY FROM CYCLOPEDIAS.

As a fair, impartial and clear statement of the teachings of the early Christian fathers concerning the observance of Sunday, we refer the reader to the following from Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, article "Lord's Day." Here is a book easy of access to all anywhere, unsectarian, embodying the results of the most thorough and scholarly examination of every passage in all the fathers having any bearing upon the Sunday question. Any one who has read the fathers must confess that its statements are fair and truthful. I have only room for one short quotation:

"The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John, are as follows: 'The Lord's day

. . . . existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of Scriptural Christianity. It was never defended; for it was never impugned, or at least only impugned as other things received from the apostles were. It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it. . . . It was not an institution of severe Sabbatical character, but a day of joy and cheerfulness, rather encouraging, than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a solemn meeting for the holy eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for alms-giving; and though being an institution under the law of liberty, work does not appear to have been formally interdicted, or rest formally enjoined. Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's day and the Sabbath, in no passage that has come down to us is the fourth commandment appealed to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's day."

So Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia*, Art. Sabbath, says: "For a time the Jewish converts observed both the seventh day, to which the name Sabbath continued to be given exclusively, and the first day, which came to be called the Lord's day. . . . Within a century after the death of the last of the apostles we find the observance of the first day of the week, under the name of Lord's day, established as a universal custom of the church. . . . It was regarded not as a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath (which was denounced together with circumcision and other Jewish and anti-Christian practices,) but rather as a substitute for it, and naturally its observance was based on the resurrection of Christ rather than on the creation rest-day, or the Sabbath of the Decalogue."

No higher authority than this could be quoted. It states the truth exactly. So the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Art. "Sunday" says: "In the second century its observance was universal. . . . The Jewish Christians ceased to observe the Sabbath after the destruction of Jerusalem." The man who will shut his eyes to all this mass of testimony and still insist that Sunday-keeping is only an institution of popes of later ages, is simply held by a theory which he is bound to maintain any way. I have had a sad experience in this matter, and know just how a seventh-day man feels just about these historical facts. I read some of them twenty years ago. They bothered me some, but I got over this by my strong faith in our doctrines and by believing them to be mostly forgeries. Afterwards as I read more, I saw these testimonies were reliable and very decidedly against our theory of the pope's Sunday. This disturbed me quite a little, but still I got over them by simply ceasing to think of them at all, and by dwelling upon other arguments in which I had perfect confidence. In debate I was always anxious to shut these out of the discussion. I know that Seventh-day Adventist ministers generally feel just about as I did, for we often referred to these testimonies of the fathers and the effect they had in debate. Of course, the great body of the members never read these things, and are in blissful ignorance concerning them. Or, if they do read them, it is in their own books where they are all explained away. Their unbounded faith in "the message" and in their leaders carries them right over these facts as matters of no consequence.

For myself, when once I decided to look these historical facts squarely in the face and give them whatever force they fairly deserved, I soon saw the utter falsity of the claim that the "popes changed the Sabbath." The old feeling of uneasiness on this point is entirely gone. I feel that so far as the evidence of history is concerned, my feet stand on solid ground. I feel so thankful to God for the relief it has brought to my

own mind that I would gladly help my old friends out also, if I could, for I know full well the bonds with which they are held.

What answer do Sabbatarians make to all this testimony? This:

1. "The Bible, the Bible only, that is our rule. We don't go by history." *Reply*: Why then do they themselves appeal to history? No people depend so much upon history, none refer to it so often, none make so great claims from it as S. D. Adventists. Thus Andrews book on the Sabbath contains 512 pages. Of these 192 are on the Bible and 320 on history. Yet they don't go by history. Wherever they can find a scrap in their favor they make the most of it. Of their reliance on history Eld. Smith says: "One of the grandest facts we have to present is that God has always had witnesses to his holy Sabbath from the days of Adam till now."—Review Extra, Nov. 22, 1887. Mark: One of the grandest facts they have to present in favor of Saturday is what? Scriptural testimony? No, witness from history. Yet they don't go by history! The fact is they quote history whenever they possible can. Why, then, cry out against history when we follow them there? Because it is against them.

2. They say that "the early fathers are unreliable, fools, apostates, forgeries and frauds." See the Extra above quoted or Andrews history. Why this effort to break down the testimony of these early Christian writers? Because they are against them and Sabbatarians know it. Whatever foolish notions those fathers might have had, they could state a simple fact of their own days as to whether they did, or did not, keep Sunday. They all agree that they did and their testimony is decisive.

Again: In those days the authors name was not always signed to his book. Look at Hebrews. No name is signed to it. It is still a disputed point as to who wrote it, Paul, Barnabus, or some other apostle. Shall we, therefore, call it a "fraud" and throw it out of the Bible? No. So of the epistle of Barnabus for instance. No name was signed to it, yet it was generally attributed to the apostle Barnabus and was read in all the churches as authority as early as A. D. 150. Some attributed it to others; but all agree that it was written as early as A. D. 150 by some Christian and gave the opinion and customs of the church at that time. "Fraud, fraud," cry the Sabbatarians, "Barnabus never wrote it." Well, what of it? Some Christian wrote it within 60 years of John's death and it says that Christians then kept Sunday.

3. "None of the fathers say that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday; nor do they ever call Sunday the Sabbath, nor do they claim to keep it in obedience to the fourth commandment." So say the Sabbatarians. That is right exactly. The early church said with Paul, Coll. 2:16, that the Sabbath was abolished with other Jewish rites. The first day was not the Sabbath, but "the Lord's Day," "the eight day," "resurrection day," etc.

4. Sabbatarians say that Christians worked on Sunday during the first century or longer. Their evidence for this is very questionable as we will soon see. Yet it seems probable that at first the day was not observed as strictly as later on; but still it was the day on which all Christians met for their worship according to the custom of the apostles. Let us claim no more for Sunday than the record shows and leave it there.

5. Sabbatarians say: "The Christians kept the Sabbath for centuries after Christ." *Reply*: All history abundantly shows that the Jewish Christians observed the Sabbath, circumcision, passover, etc., for a long time. In some churches where the Jewish element predominated, the Gentiles also kept the Sabbath, but all parties kept Sunday at the same time. These are the facts about Sabbath keeping in the early church as proved above.

6. S. D. Adventists quote a lot of so-called "eminent historians" to prove that the Sabbath was kept by all, or nearly all, the church for three hundred years after Christ, while Sunday was a common working day for the same length of time. With these authors they deceive the people and deceive themselves. They quote them as "reliable historians," "high authorities," "eminent divines," "all friends of Sunday," etc. But who are they? Look at Andrews' History of the Sabbath, their standard work. All others relating to the history of the Sabbath are only a re-hash of this. It is served up on all occasions and his authors are quoted over and over by writers and preachers. But the great bulk of his quotations are from such men as Heylyn, Domville, Morer, Cox, Brerewood, White, etc., Episcopal clergymen of England who were bitter opposers of Sunday sacredness. Charles I, of England, in the first half of the 17th century, issued a "Book of Sports" for Sunday. This was a severe blow to the sacredness of Sunday and a great offense to pious people. The infamous Laud was then the chief adviser of the king. Dr. Heylyn and Dr. White were hired by Laud and the king to write against the sacredness of Sunday in defense of the Book of Sports. See "The Sabbath," by Gilfillan, p. 132.

Jeremy Taylor was the chaplain of Laud. Morer in the 18th century wrote against Sunday, and Domville did the same in the 19th century. Living at these late dates, writing as intense partisans, writing to overthrow Sunday as a Sabbath of divine origin, what is their testimony worth in this controversy? Nothing. Yet these hirelings and haters of Sunday are the chief witnesses on which Eld. Andrews depends, the ones always quoted by Sabbatarians. Take out from Andrews' "History of the Sabbath" his numerous quotations from Heylyn, White, Morer, Cox, Taylor and Domville, and you would hardly have a skeleton left. So Waggoner, Smith, Buttler, and all the lesser lights among S. D. Adventists who have come after Andrews simply use these quotations which he gathered for them. But they might as well quote Ingersol and Tom Paine as "friends of the Bible" as to quote these men as "friends of the Sunday Sabbath." Each of them wrote on purpose to refute the claims of Sunday as a Sabbath of divine authority. Thousands of readers ignorant of history, are misled by these quotations used by the Adventists. If they had the truth they would not be compelled to rely upon such authors.

THE PAGAN ROMANS NEVER KEPT SUNDAY.

S. D. Adventists affirm that keeping Sunday was adopted from the pagan Romans by the Catholics and from the Catholics by the Protestants. This idea they industriously teach everywhere. They say that these pagans kept Sunday in worship of the Sun. See Andrews' History of the Sabbath, pp. 258-264. Such statements are utterly false. Each day of the week was named after some god and, in a certain sense, was devoted to the worship of that god, as Monday to the Moon, Saturday to Saturn, Sunday to the Sun, etc. But did they cease work on these days? No; if they had they would have kept every day in the week? Did they observe Sunday by ceasing to work? No, indeed. No such thing was taught or practiced by the Romans. They had no weekly rest day. Herzog says: "No special religious celebration of any one day of the week can be pointed out in any one of the pagan religions."—*Article Sabbath*. This fact is accidentally confessed by Eld. Waggoner, Review Extra, Nov. 22, 1887. Of Constantine's law, A. D. 321, he says: "Though the venerable day of the sun had long—very long—been venerated by them and their heathen ancestors, the idea of rest from worldly labor in its worship was entirely new." Mark this confession for it gives up the main pillar of their argument in their effort to prove that Sunday keeping was taken from the pagans. *The pagans never kept Sunday.* It

was a common work day like other days of the week. The idea and the custom of keeping Sunday as a day of rest from work originated with the Christians, not with pagans. So much for that falsehood.

CONSTANTINE DID NOT CHANGE THE SABBATH.

It has been common for Sabbatarians to point to the law of Constantine as a chief factor in changing the Sabbath to Sunday. There never was any truth in the charge; but Eld. Waggoner now owns it all up and confesses that it had nothing whatever to do in changing the Sabbath. "Constantine, in his decrees, said not one word either for or against keeping the Sabbath of the Bible." "It is safe to affirm that there was nothing done in the time of Constantine, either by himself or any other, that has the least appearance of changing the Sabbath."—Advent Review, Dec. 13, 1887, page 780.

That is the truth and a good confession, though it contradicts all that they have said heretofore. Now let them revise their old books to harmonize with this truth and they will be much smaller.

CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY LAW AND ITS OBJECT.

A. D. 321 Constantine, the first Christian emperor of Rome, issued the following edict:

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

The simple facts about this law are these: Christians from the days of the apostles had kept the first day of the week; but there was no civil law to protect or aid them in it. By this time they had become very numerous in the empire and their influence was rapidly gaining. The old pagan religion was falling before them. Constantine, to say the least, was favorable to Christianity. His mother was a Christian. He was shrewd enough to see that it was for his interest to favor this new and rising religion. Hence long before he publicly professed Christianity, he issued several edicts favoring it in various ways, this one concerning Sunday among the rest. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia well says: "He was no doubt convinced of the superior claims of Christianity as the rising religion; but his conversion was a change of policy, rather than of moral character. . . . He knew Christianity well, but only as a power in the Roman Empire and he protected it as a wise and far-seeing statesman. . . . His first edict concerning the Christians (Rome 312) is lost. By the second, (Milan 313), he granted them, not only free religious worship and the recognition of the state, but also reparation of previously incurred losses. . . . A series of edicts of 315, 316, 318, 321, and 323, completed the revolution. Christians were admitted to the offices of the state. . . . An edict of 321 ordered Sunday to be celebrated by cessation of all work in public."

It will be seen that this edict was only one of seven issued to favor Christians. 1. It was not made to please or favor the pagans for, as seen above, they did not keep Sunday. 2. As we have proved, the Christians did all keep Sunday, hence this law would favor and please them. 3. The edict was not addressed to Christians for they needed no such law for themselves as they kept that day already voluntarily. 4. It was not worded in Christian terms, "Lord's Day," as it was addressed to pagans. 5. It was couched in pagan terms "venerable day of the sun," that pagans might understand it and that it might offend them less. This law, then,

made no change in the observance of Sunday on the part of Christians; but it did secure to that day a better observance by requiring everyone, pagans and all, to cease work that day. But it is said that this law of Constantine, A. D. 321, was the first law ever made prohibiting work on Sunday. Very true, but why? Because none but Christians believed it wrong to work that day; and up to that date Christians had no power to make laws and hence could not have made a law for keeping Sunday if they had desired to. It is noticeable that the first emperor who favored Christianity made, among other laws favoring Christians, a civil law prohibiting work on Sunday. This shows that Sunday observance was then regarded as an essential part of Christianity. Of this law Mosheim says: "The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of the Christians, *was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.*"—*Mosheim*, century 4, part 2, chap. 4, sect. 5.

This law addressed to pagans who had always worked on Sunday, required the cessation of business on that day and so secured to Christians a better observance of Sunday than before. The ecclesiastical historian, Sozomen, writing of Constantine only one century after his death, says: "He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's Day.

He honored the Lord's Day because on it Christ rose from the dead."—*Ecl. Hist.*, p. 22. It was, then, in behalf of Sunday as a Christian day, not as a pagan festival, that this law was made.

FOUND AT LAST, THE EXACT TIME AND PLACE WHEN AND WHERE THE
POPE CHANGED THE SABBATH.

Last year I pressed the Adventists to name the time and place, when and where the Sabbath was changed by the pope and to name the pope and the facts about such a change if it ever occurred. Nettled by this, Eld. Waggoner undertook the Herculean task, in twenty-seven solid columns of their paper. A worse sample of assumptions, hair splitting and special pleading, it would be hard to find. At last he settles on the council of Loadicea, A. D. 364, as the place and time, when and where, the Sabbath was changed. The 29th canon of that council reads thus: "Christians ought not to Judaize and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day; but preferring the Lord's Day, should rest, if possible, as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ."

On this the Elder says: "Now, if any one can imagine what would be changing the Sabbath, if this is not, I would be extremely happy to learn what it could be." "Now, I claim that I have completely met his demand; I have shown the time, the place, and the power that changed the Sabbath." *Advent Review*, Dec. 13, 1887. He claims that this was "a Catholic council" and that "historians early and late have made much mention" of this council. Now let us examine his position.

1. If the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope right here, as he affirms, then certainly it was not changed before nor after nor at any other place. So if this fails their whole cause is lost. Let the reader mark the importance of this fact.

2. He admits what every scholar knows that till after the time of Constantine the bishop of Rome had no "authority whatever above the other bishops" and so could not have changed the Sabbath before that time.

3. He admits, as above, that Constantine did nothing to change the Sabbath.

4. But we have abundantly proved in preceeding pages that all Christians long before this date were unanimous in observing the Lord's Day,

Sunday. This one simple fact proves the utter absurdity of the claim that it was changed at Laodicea, A. D. 364.

5. In the year 324, or just 40 years before the council of Laodicea, Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, Palestine, wrote his celebrated history of Christianity. He had every possible opportunity to know what Christians did throughout the world. Of him Justin Edwards D. D. says:

"He lived in the third century, was a man of vast reading, and was well acquainted with the history of the church from the days of the apostles as any man of his day." At Cæsarea was "a very extensive library, to which Eusebius had constant access. He was a learned and accurate historian and had the aid of the best help for acquiring information upon all subjects connected with the Christian church."—Sabbath Manuel, pp. 124, 125. Now hear Eusebius:

"They [the patriarchs] did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, *neither do we*."—Ecl. Hist. So, then, 40 years before the council of Laodicea Christians did not keep the Sabbath. Eusebius lived right there and did he not know? True, there was a small heretical sect who kept the Sabbath as Judaizers do now. Of them he says: They are "those who cherish low and mean opinions of Christ.

With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary [just like S. D. Adventists] as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life. They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews [like S. A. Adventists again] just like them, but on the other hand they also celebrate the Lord's Days very much like us in commemoration of his resurrection."—Ecl. Hist., pp. 112, 113. Again: "And all things whatsoever that it was the duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's Day as more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath."—Quoted in Sabbath Manuel, p. 127.

That is the way the Sabbath and Sunday stood in the church 40 years before Laodicea. They did not keep the Sabbath, but did keep the Lord's Day—had transferred all things to it. How much truth, then, can there be in the position that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday by the pope 40 years later? Shame on such brazen attempts to pervert the truth. But let us look at the real facts about the council at Laodicea. S. D. Adventists claim two things, viz.: that the Sabbath was changed by the Roman church, and that it was done by the authority of the pope. Then they select Laodicea as the place and time. But,

1. Laodicea is not Rome. It is situated in Asia Minor over 1,000 miles east of Rome. It was in Asia not in Europe. It was an Eastern, not a Western town, an oriental, not a Latin city.

2. It was a Greek city, not a Roman.

3. The pope of Rome did not attend this council at Laodicea A. D. 364. Does Waggoner claim that he did? No, he does not dare to.

4. The pope did not attend, nor did he send a legate or a delegate or any one to represent him. In fact, neither the Roman Catholic church nor the pope had anything to do with the council in any way, shape or manner. It was held without even their knowledge or consent.

5. At this early date, A. D. 364, the popes, or rather bishops of Rome, had no authority over other bishops. It was 200 years later before they were invested with authority over all the churches. Even then their authority was stoutly resisted for centuries in the East where this council was held. See Bower's History of the Popes or any church history. Speaking of Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome A. D. 314 to 336, only 28 years before this council at Laodicea, Eld. Waggoner says; "The bishop of Rome had not then yet attained to any authority whatever above the other bishops."—Review and Herald, Dec. 13, 1887. This is true. Did they in the next 28 years gain authority to change the keeping of the

Sabbath from one day to another throughout the whole world? Preposterous!

6. Leberius was bishop of Rome at the time of this council at Laodicea. He was degraded from his office, banished, and treated with the utmost contempt. Bower says that in order to end his exile, Liberius "wrote in a most submissive and cringing style to the eastern bishops."—*Hist. of the Popes*, vol. 1, page 64. And this was the pope who changed the Sabbath at a council of these eastern bishops 1,000 miles away which he never attended!

7. The council of Laodicea was only a local council, a small, unimportant affair and not a general council at all. Eld. W. magnifies it into a great "Catholic [general] council." A claim which is utterly false. The general councils are: 1. That at Nice A. D. 325. 2. That at Constantinople A. D. 381. 3. That at Ephesus A. D. 431, etc. See the list in Johnson's *Cyclopedia* or any history. Bower in his extensive work, the "History of the Popes," gives an account of all the general councils, the important local councils, and all with which Rome or the popes had to do, but does not even mention this one at Laodicea. He mentions a lot of councils held about that time but not this one. He says: "Several other councils were held from the year 363 to 368, of which we have no particular account."—Vol. 1, p 79. I have searched through a number of cyclopedies and church histories and can find no mention at all of the council at Laodicea, in most of them and only a few lines in any of them. Rev. W. Armstrong, a scholar of Canton, Pa., says: "This council is not even mentioned by Mosheim, Milner, Ruter, Reeves, Socrates, Sozomen, nor by four other historians on my table." McClinock and Strong's *Cyclopedia* says: "Thirty-two bishops were present from different provinces in Asia."—All bishops of the Eastern church, not one from the Roman church! And yet this was the time and place when and where the Roman church and the pope changed the Sabbath!

8. Now think of it: this little local council of thirty-two bishops revolutionizes the whole world on the keeping of the Sabbath!

9. The fact is that this council simply regulated in this locality an already long established institution, the Lord's Day, just the same as council after council did afterwards. If this changed the Sabbath to Sunday, then it has been changed a hundred times since! Sabbatarians point to these different regulations as so many acts in changing the Sabbath when they have not the remotest relation to such a thing.

10. The church of Loaticca where this council was held, was raised up by Paul himself, Col. 4:13, 16; 1 Tim. 6; close of the epistle. It was one of the seven churches to which John wrote. Rev. 3:14. Hence it is certain it was well instructed and grounded in the doctrines of the apostles. Half way between Paul and this council, that is A. D. 270, Anatolius was bishop of Laodicea. He wrote: "Our regard for the Lord's resurrection which took place on the Lord's Day, will lead us to celebrate it on the same principle."—Canon 16. Here we have that church keeping Sunday 100 years before this council.

11. Finally, if the council of Laodicea changed the Sabbath as Adventists say, then it was changed by the Greek church instead of the Roman church; changed by the eastern churches over which Rome had no authority; changed before the papacy was established, before the pope had any authority over the east, by a small local council which neither the pope nor any of his servants attended. The absurdity of this claim is manifest without further argument.

For many years I accepted these false statements of Sabbatarian writers as undoubted truths, as all their converts do. I had no means of knowing better. I preached strongly what I read in their books and led hundreds still more ignorant than myself to believe it. Gradually

the truth dawned upon me that I was being misled, but it then took me years to learn the real facts in the case and get free from the superstition which bound me. Now I have investigated the matter till I am fully satisfied for myself that, to sustain their false theories, they have done great violence to the plainest facts of history. The assertion that the pope changed the Sabbath is a fair sample of the rest.

CHAPTER V.

WHY NOT FOUND OUT BEFORE?

If Sabbatarians are right on the Sabbath question, then the whole Christian church has broken the Sabbath for the last 1,800 years, and has kept Sunday, "a popish institution," "the mark of the beast," in its stead. During all these long ages all the holy men, martyrs, reformers, commentators, historians, and Christian scholars, with all their seeking of God, searching the Bible, and studying history, never discovered this great mistake! Is it reasonable to believe that the entire church, during nearly all its history, has been trampling upon one of God's most holy commandments? Can it be that the wrath of God is now to be poured out upon the church for keeping the same day that all others have kept for 1,800 years? Would God have blessed the reformers and his church as he has, if Sunday-keeping is such a fearful crime against God as is now claimed?

Sunday-keeping, according to these men and Mrs. White's revelation, is the "mark of the beast," "idolatry," "a terrible sin," etc. Now, just to think that the whole church of Christ, immediately after the death of the apostles, should fall into this fearful sin and error, and practice this crime without rebuke during the entire history of the church, till just a few days before Jesus comes, and then only a few find it out and give it up! That pious men should fall into error on speculative doctrines, as the nature of the soul, future punishment, God's decrees, etc., would not be strange; but when it comes to so important and so practical a question as the weekly day of rest, the case is different. According to Seventh-day Adventists, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, Moody, with all the church of Christ for hundreds of years, committed two fearful sins each week of their lives—they broke the holy Sabbath, the most important commandment in the decalogue, and kept Sunday, the mark of the beast! Yet God has let the whole thing go on without any protest, till the last minute of time, and now everybody who does not accept this "new light," is to be hopelessly damned for doing what all Christians have always done! In all candor, this is a pretty big pill to swallow.

But Sabbatarians say that this has nothing to do with the case. "Our appeal is to the Bible alone. The Bible plainly teaches it, and we will go by that." So they say, and so they honestly believe; but the fact is, it is only *their interpretation, their explanation*, of the Bible which makes it say so. Did you ever know a sect under heaven, even the wildest and most fanatical, who were not always on hand ready to "prove it all by the Bible?" Yes; they know that they are right beyond a doubt, "because the Bible just says so." They will argue you blind, and grow more confident every day, and always end by saying, "It is true, not because I say so, but because the Bible says so." Meet a Mormon, and he has the Bible at his tongue's end. He "proves it all by the Bible. So the Shaker, and the Swedenborgian, and the Universalist, and the rest of them, "prove it all by the Bible." How many persons and sects have arisen at different times with a perfect furore of enthusiasm over some new idea besides "the old, old story of Jesus and his love." No matter

what harm it does to other Christians and to the gospel, "the Bible teaches it, and that is enough. When we give this up we will give up the Bible, too." So they go on till time alone demolishes their theory, and then they do indeed give up the Bible and all, while precious souls are lost.

God pity the good, old Bible! for it is made to teach all the fanaticism and tomfoolery that has ever disgraced Christianity. The Bible is all right, but you need a little common sense and some proper idea of the nature of the gospel with it. The *effects* of a doctrine are to be considered as well as the supposed Bible proof for it. We must be very cautious how we accept some unreasonable, useless and impracticable theory, just because some sharp person can construe and color the Scriptures to favor it. If a doctrine is not in harmony with the general tone of the gospel; if it turns upon mere technicalities; if the plain, simple statements of the New Testament have to be explained away to harmonize with it; if it leads you to tithing mint and rue and straining at gnats; if it does not lead you to more love for your fellow-men, to more benevolent deeds in your own community, to a sweeter and lovelier life; if it leads you to become more contentious, more narrow, bigoted and sectarian; if it leads you to think of anything more than of Jesus, then, as you value your peace here and your soul hereafter, avoid it.

Jacob Knapp, in rebuking hair-splitting theologians, said: "It is not God, but the devil, who sets men tanning a mosquito's hide on shore, while a shipwrecked crew are perishing unhelped before them." There is a volume of sense in that homely remark.

THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY NOT A NEW THING.

The truth is that this very question has been up time and again all along the history of the church, all the arguments for the seventh day have been brought out and urged as now. They have been examined and refuted by the most pious men of the past the same as now. It is simply an old Judaizing notion often revived in some new phase, to flourish awhile, and then go down, as it had often done before. In proof of this one only needs to turn to the pages of the "History of the Sabbath," by Elder Andrews, the Seventh-day Adventist historian. As they will not question his statements, I refer to it rather than to other authors.

On page 400 he finds Sabbatarians in Rome A. D. 600, and in France A. D. 1160, one of whom wrote a book defending it. He finds seventh-day keepers in Abyssinia in the 15th century. Coming to the time of the Reformation he finds all the leading reformers speaking plainly and very decidedly on the Sabbath question. They all held that the Jewish Sabbath was abolished, and that Christians should keep the Lord's day. (pp. 433-446.) Charlstadt, one of the reformers in Luther's time, was a Sabbatarian, a scholar, and wrote in favor of the seventh-day and urged it upon Luther and upon all as S. D. Adventists do now.

Here, then, was an able and learned advocate of the seventh day right in the midst of the Reformation. His arguments for the seventh day he laid before Luther, who examined them. Here is Luther's decision in his own words: "Indeed, if Charlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath—that is to say, Saturday—must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcized; for that is true, and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all." (Quoted in "Hist. Sabbath," p. 457.

Luther's argument against the Jewish Sabbath is sound, and has never been answered to this day. So, then, the "light" on the Sabbath question was given to Luther, and he rejected it, just as the great body

of Christians do now. Then was he an "idolator," a "Sabbath-breaker," having "the mark of the beast?" If this is true of those who reject the Sabbath now, why not also of him? Let our Sabbatarian friends think of this a little, for they all esteem Luther highly. The other leaders of the Reformation were likewise familiar with the arguments for the seventh day, but, as Elder Andrews confesses, they "as a body were not friendly to such views." ("Hist. Sabbath, p. 460.) These facts show how untrue it is to say that people have been unacquainted with this Sabbath question before.

So Eld. A. finds a large body of Sabbatarians in Transylvania at that date, and others in Bohemia, in Russia, in Germany and in France.

In England Sabbatarians were numerous in the sixteenth century. See "Chambers' encyclopedia," article "Sabbath." It says they "became numerous enough to make a considerable figure for more than a century in England." Of this time, Mr. Gilfillin, in his book, "The Sabbath," (p. 60), says there was then "a great diversity of opinion among the vulgar people and simple sort concerning the Sabbath day and the right use of the same, some maintaining the unchanged and unchangeable obligation of the seventh-day Sabbath." This controversy, then, over the Sabbath day is not peculiar to our age. Precisely the same ground has been gone over time and again hundreds of years ago. Thus Mr. Andrews himself says: "In 1607, an English first-day writer, John Sprint, gave the views of the Sabbath-keepers of that time, which in truth have been *substantially the same in all ages.*" ("Hist. Sabbath," p. 480.)

This confession of their champion writer upsets one of the main arguments of the Seventh-day Adventists. They hold that the light of the Sabbath question was reserved in the special providence of God to be brought out as a test in this last generation. Now the stubborn facts of history, even as represented in their own "History of the Sabbath," show that this is not true, for substantially the same arguments which Sabbatarians are now giving to the world have been given over and over again by Sabbatarians for ages in the past. Yet nearly all who are led into keeping the seventh-day are led there with the idea that is a *new truth* to which the attention of the church and the world has never been called before since the early apostasy in the church. But here, again, all the facts of history are against them. There were far more eminent advocates than the seventh-day can boast of in our times, and the question appears to have been more widely discussed then than now. Sabbatarian churches were formed and Sabbath-keepers were scattered over the kingdom.

In the beginning of the present century there arose in England a body of Sabbatarians in some respects similar to the Seventh-day Adventists of our day. For manifest reason Elder Andrews omits all mention of these, though they were by far the largest body of Sabbatarians that has ever arisen. They were led by a woman who had visions, as Mrs. White does. Thus I read: "Sabbatharians, or New Israelites, is the name of a religious sect founded by Joanna Southcott." She "ordered the strictest observance of the Jewish law and Sabbath. . . . Her followers, who at one time *numbered one hundred thousand*, continued till 1831 to observe the Jewish Sabbath." ("Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of religious knowledge.")

Here were 100,000 people keeping the Jewish Sabbath in England only fourteen years before the Seventh-day Adventists arose in America. And yet Mrs. White says nobody has had the light on this Sabbath question till after 1844! This is a fair illustration of the groundlessness of all these Sabbatarian claims. In the ignorance and simplicity of my youth, when I was ensnared into keeping the seventh-day, I knew nothing of these historical facts about these numerous attempts in the past

to resurrect that day. And it is so with those who are being led into it now. They honestly think that it is a brand new truth and the grandest movement ever inaugurated in religious reform! I positively know that scores of Seventh-day Adventist ministers are now preaching this theory of the present Sabbath movement, who themselves have never read one single volume of church history of any kind. Only a short time since I was sent to ten different states and examined their ministers upon this very point, and hence I know, "If the blind lead the blind," etc.

In 1644, over 200 years ago, the Seventh-day Baptists began teaching that doctrine in America at Newport, R. I. The first church was organized Dec. 23, 1671. (See "Manual of the Seventh-day Baptists," pp. 39, 40.) From that time on they industriously taught the observance of the seventh-day, both in America and other lands, even as far as China, by preaching, by tracts, books and periodicals, till the religious world was familiar with their views. They were numerous enough to organize a general conference as early as 1802. (See "Hist. S. D. Bap. Gen. Conf.," pp. 15, 238, or any cyclopedia.) This was over forty years before the Seventh-day Adventists started. And yet it is now claimed that the world never had the light on the Sabbath question till Seventh-day Adventists rose up to give it. In the light of the above facts, what a modest claim that is! In fact, instead of receiving this "light" on the Sabbath question directly from heaven after 1844, or even by studying the prophecies, as is claimed, the Adventists simply learned it from the Seventh-day Baptists. Thus in their own "History of the Sabbath," I read:

"The Sabbath was first introduced to the attention of the Advent people at Washington, N. H. A faithful Seventh-day Baptist sister, Mrs. Rachel D. Preston, from the state of New York, having removed to this place, brought with her the Sabbath of the Lord. Here she became interested in the doctrine of the glorious advent of the Saviour at hand. Being instructed in this subject by the Advent people, she in turn instructed them in the commandments of God, and as early as 1844, nearly the entire church in that place, consisting of about forty persons, became observers of the Sabbath of the Lord. . . . From this place, several Advent ministers received the Sabbath truth during the year 1844." (pp. 500, 501.)

The "great new light upon the Sabbath question" which the Adventists found in 1844, was simply the old threadbare arguments from the Seventh-day Baptists; which that people had been giving to the world for over 200 years! Here is just where they got that doctrine, as Elder Andrews plainly states.

KEEPING THE SEVENTH DAY NOT A SUCCESS.

Since the introduction of the gospel, the blessing of God, for some reason, does not go with the observance of the seventh day. Whenever tried, and that is many times, it has been a failure. Elder J. N. Andrews, Seventh-day Adventist, has industriously gathered up the notices of those, here and there along, who have kept the seventh day. Of course he has set them out in the most favorable light; yet even then their weakness as Christians and their generally heretical notions in other respects are manifest. According to his own showing, numerous attempts all along since the early ages, have been made to resurrect the dead Sabbath observance. But after a short life it has failed every time.

The Reformation developed some prominent Sabbatarians. Among the most noted of these was Carlstadt, talented and highly educated man, the friend and companion of Luther. He kept the seventh day, wrote in favor of it, and urged it strongly. Elder A. devotes one whole chapter

to the history and defence of this man. See pp. 446-459. Nor was Carlstadt alone in his Sabbatarian views. Elder A. says: "When the reformation had lifted the veil of darkness that covered the nations of Europe, Sabbath-keepers were found in Transylvania, Bohemia, Russia, Germany, Holland, France and England." ("Hist. Sabbath," p. 460.)

Here, then, the seventh day had a strong foothold and a fair start in the very beginning of the reformation. Now test this Sabbath keeping by the rules laid down in the Bible, and see how it will come out. "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God. And to him they agreed." (Acts 5:38-40.) That was an excellent test, and the apostles were glad to abide by it. In a few years they filled the world with their doctrine and their churches. But at the reformation what became of all the seventh-day advocates and their widespread effort for the Jewish Sabbath? Just nothing at all. It all flashed in the pan. And now, after 350 years of trial, scarcely a remnant of them can be found in any country of Europe. They number less now than they did then. It has come to nought because the blessing of God did not follow it. But those who rejected the seventh day and kept Sunday have been mightily prospered till they number 136,000,000. They have revolutionized the world, and done a noble work for the gospel and the salvation of souls. Which has borne the test? Now this is remarkable if Sunday-keeping is indeed "the mark of the beast," "a most fearful sin," a violation of the law of God. And if keeping the seventh day is such an important thing in the sight of God, why did he not bless those who tried it? Laban said to Jacob, "I have learned by experience that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake." (Gen. 30:27.) Yes, actual experience is the very best test in the world of anything. Now, if experience, if the history of the church, if the providence of God, proves anything, then keeping Saturday is not a success. No class of people are more ready than Seventh-day Adventists to point to any little success they may have as proof that God is with them. They are always pointing to their great success as proof that they are right. But, according to their own test, what kind of a show do they stand when compared with the success of Sunday-keepers?

As we have already seen, the Seventh-day Baptists began in England in the time of the reformation, over three hundred years ago. They had many able men, ministers and writers. They published many books, discussed the subject widely, and made many converts. Here again they had a fine field and a fair start. How did Sabbath-keeping succeed? What have they accomplished in England? Three hundred years ought to be long enough to tell whether it is a success or not. Let Elder Andrews tell the sad story: "In the seventeenth century eleven churches of Sabbatarians flourished in England, while many scattered Sabbath-keepers were to be found in various parts of the kingdom. *Now* but three of these churches are in existence! And only remnants, even of these, remain!" ("Hist. Sabbath," p. 491.) Since he wrote the above, two more out of the three, I believe, have expired, and only one little company of less than ten members survives! Elder A. sorrowfully asks, "To what cause shall we assign this painful fact?" The cause is evident; God is not in it. It comes to nought every time it is tried. Three hundred years hence, if time should last so long, the same mournful requiem will be chanted over the grave of Seventh-day Adventism.

Now, look at the history of Sabbatarian effort in America. They began their work at Newport, R. I., in 1664, over 200 years ago. December 23, 1671, they organized their first church. See "Manual of the Seventh-day Baptists," pp. 29, 40. What have they accomplished? Almost nothing. They now number only about 8,000, and are hardly

holding their own, or, at most, only gaining a few score per year, less than the increase of their children. Largely their youth abandon Saturday for Sunday. With many of the older people keeping the seventh day is merely a nominal affair.

Here again the seventh-day has had the fairest possible chance of success. Its advocates are intelligent, highly educated, respected, free from any other heretical or fanatical notions, and live in this free land and age of investigation. Why has it not succeeded? That it has not they themselves must admit. These sober, stubborn facts should have weight with us. Sabbatarian brethren, stop and weigh these things fairly. What is the use of wasting life contending for what is a practical failure?

Contrast with the above the work and success of the First-day Baptists. What a grand work they have done for Christ and for souls in the last two hundred years! Instead of numbering 8,000, as the Seventh-day Baptists do, they number 3,000,000. As a body they are just as pious and devoted as are the Seventh-day Baptists. Then look at the Methodist and other Sunday keeping churches, and see how God has blessed them all. Experience shows that keeping the Jewish Sabbath does dwarf, cripple and unfit a church for gospel work.

So the Seventh-day Adventists have been at work for forty-three years, and have made less than 30,000 converts, and these are largely from the other churches. Here again we find the keeping of the seventh day mixed up with Millerism, with Mrs. White's visions, feet washing, the short dress, extreme ideas about diet, fanciful interpretations of the prophecies, and many heretical doctrines, so that they can neither work nor associate religiously with any other Christians. All this looks very badly and unfortunate for the seventh day theory.

If, now, keeping Saturday is so highly pleasing to God, why does he not prosper it more? If Sunday observance is such a sin in the sight of God, why does he so remarkably bless those who persist in it? At least one-half of those who now keep the seventh day were themselves converted in Sunday-keeping churches! How is this? Theory is very nice, but often delusive and impracticable. Experience is the only safe test of any theory. Tried in these balances, the Sabbath is found wanting every time.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SABBATH ON A ROUND WORLD.

Consider the nature of the Sabbath commandment. That this precept is partly of a moral, and partly of a ceremonial nature, has generally been held by the best theologians. This position is well founded. Man's nature requires a day of rest and worship about as often as one day in seven. Probably this principle is applicable to all intelligent beings, whether men or angels. So far the precept may be called moral. But when you come to the particular day for this rest, that must vary with circumstances, and may be one day as well as another, if God so direct.

All must admit that this commandment does differ from those which are admitted to be wholly moral. No one could all his lifetime live in open violation of the commandments against idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, stealing, etc., and yet have the least hope of heaven. Yet the most zealous Sabbatarian will admit that millions of devout christians have lived holy lives, who never kept the seventh day, but rested on Sunday instead. And the most devoted Sunday-keeper will admit that those who keep Saturday instead of Sunday are Christian people. Now, certainly one or the other of these classes does not keep the Sabbath commandment, if the essential thing is to keep the particular day. Would any seventh-day man recognize as a christian any person who would every week violate the letter of any other commandment? No, nor would he excuse him on any plea of ignorance either. Yet they will freely admit that thousands right around them who do not keep the Sabbath commandment as they read it, are yet good people and christians. So, they themselves being judges, this commandment does differ from the others in some way.

Again, all the benefits of Sabbath-keeping are secured just as truly by keeping Sunday as Saturday. Physical rest, cessation of business, a quiet day, mental rest, social advantages, religious worship, the moral influence—everything that can be secured by keeping the Sabbath day, is secured by keeping the first day. So, if in the providence of God, any other day of the week had been selected, all these advantages of Sabbath-keeping would have been secured by one day as well as another. But could such a course be pursued with any other precept with as good results? Certainly not. Sabbatarians can afford to meditate on this point a little.

Without a direct command of God to keep it, it would never have been wrong to work on the Seventh day. In itself, and by its own nature, that day is no different from any other day. But would not idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, murder, etc., have been wrong and wicked, even though God had given no commandment against them? Surely they would. Why this difference? Because, in the very nature of things, these acts are wrong, while it is not so with regard to keeping a particular day. The sanctity of the day does not rest upon the nature of the day itself, but simply upon God's appointment.

In their very nature all purely moral laws are universal and eternal in their application, are binding in heaven, in Eden, on Jews or Gentiles,

saints or sinners, now or hereafter. Test the particular seventh day, Saturday, by that rule, and it fails everywhere. Go to Venus, where the days are about twenty-three hours long; to Jupiter, where they are only about ten hours long; to Saturn, where they are about twelve hours long, or to some of the larger planets, where their days are much longer than ours. How could the inhabitants of those worlds keep our seventh day? They could keep a seventh day, their own, but that would not be of the same length of ours, nor come at the same time of ours. Even Seventh-day Adventists now admit this. Their seventh day would not be our Saturday, nor would the seventh day of any two planets be alike, nor come at the same time. All the universe can keep a seventh part of time, but not the same seventh part. Not knowing this, see what a blunder Mrs. White made. She says: "I saw that the Sabbath would never be done away, but the redeemed saints, and all the angelic host, will observe it in honor of the great Creator to all eternity." ("Spiritual gifts," vol. 1., p. 113.) Elder U. Smith, ("Biblical institute," p. 145), says: "We infer that the higher orders of his intelligences keep the Sabbath also. . . . The Sabbath of each of his creatures will be the Sabbath of all the rest, so that all will observe *the same period together* for the same purpose."

Here you have your definite seventh-day theory with a vengeance. Look at the utter absurdity and impossibility of the theory. All intelligent beings in heaven and earth, and on all the planets, keep "the same period together." So the Sabbath day on this little planet of ours regulates the Sabbath days of all the planets in the universe! I wonder how they manage it in Jupiter, where their days are only ten hours long, or in Venus, where they are twenty-three hours long, or on some of the planets where they are as long as several of our days? As the Sabbath must be kept from sunset to sunset (Lev. 23:32), I wonder how they find out, on all those planets, just when it is sunset down here!

The stubborn facts nearer home show that God's children do not, and can not, all "observe the same period together." Everybody knows that it is Saturday in India some twelve hours sooner than it is here, and that it is Saturday here twelve hours after it has ceased to be Saturday there. In Australia the day begins eighteen hours sooner than it does in California. So the Seventh-day brethren in California are working nearly the whole time that their brethren in Australia are keeping Sabbath! Come even nearer home than that. The sun sets about three hours later in California than it does in Maine. So when the Seventh-day Adventists in Maine begin to keep the Sabbath at sunset Friday evening, their own brethren in California, where the sun is yet three hours high, will still be at work for three hours! So, very few of them even on this earth, "observe the same period together." While some of them are keeping Sabbath on one part of the earth, others of them are at work on another part of the earth. How much less, then, do all the heavenly hosts keep the same period with men on earth.

Now, if, as Mrs. White and Bro. Smith say, the angels keep our Sabbath, the question is, with which party do they keep it? With those in Australia, or those in America? If the angels keep the Sabbath at the same time the Sabbatarians keep it in Australia, then the Sabbatarians in America are working while the angels keep Sabbath, and so, of course, the angels work while those here rest. So we see how absolutely false and absurd is the theory that all can keep the Sabbath at the same time.

I have to confess that for many years I was so stupid as to suppose that the Lord himself kept the Sabbath at the same time I did here. I supposed that when the sun set Friday evening and I began keeping the Sabbath, the Lord and the angels began keeping it, too. But now I see how utterly impossible that is; for if the Lord keeps the Sabbath at the

same time I do here, then he does not keep it with the brethren on the other side of the globe, because they begin the Sabbath at least twelve hours earlier than we do here. In fact, it takes just forty-eight hours, or the time of two whole days, from the time any one day first begins in the extreme east till it ends at the furthest place in the west. Will the reader stop and think carefully, sharply, on this point, for it is an important one? It takes twenty-four hours for the *first end* of a day to go clear around the earth. Then, as the *last end* of the day is twenty-four hours behind the *first end*, it must also have twenty-four hours more to go clear around the earth, and that makes forty-eight hours in all that each day is on the earth somewhere.

I am quite certain that the average Sabbatarian feels when he keeps the seventh day that he is now keeping holy time with the Lord himself, and with the angels, and with all his brethren. I used to feel that way I know, and the above quotations from Mrs. White and Elder Smith show plainly that even they think so, too. But it will be seen that this cannot be so unless the Lord keeps the time of two whole days each week. And in that case, those on this side of the earth would be working while the Lord was keeping the Sabbath with those on the other side of the earth. Then those on the opposite side of the earth would be working while the Lord kept Sabbath with those on this side. And so none of them would keep the Sabbath with the Lord after all! In fact, taking it all around the earth, there is not a single hour in the whole week when there is not some Sabbatarian at work on some part of the earth!

But, further, does the Lord keep our seventh day with us, or does he keep the seventh day with the people on other planets? Our days and weeks are not at all in harmony with theirs, nor can one of them be like another. Now, if the Lord rests only on our Saturday, then he could not rest on the seventh day of Venus or Mars or Jupiter, etc., as the seventh day of each planet differs in length, and comes at a different time, from that of our earth or any other planet. How, then, could God rest on all these days? If he did, he must keep Sabbath all the time, and then nobody, angels or men, could keep the Sabbath with the Lord if they worked at all!

What, then, becomes of Mrs. White's statement that "all the angelic host" keep our Sabbath? or Elder Smith's hypothesis that all the universe "will observe the same period together?" Both are utterly absurd. The same definite seventh day can not be kept by all the universe; even on this earth alone it cannot be kept by all at the same time; but all can keep a seventh part of the time. This principle upon which the fourth commandment was based, may be of universal application in earth and in heaven, in time or eternity. But just which day that shall be, is a matter of minor consequence to be determined by the circumstances in the case, which may and must differ at different times and in different places. To the Jewish people it certainly was the seventh day, or Saturday, and no other day would have met the commandment. All the rigorous limitations and exactions of the Sabbath day, as under the Jewish law, could be carried out by a small people in a limited territory where the church bore rule. A particular day, the seventh (Deut. 5:12, 13); definite hours, sunset to sunset (Lev. 23:32); no fires in all their houses (Ex. 35:3); stoning to death for picking up a stick (Num. 15:32-36)—this was the Jewish law. But we are not Jews, nor under the Jewish law. Under the new dispensation of the gospel, other circumstances have arisen plainly and grandly marking another day as the all-important day in Christian memory—the resurrection day. When the gospel was to go to all nations, to all climates, and around the earth, the Christian rest day was necessarily and wisely left upon a far different basis,

Then, how do our Sabbatarian friends know just *where*, at what place on the earth, to begin reckoning the day? They certainly *know* nothing about it, but have to guess at the whole thing. Open your map at longitude 180 degrees west, where the day line is located by common consent by Sabbatarians and all. It runs across a point of Asia, and through the Pacific ocean. On the west side of this line, as the sun sets Friday evening, the seventh day is reckoned to begin. A few rods on the east of this line the same day does not begin till twenty-four hours later, as now reckoned.

But who knows that this is the exact place where the Lord began the day? No one, as there is no evidence of it whatever. It is all guess work. It was only by accident and for convenience that it was located here. At a comparatively recent date the English began to reckon longitude from the Royal observatory at Greenwich, England. From this place 180 degrees east or west are reckoned, and there the day line was located by them, and finally accepted for convenience by other nations. But suppose that Jerusalem, Rome, Paris, or Washington, had been selected, instead of Greenwich; then what? In that case, which easily might have happened, and may even yet, the day line would have been thousands of miles from where it is now. Then for thousands of miles it would have been Saturday where now it is Sunday, and Sunday where now it is Saturday! If the day began in the traditional place where Eden is supposed to have been located, then it would be away west of this some 7,000 miles, west even of Australia; and then the seventh-day people in Australia are not keeping the Sabbath at all. In that case the Sunday-keepers of New Zealand and Australia are now actually keeping the original seventh day, and Sabbatarians there are keeping the sixth day! Do they know, and can they prove, that this is not so? No; they simply have to take the reckoning just as it happened to be, right or wrong, without knowing which it is. And yet, at great expense, they have sent missionaries there to convert the people over to keep another day, when actually they do not know but what those people are really keeping the seventh day, and they themselves are wrong! None, not even themselves, pretend to know where God began to reckon that day; yet they draw the line to a hair, and say that all will be damned who do not toe that line and count from that spot! Does the salvation of a man's soul depend upon such mathematical niceties and such uncertainties as these? If it does, we may well despair of heaven.

The very fact that God has never revealed just where the true day line is, or where the seventh day began, shows that it is of no consequence for us to know. As a matter of fact, the people of Alaska and of Pitcairn's Island, both lying on the American side of the day line, having come to those lands from the east, brought with them the reckoning of the east, and so call our Saturday Sunday.

Look also at the difficulty in crossing this supposed day line in the Pacific ocean. I have personally conversed with Sabbatarians who have crossed this line both ways, east and west. Going west, a day is *added*, going east, it is dropped, and this is done at *noon* of the day which finds them nearest the supposed line. On the vessel, a man going west sits down to dinner 11:50 a. m., Friday. While he is eating the time is changed and he rises from dinner Saturday noon! Then he has only six hours of Sabbath till sunset; or coming east, he sits down to dinner Saturday noon and rises from dinner Friday noon! He has kept eighteen hours Sabbath; then it is gone in a second at high noon, and he has six hours to work till sunset. Now he must begin Sabbath once more and keep it over again, twenty-four hours! In one case he only kept six hours Sabbath, and in the other case he kept forty-two hours!

These stubborn facts demonstrate the utter absurdity of the Sabbatarian view. They claim that these things do not bother them any; but

I know that they do, and badly, too. They have written much on it, devised all sorts of diagrams, illustrations and argument to meet the difficulty; but none are satisfactory, even to themselves. Hence new methods are constantly being devised to dodge the difficulty. The latest discovery is that adopted by the Seventh-day Adventist ministers of the New York conference. It is, that the earth is absolutely *flat* and *stationary*, with sun, moon and stars much smaller than the earth and revolving around it! "The sun, he do move," the old darkey said, and they say, Amen.

Now test the definite seventh-day theory in the frozen regions of the north. The day must be kept from sunset to sunset (Lev. 23:32.) But in the winter there are months when the sun is not seen there at all, so they have no sunset. And again, in summer there are months when the sun is above the horizon all the time, when there is no sunset. Here the theory breaks down entirely, and the day must be reckoned by artificial means. They can keep one-seventh of the time, and that is absolutely all that can be done. Seventh-day Adventists have argued that there was no real difficulty here; it was all imaginary. But I happen to know that they themselves have got into serious trouble right there. What endless and needless difficulties people get themselves into, trying to keep a law which was only designed for the Jews in a limited locality. How contrary to the freedom and simplicity of the gospel!

In reply to all these facts, which can not be denied, seventh-day people say: Is not the first day of the week, or Sunday, just as definite a day as the seventh day, or Saturday? Is it not just as difficult to keep Sunday all around the world as it is to keep Saturday? Do you not claim that you should keep the first day in honor of the resurrection? and will it do, then, to keep some other day? The answer to these questions is not hard to give. The essential idea is that we should devote one day in seven to religious duties. To secure the highest good, all should unite in observing the same day. From the days of the apostles the christian church has, with one consent, observed the day on which Jesus rose from the dead, the first day of the week, or Sunday. But it is not claimed that it is absolutely essential that exactly the same minutes and hours, or even the same definite day, must be kept anyway and under all circumstances, whether or no. That would be legalism, and contrary to the very nature and freedom of the gospel. Suppose the Jewish day on which Jesus arose was reckoned from sunset to sunset, as doubtless it was, must we also reckon it that way? As it is found more convenient to reckon the day from midnight to midnight, and as all are united in doing so, it is for the best interests of religion to conform to this custom. If, in travelling around the world, men should mistake their longitude, as in case of Alaska and Pitcairn's Island, and call Saturday Sunday, it is not material. They had better all unite on that, than to quarrel over it. If, in the long period of darkness at the north pole, men should lose the time, and then select some other period than that which exactly corresponds to our Sunday, hour for hour, the difference would not be material. Or, if in locating the day line from which to reckon the beginning of the day, that line had happened to be located 5,000 miles further east or 10,000 further west, it would not have made a particle of difference. And as to whether we now begin the day just where God did in Eden or not, is a matter of no consequence. And whether our brethren in China rest at the same time we do or not, is of little account. And whether the Sabbath of Jupiter and Mars and Neptune, and of heaven itself, comes when ours does or not, is of little interest to us. It will be time enough to settle that matter when we go to live with them. So, while travelling around the earth, east or west, or crossing the day line, whether or not we are able to keep exactly the same time, or even exactly one-seventh part of time to a minute, is of

little importance. We do the best we can under the circumstances, and conform to the time as reckoned by those where we go. To "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel," is not a good practice in any cause. But with the strict Sabbatarian all this is entirely different. A certain day, beginning at precisely such a line to a hair, and at such a minute to a second, is holy time. If you don't hit that exact time just right, you might as well keep no day at all! That may do for Judaism, but it certainly is not according to the spirit and freedom of the gospel.

I believe this is a fair statement of the position held by the great body of the intelligent observers of Sunday. It harmonizes exactly with the statement of our Saviour, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27.) Man and his highest good are first; the Sabbath is secondary and subservient to these. Practically, the Sabbatarian exactly reverses this order. The Sabbath is the all-important thing, a rigid, iron rule, unbending and inflexible. Man and his necessities and his good are of little or no account in comparison with the supremely great duty to keep the Sabbath. "Man was made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man," would much better express their idea of the relative relation and importance of the two. It is well for the people and the world that such pharisaical ideas have found few advocates in the church of Christ.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SABBATH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

With the opening of the gospel comes the most glorious period of the church's history. The Son of God himself stands before us clothed with all the authority of heaven. (Matt. 28:18.) God says, "Hear ye, him." (Matt. 17:5.) He came to introduce the gospel, "a new and living way" (Heb. 10:20), "the new covenant," "a better covenant" (Heb. 8:6, 8), which sets aside and supercedes the old (verse 13). Compared to the Jewish age it is a "great light" (Matt. 4:16), and the gospel church is represented as "a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet" (Rev. 12:1). All agree that the sun is the gospel, and the moon the old dispensation. Much which before was dark, shadowy, and mysterious, is now light and plain. (Rom. 16:25, 26.)

A great and radical change in the mode of worshipping God is now introduced. The new wine of the gospel must not be put into the old bottles of the Jewish law, nor the new covenant patched on to the old. (Mark 2:21, 22.) Hence, "there is made of necessity a change also of the law" (Heb. 7:12), which was only a "schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ" Gal. 3:24, who "is the end of the law" (Rom. 10:6). Now we are to hear Jesus (Matt. 7:24), and keep his commandments (John 14:15, 21), for we "are not under the law" (Rom. 6:14). Many institutions of the Old Testament which were once given in the most solemn manner, and by the authority of God himself, are no longer binding.

Now, where shall we look to find the clearest light upon these old institutions? Where shall we go to learn the real design of them all? Where shall we turn to obtain the necessary rules for a Christian to live by? Shall we go back to the moonlight of the Jewish law? to the starlight of the patriarchal age? or shall we come to the full sunlight of the gospel? Evidently the New Testament furnishes the clearest, and only authoritative guide for the Christian. The Old Testament can only be read and rightly understood in the light of the New. But it is a fact that Sabbatarians have to go back to the Old Testament, even clear back to the uncertain institutions of the patriarchal age, as their clearest and most certain authority for the seventh day. The evidence from the New Testament only comes in as secondary and collateral. All their strongest arguments for the Sabbath are away back among the shadows of the Old Testament. Take these from them, and the very foundation has fallen out from their theory. I know that this is so, for I have gone over the ground a thousand times. I know just how a seventh-day man feels, and where he rests his confidence. It is in Genesis and the law. Of the New Testament he is always a little shy. But is there any other Christian duty which is plainly laid down only in the Old Testament? I do not think of a single one, though in the past I tried hard and long to find it. On all other points the New Testament is clear and full. In it we have chapter after chapter, epistle after epistle, and book after book, packed full of instruction on every Christian duty in every possible phase of it. The duty or the sin covered by each of the other nine commandments is directly named many times over in the New Testament. But the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned in all the New Testament. We arrange side by side,

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

1. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv:10, and Luke iv:8.

2. "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." I John v:21; Acts xv:20-29, xxi:25; Rev. ix:20.

3. "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath." James v:12; Matt. v:33-36.

4. THE FOURTH COMMAND OF
THE DECALOGUE IS NOT IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

5. "Honor thy father and thy mother: He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death." Matt. xv:4, xix:19; Eph. vi:1.

6. "Whoso hateth his brother is a murderer." I John iii:12. "Thou shalt do no murder." Matt. xix:18; Mark x:19; Rom. x:iii:9.

7. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already within his heart." Matt. v:28. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Matt. xix:18; Mark x:19; Rom. xiii:9; Eph. v:5; Rev. xxi:8.

8. "Thou shalt not steal." Matt. xix:18; Mark x:19; Eph. iv:28.

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Matt. xix:18; Mark x:19;

10. "Thou shalt not covet." Rom. xiii:9; Eph. v:5; I Tim. vi:10.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT.

1. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Ex. xx:3.

2. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, . . . thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them." Ex. xx:4, 5.

3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Ex. xx:7.

4. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Ex. xx:8.

5. "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land . . ." Ex. xx:12.

6. "Thou shalt not kill." Ex. xx:13.

7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Ex. xx:14.

8. "Thou shalt not steal." Ex. xx:15.

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Ex. xx:16.

10. "Thou shalt not covet." Ex. xx:17.

Time and again, all through the New Testament long lists of sins embracing every possible shade of wickedness are given, but a disregard of the seventh day is never once included. Thus: Mark 7:21, 22, thirteen sins; Rom. 1:29-31, nineteen sins; Gal. 5:19-21, seventeen sins; 2 Tim. 3:1-4, eighteen sins, etc. How is this? Would Sabbatarians have left it so?

Strange to say, the duty to keep the seventh day is not once mentioned in the whole New Testament. There is not one single command from either Christ or any of his apostles to keep that day. It is not once said that it is wrong to work on the seventh day, or that God will bless any one for observing it. There is no promise for keeping it, no threatening for not keeping it. No one is ever reprov'd for working on the seventh day, nor approved for observing it. If disregarding the seventh day is so great a crime as its advocates now claim, it is unaccountable that no warning against it should be given in all the New Testament—not even once. Is all this silence merely accidental? So Sabbatarians have to believe; but the supposition is absurd. Evidently it was left out on purpose, the same as the pentecost, passover, new moons, sacrifices and the like.

The usual answer is that the Jews were already keeping the Sabbath, even too strictly, and therefore the Jewish christians needed no instruction on this point. But this answer is not satisfactory. The Jews were just as strictly opposed to false gods and images, and yet over christians are warned against these things. Thus Paul says: "Neither be ye idolaters," and "Flee from idolatry." (1 Cor. 10:7, 14.) But where does it say, "Keep the seventh day?" or "Flee from Sabbath breaking?" Besides, the great body of the Christian converts in the latter years of the gospel, were Gentiles, who had never kept the seventh day at all. Why should they not be instructed how to keep it? Why should they be repeatedly warned against all other evil practices of their former lives, but never warned against breaking the Sabbath as they certainly had done before? This was a point which I was never able to answer satisfactorily to myself while I kept the seventh day. The simple and manifest fact is, that it was not intended to bind the Jewish Sabbath upon the christian church. Hence it was quietly allowed to drop out with other old covenant holy days and institutions.

The arguments offered out of the New Testament for the observance of the seventh day are few and not hard to answer. Let us examine the main ones.

JESUS KEPT THE SEVENTH DAY, THEREFORE WE MUST.

With Sabbatarians this argument has more weight than all others from the New Testament. It always did with me. But now I am satisfied that, when fairly considered, there is nothing in it. Jesus was born and lived all his life under the law. (Gal. 4:4.) That law was binding till his death. (Col. 2:14.) Of course he ought to have kept every item of that law till the cross, just as he evidently did do. On this point Elder Geo. I. Butler, the present leader of the Seventh-day Adventists, says: "He lived under all the ceremonies and observances of the law of Moses, the same as did the other Jews. Thus he was 'born under the law' and subject to it. All his life he was careful not to break any of its provisions, and he never permitted his disciples to do it to the day of his death." ("The book of Galatians," p. 59.)

This is the plain truth in the case. But it shows the utter fallacy of arguing that we must keep the seventh day just because Jesus did. If we observe one institution of the old law just because Jesus did, then we should also keep all that he did; that is, live just as the Jews did under the law of Moses! for that is just what Jesus did. He instructed his disciples how to offer gifts upon the altar (Matt. 5:23, 24), sent a man to offer a *gift* (Matt. 8:4), commanded his disciples to observe all that the scribes taught (Matt. 23:2, 3), and was very particular to keep the passover just according to law only the day before his death (Luke 22:7-15.) But who thinks now of doing all these things because Jesus did? No one. Then why pick out the seventh day from all other holy days and rites and hold on to that while rejecting all the rest which he also

observed? It seems as though a candid man must admit that this argument for the Jewish Sabbath is not a success. If that day is binding upon christians it must be upon some other ground than because Jesus kept it while living as a Jew under the Jewish law.

THE SABBATH IN THE BOOK OF ACTS.

Sabbatarians think they have a fair argument in the Acts. Here the seventh day is always called "the Sabbath," and it is evident that the Jewish christians still observed it, and met with the Jews in worship on that day. From this it is concluded that all christians should keep that day, too. This is based upon the false assumption that whatever customs and laws of the old covenant were still observed for a few years by the Jewish christians after the resurrection, must be binding upon the church now.

A careful examination of what the disciples did really do for many years after the resurrection will show that they kept all the Mosaic law, including feast days, the Sabbath day, sacrifices, circumcision, vows, and the whole Jewish ritual. But they did this as *Jews*, according to their national law and long established custom. That they did not do so as a christian duty is manifest from the fact that Gentile christians were not required to observe these things. (Acts 15:19-28; 21:25.) "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observed no such thing." Every mention of the Sabbath in Acts, without a single exception, is in connection with the Jewish worship on that day. (Acts 13:14, 15, 42-45; 15:21; 16:13; 17:1-2; 18:4.) The law and the prophets were read, and Jewish worship conducted as usual. Certainly the disciples could not hold a distinctively christian meeting here under these circumstances. They must assemble by themselves to worship Jesus and have the Lord's supper, and that is just what we find them doing on the first day of the week. (Acts 20:7.) There is no record of a single meeting of Gentile christians upon the seventh day, nor of Jewish christians, except in the Jewish synagogues or Jewish worship.

When the word "Sabbath" was used of the seventh day, it was used simply as the long established *name* of that day, and not as indicating any sacredness to the day. So another Jewish holy day, pentecost, continued to be called by that old name, "pentecost," though no sacredness of the day was meant by it. See Acts 2:1; 20:16. Consider a few facts as to why the Jewish christians did not immediately give up the observance of the seventh day. How carefully and gradually Jesus unfolded his new doctrines, even to the chosen apostles. To the multitude he spoke only in parables "as they were able to hear it." (Mark 4:33.) Had Jesus at once and plainly told the people the radical change which he had come to make in the Jewish system of worship, they would have killed him immediately. Even the apostles would doubtless have left him. During all the ministry of our Lord, nothing stands out more prominently than the fact that he was gradually but cautiously preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God. The great obstacles he had to contend with were their narrow views, their tenacity for the forms and ceremonies and letter of the law, and Jewish ideas of God's kingdom. That he was to take the throne of David, subjugate the world to Israel, and carry on the Jewish mode of worship with the temple service—this idea was so firmly rooted in the minds of even the apostles, that they could not understand Jesus even when he plainly told them to the contrary. Hence the Saviour simply left them to outgrow these ideas as the nature of his gospel more fully dawned upon them after his resurrection and ascension and the descent of the Holy Spirit. Just before Jesus died, he said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye

cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." (John 16:12, 13.) How often he had to say to them, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe." (Luke 24:25.) "Are ye also yet without understanding?" (Matt. 15:16.)

Forty days after the resurrection still found them clinging to their old Jewish idea of the temporal reign of Jesus at Jerusalem. "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Knowing that it was impossible to correct their wrong notions by a mere statement, Jesus left them to outgrow these errors as they learned more of the gospel. Now follow them through the book of Acts, and observe how long and tenaciously they held on to all the observances of the old Jewish law, not only the Sabbath, but all the temple service and ceremonies of the Mosaic law. On Pentecost we find them keeping the sacred day with the other Jews. (Acts 2.) As late as ten years after the resurrection they were "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only. (Acts 11:19.) Not a sermon had they thought of preaching to a Gentile till God, by a special miracle, sent Peter to Cornelius. (Acts 10.) As late as this Peter was scrupulously regarding the Mosaic law of meats. He said, "I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." (Verse 14.) And he designed to keep right on observing it. And when the Holy spirit came upon the Gentiles, the disciples were astonished "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Verse 45.) When he returned to Jerusalem the whole church was in an uproar over it. "And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." (Acts 11:2, 3.)

Up to this time, then, we find the church at Jerusalem, with Peter at its head, still keeping the Jewish law concerning food, and refusing to eat with Gentiles. Now study the great council at Jerusalem, held over twenty years after the resurrection. (Acts 15.) Not only did the whole church in Judea keep the entire Mosaic law in all its rites, including circumcision, but they endeavored also to force it upon the Gentile converts. (Verses 1-19.) But through the influence of Paul, this move was defeated. If it had not been that, in the providence of God, Paul was raised up to oppose it, the whole Christian church would have been placed under the bondage of the Mosaic law. As it was, that council freed only the Gentile converts from obedience to Moses' law. (Acts 15: 19, 23; 21:25.) All Jewish Christians still kept it.

Even as late as A. D. 60, or nearly thirty years after the cross, we still find the whole Jewish church in Judea strictly keeping the law of Moses as to circumcision, offerings, vows, shaving the head, etc. Not only did they themselves observe all these rites of the old law, but they required all Jewish Christians throughout the world to do the same. When Paul went up to Jerusalem only a few years before his death, they demanded of him a pledge that he himself also kept these rites. Read carefully the following: "And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law. And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee; We have four men which have a vow on them. Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have

written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication. Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them." (Acts 21:20-26.)

These words prove all that I have claimed above, and show conclusively that the Jewish christians observed all the rites of the laws of Moses as late as that, which was but a few years before the fall of Jerusalem. All church historians agree that the Jewish christians continued to observe the seventh day, even for some time after the fall of Jerusalem. But they also observed Sunday. The Ebionites, Jews, "observed both the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath." ("Ruter's church history," p. 29.) Neander says: "Churches consisting of Jewish converts, although they received the festival of Sunday, retained also that of the Sabbath." (p. 186.) "The Jewish christians of Palestine retained the entire Mosaic law." (Giesler's "Ecclesiastical history," quoted in Andrew's "History of Sabbath," p. 334.) These historical facts help us to understand the record in Acts.

If we consider a moment we shall not wonder that they clung with such tenacity to the observances of that law. Every item of it had been given to their forefathers in the most solemn manner, either directly by God himself or through his holy prophets, whose memory they held in the greatest reverence. The wrath of God had been threatened against the slightest violation of this law. All the blessings of heaven were promised for obedience to it. (Deut. 28:1-50.) Its unchanging perpetuity seemed to be taught throughout the Old Testament. Thus: "All his commandments are sure. (Psa. 111:7, 8.) "Every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever" (Psa. 119:160.) God gave Levi "the covenant of an everlasting priesthood." (Num. 25:13.) Aaron was to offer "a perpetual incense before the Lord." (Ex. 30:8.) Circumcision "shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." (Gen. 17:13.) "Ye shall keep it [the passover] a feast by an ordinance forever." (Ex. 12:14.) "Observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever. (Ex. 31:16, 17.) Easily enough a Jew would give these expressions the strongest possible construction, and conclude that every item of that law was to be perpetual. Every child was taught this from infancy up.

It was the observance of this law that had separated the Jews out from, and lifted them above, all the nations of the earth as the special people of God. Every rite and ceremony of that law had been hallowed by the observance of 1,500 years. Their forefathers had laid down their lives for the law. A word against it was blasphemy. (Acts 6:13, 14.) In view of all this, think of asking a pious Jew to give up the keeping of his holy law, or any item of it. No indeed, such a thought could not be entertained for a moment, not even by the disciples. Hence Jesus, as a wise leader, did not attempt it, but allowed them time to learn better as they came to comprehend more clearly the wonderful change which the gospel really carried with it. Even among the apostles, Paul seems to have been the only one who fully took it in. Elder Butler, the Seventh-day Adventist leader, truly says: "Indeed, it may well be doubted whether a large portion of the early church who were Jews before conversion ever fully realized the scope and extent of the gospel in setting aside those laws peculiarly Jewish. They clung to them, and were zealous for them long after they were abolished at the cross. To Paul we are indebted, through the blessing of God, for the only full explanation of the proper relation of these laws to the plan of salvation." ("Law in Galatians," p. 8.)

This is the simple truth exactly. Hence it is that in the earlier gospels of Matthew and Mark and in the epistles of James and Peter, you find little or no reference to a change of the Jewish law. It was certain who "came from James" (Gal. 2:12) that tried to enforce that law upon Gentile converts, and it is to Matthew and James that Sabbatarians now go for their strongest texts. (Matt. 5:17-19; James 2:8-12.) It is Paul who furnishes us the strong statements against the keeping of the Mosaic law, Sabbath and holy days. Let Sabbatarians meditate upon this point a little. The hottest battle which the great apostle to the Gentiles had to fight all his life was right upon the question of the observance of that law and these things, and his bitterest opponents were his own Christian brethren who were Jews. (Acts 15:1, 2; Gal. 2:1-14.) To conciliate these as far as possible, according to his own rule, "unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews" (1 Cor. 9:20); he, himself, as a Jew, not as a Christian, submitted to keep all the Jewish law, as we have seen. (Acts 21:20-26.) He circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews" (Acts 16:3), and kept the pentecost (Acts 20:16.)

How much, then, does it prove in favor of the Jewish Sabbath to find that it was still called "the Sabbath," or that it was kept by the Jewish Christians, or even by Paul himself? Just nothing at all; for by the same argument, as we have seen, we must observe the passover, pentecost, offer offerings, make vows, shave your heads, be circumcised, and keep all the rites of the Mosaic law the same as those disciples did for years.

One of the strongest arguments the seventh-day people make from the New Testament is from Paul's statement (Acts 25:8; 28:17) that he had done nothing contrary to "the law of the Jews" or the "customs of their fathers." Then he must have kept the Sabbath, for that was the law and custom of his people. Yes, indeed, and so it was also to circumcise, to keep all the feast days, offer offerings, etc. Hence Paul must have done all these, and therefore we must do it, too! So it is that the arguments for the seventh day lead right back to keeping all the Jewish observances of the old law.

It was zeal for the law that stirred up the Jews to the most intense hatred of Paul, the one apostle above all others who, as the apostle of the Gentiles, showed the fulfilment and end of that law in Christ. They cried out, "Men of Israel, help, this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people and the law." (Acts 21:28.) For this they dogged his steps from city to city, plotted his destruction, and never rested till he was killed. It was the same mistaken zeal for that law which led the believing Christian Jews "to command them [the Gentiles] to keep the law of Moses." (Acts 15:5.) Everywhere they followed after Paul, entered the churches which he had gathered, and urged upon their necks that yoke of bondage from which Christ had made them free. Of all the trials which Paul had to endure, this stirred up his righteous wrath the most, till at last he denounced against them the curse of God. (Gal. 1:8.) To his children he cried out, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" "Ye did run well, who did hinder you?" (Gal. 3:1; 4:21; 5:7.) Paul bore with more patience even the sins of his churches than he did the Judaizing teachings of these misguided disciples; for the one was only personal and temporary, but the other was fundamental, a perversion of the gospel, leading away from Christ back into Judaism.

A study of church history shows that this same Judaizing spirit has cropped out here and there all along from the days of the apostles down. Honest, conscientious men, reading the strong expressions of the Old Testament, conclude that those old institutions must still be binding. Hence all who disregard them are sinners, breaking the law of God. Immediately they are fired up with zeal to proselyte everybody to their

views. Into the churches they go, into other men's labors they enter, just as their brethren of old followed after Paul, taking his converts, dividing his churches, turning them against their own father in the gospel, judging and condemning everybody who did not "keep the law" according to their ideas. "They have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." (Rom. 10:2.)

It was my misfortune to fall under these influences in my youth. Twenty-eight years of the best of my life I gave to such work. I have been through the mill, and know its sad effects. It has blighted and saddened my life, as it has thousands of others. From my heart I pity those who are now daily being led into the same error. A few can be helped: the most cannot. "Bewitched," is what Paul calls it, and my experience is that he hit the right word.

MARK 2:27, 28. THE SABBATH MADE FOR MAN.

"The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath: therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." From this we learn,

1. Man is superior to the Sabbath, for it was made for him and not he for it.

2. Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath, hence superior to it and can dispose of it to please himself.

3. In the service of God, the ceremonial precepts of the law are of greater importance than the Sabbath law. In proof of this Jesus says "that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple, profane [disregard] the Sabbath and are blameless." (Matt. 12:5.) Jesus himself said this. The priests would work hard all day butchering and dressing animals and thus profane the Sabbath. The Sabbath law was set aside to obey a ceremonial precept.

4. Man's need is higher than the Sabbath law. To prove this Jesus cites the case of David, who violated the ritual law when he ate the holy bread in his need. (Matt. 12:3-4.) So his disciples in their hunger had done with the Sabbath law and were not guilty.

5. The preservation of animal life is more important than the keeping of the letter of the Sabbath law. Jesus proves this by the case of the sheep in the pit. They would work on the Sabbath to take it out. So now, even Sabbatharians will work hard on the Sabbath in fire or flood to save even property. Would they dare violate the letter of any other commandment that way? No. Then, surely, Jesus himself being judge, the observance of the strict letter of the Sabbath law is not a matter of the highest importance. This is the lesson plainly taught here by Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath. It squarely condemns the rigid interpretation of the Sabbatharians who make the Sabbath more important than man himself for whom it was made.

MATT. 24:20.

"Pray that your flight be not . . . on the Sabbath day." Why? Read the connection. (Verses 15-20.) Jerusalem was to be suddenly destroyed. When they saw the sign of this they must flee immediately. Those in the field must not go to the house; those on the house top must not go down to get their clothes. They must not lose a moment. But if it came on the Sabbath the gates of the city would be shut, (Neh. 13:19) and they would be detained. The gates of all the towns through which they must pass would be shut. The Jews would also arrest them as Sabbath-breakers. These are sufficient reasons for praying that it might not happen on that day.

But would it be wrong to flee on that day, to save your life if it did happen on the Sabbath? Even Sabbatharians will not say that it would be wrong nor did Jesus say they should not flee on the Sabbath. Evi-

dently, then, Jesus did not mention this because it would be a violation of the Sabbath, but because it would be inconvenient. Hence this text affords no proof of Sabbath sacredness after the cross.

MATT. 28:1.

"In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week." So Mark 16:1-2. The Sabbath, after the death of Christ, is still the day before the first day of the week. Hence the first day of the week on which Christ rose was not the Sabbath yet. *Answer*: All the days in the week, in the month and in the year, still continued to be called by their old Jewish names for many years after Christ; but it does not follow that they continued to be sacred days, for Paul expressly states that all those feast days, new moons, and Sabbath days were nailed to the cross. Col. 2:14-16; Gal. 4:10-11; Rom. 14:5-6. Take three examples: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," Acts 2:1; "Then were the days of unleavened bread." Acts 12:3; "Went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day." Acts 13:14. Here we have the same old names for three of the Jewish holy days, viz: Pentecost, days of unleavened bread, and Sabbath day. Are all these days still holy days because they are still called by their former names? If so, then we ought to observe Pentecost and the days of unleavened bread as well as keep the Sabbath. So there is no force in the argument from the mere use of the word Sabbath after the cross. The resurrection day was not called the Sabbath in the New Testament nor by Christians for several hundred years after Christ. It was called "Lord's Day." Rev. 1:10.

LUKE 23:56. THE WOMAN "RESTED THE SABBATH DAY ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT."

This was after Christ died; hence it shows that they thought that the Sabbath was still to be kept. They were the followers of Jesus and knew what he taught. *Answer*: But this was before Jesus rose from the dead and before they had any idea of the great change which the gospel was to make in the service of God. Their old Jewish ideas still blinded their minds so that they could not at once take in the nature of what Jesus had really come to do. Just before this Jesus said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but he cannot hear them now." John 16:12. So he had not tried to explain all these less important matters to them; but he said that he would, after the resurrection, send them the holy spirit to guide them into all truth. John 16:13. It was not till after the Holy Ghost came upon them at Pentecost that they began to comprehend the true nature of the gospel. So it is no proof that the Jewish Sabbath is binding on Gentiles because the Jewish women kept it while Jesus was dead and in his grave.

PAUL AT CORINTH, ACTS 18:1-11.

Sabbatarians argue that Paul preached in the synagogue on the Sabbath for one year and a half, while at Corinth as above. But facts are against them. He preached to the Jews in the synagogue only a few Sabbaths. Then he went to the Gentiles and stayed with Justus a Gentile. He appears to have held meetings in his house. (Acts 18:4-7.) So far is another one of their famous arguments.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LAW.

The foundation of their Sabbatarian error, I believe, is the idea that "the law," in all the strictness of the old letter, is binding on christians. Hence, their constant theme is the law, law, law. They preach it ten times as much as they preach Christ. Unfortunately, a false theory of the law taught by some other churches has led them into this sad error. For twenty-eight years I was held in that "bondage." Now that I have found my way out, if I can help others, I shall rejoice.

Antinomians, from *anti*, against, and *nomos*, law, against law, is a term applied to those who maintain that christians are under no obligation to keep the law of God or to do any good works. If they commit any kind of sin it will not hinder their salvation at all if they only believe in Jesus. Salvation is wholly of faith without any regard to a man's deeds. See any cyclopedia. This is an abominable doctrine, subversive of the gospel; yet Seventh-day Adventists brand all as Antinomians who do not agree with them as to what is the law of God. I am as much opposed to Antinomianism as they. I believe in strict obedience to law, in keeping the commandments of God, and in the necessity of good works as strongly as they do. Luther, vehemently opposed Antinomianism and yet taught the abolition of the Mosaic law and the decalogue. It is unfair and unjust for Adventists to call people Antinomians who abhor that doctrine. We plead for a pure life, good work, and obedience to God as necessary to salvation. Hence it is a falsehood and a slander to represent us as Antinomians.

Bunyan, Judson, and a host of such men have repudiated the Sabbatarian idea of the law, and yet have been holy men. I am not afraid to stand with them. I shall now lay down a few propositions concerning the law which seem to me so plain and well supported by the Bible, that all must agree with them.

PROPOSITION 1. "THE LAW" EMBRACES THE WHOLE MOSAIC LAW, MORAL, CIVIL AND CEREMONIAL.

The term, "the law," when used with the definite article and without qualifying words, refers "in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch." Smith's Bible Dictionary, article Law. Invariably the Adventists use the term "the law," for the ten commandments only. They hang up a chart of the decalogue and constantly point to it as "the law," Matt. 5:17; "the law of the Lord," Ps. 19:7; "the law of God," Rom. 7:22. This is their fundamental error on the law. I affirm that "the law" included the whole system of law given to the Jews at Sinai, embracing all those requirements, whether moral, civil or ceremonial—decalogue and all. Look at the term "law," in a concordance, or in any Biblical lexicon, dictionary or cyclopedia. "The law" commonly included the whole of the five books of Moses. Even Eld. Butler is compelled to make this confession: "The term, 'the law,' among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical and civil. This as a *system* these Judaizing teachers desired to maintain. Circumcision was a sign of the whole." Law in Galatians, p. 70.

This is exactly the truth. Now bear in mind this one simple fact, wherever you find the term "the law" and you will have no trouble with Sabbatarian arguments on "the law." In 1 Cor. 14:34, "the law" refers to Gen. 3:16; in Rom. 7:7 it refers to Ex. 20:17; in Matt. 22:36-40 it refers to Lev. 19:18 and Deut. 6:5; in Matt. 12:5 it refers to Num. 28:9. These embrace all the five books of Moses as "the law." Read carefully the following texts, and it will be seen that "the law" embraces all parts of the Mosaic law, whether moral, civil, or ceremonial. Hag. 2:11-12; Luke 2:27 (ceremonial); 1 Tim. 1:8-10 (moral); Acts 23:3 (civil). But every time it is simply the law. "Gamaliel, a doctor of the law," Acts 5:34. Of what law? Was he simply a doctor of some part of the law, as the moral, or civil, or ceremonial precepts? Every intelligent man knows that "the law," of which he was doctor or teacher, was the whole Pentateuch, decalogue included. The law, then, is the whole Jewish law, in all its parts. This one point, clearly settled, destroys nine-tenths of all the Seventh-Day Adventist argument for the Jewish Sabbath.

Take a few examples of the use of the term "the law." "The parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law." Luke 2:27. This was of the temple offerings, ceremonial. "Commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law." Acts 23:3. A civil regulation. "The law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. A moral precept: "The law was given by Moses." John 1:17. The law as a whole. Notice that it is always simply "the law." Now *the law* is either binding or it is not. It is not partly abolished and partly binding. That would be an absurdity, nor is such an idea hinted at anywhere. But if the law is binding, then we must offer sacrifices, keep the old feast days, and live just as the Jews did, for they kept the law.

THE TWO LAWS.

PROPOSITION 2. *There was no such thing as two laws given to the Jews.* To sustain their doctrine Sabbatarians have invented a theory of two laws given at Sinai; one the moral law, the other the ceremonial. But the Bible makes no such distinction. As we have seen, "the law" embraces the "whole law." Gal. 5:3. Of course, in that law, some precepts refer to moral duties, other to civil, and others to ceremonial but all are only different parts of the same law, called, as a whole, "the law." Thus Jesus quotes from Lev. 19, as "the law." See Matt. 22:36-40; Luke 10:26, 27. Now read the whole chapter, Lev. 19, and you find moral, civil and ceremonial precepts all mingled together, and often in the same verse. Adventists, to sustain their theory, have to go through this chapter, as they do through the whole Bible, and cut and carve, and split hairs, and label one sentence "the moral law," another "the ceremonial law," etc. This is what is properly termed "the scrapping system." It does great violence to the Scriptures, twisting them out of their evident meaning.

In no place can they find their ceremonial law given by itself. They have to pick it out here and there in scraps. The "book of the law," which was placed in the side of the ark, Deut. 31:24-26, is usually pointed to as the ceremonial law. But this "book of the law" embraced the whole five books of Moses. At least, the whole of Deuteronomy. Compare Josh. 8:31 with Ex. 20:25; Gal. 3:10 with Deut. 27:1-26 (all moral precepts); Deut. 1:5, 5:1-21 (the whole decalogue); 31:9, 24-26. Eld. Butler, himself, the present head of the Advent church, makes this confession: "The 'book of the law,' which was placed in the side of the ark, or at the side of it, contained both the moral and ceremonial laws." Law in Galatians, p. 39. That drops the bottom out of the theory that the moral law was "in the ark," and the ceremonial law "in the side of the ark." So, on close examination, every text on which they rely for two laws will fail them.

But they assert that such opposite things are said of "the law," that it cannot be the same law all the time. This method of proving two laws by contrasting particular expressions about the law when spoken of from different standpoints, would make bad work with the Bible if urged on other subjects. Paul said he was "a Jew," Acts 21:39, and again that he was "a Roman," Acts 22:25; two Pauls. So Christ is "a Lion" and "a Lamb," Rev. 5:5, 6; "The everlasting Father," Isa. 9:6, and born of a woman, Luke, 2:7; Prince of Life, Acts 3:15, yet died through weakness, 2 Cor. 13:4; a child, Isa. 9, 6; and yet God, Heb. 1:1-8—two Christs. It would be much harder to reconcile the apparently opposite things said of Christ, than it would be the different things said about the law. There were different sides to Christ's nature, yet he was but one person. So there were different sides to the law, but it was only one law for all that. Viewed in the light of its ultimate design, viz.: to prepare the way for Christ, Rom. 10:4; Gal. 3:23-25, in its spirit, Rom. 7:6; in its righteousness, Rom. 8:3, 4; it was "holy and just and good," Rom. 7:12. But viewed from the side of its mere letter, Rom. 2, 29; 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:6, 7; its numerous rites, ceremonies, penalties and rigorous exactions, it was "the ministration of death," 2 Cor. 3:7; and "a yoke of bondage," Gal. 5:1-3; Acts 15:1-10. This is the true explanation of their "two laws."

Adventists have drawn up a long list of things which they claim are true of the ten commandments, and then another long list of things said to apply to the "ceremonial law." These two they contract and so make out two laws. Closely examined, there is nothing to it. Thus: They say the decalogue existed before man fell; but the fact is it was first given at Sinai 2500 years afterwards. See Ex. 19 and 20. They say the ten commandments were spoken by God, written on stone by him, and placed in the ark while the other was spoken by Moses, written in a book and placed in the side of the ark—two laws, moral and ceremonial. But the ten commandments were also spoken by Moses, and written in the book and placed in the side of the ark with the other precepts. See Deut 5. Read from Deut. 1:5 to Chapter 31:24-26. This destroys the distinction which they claim.

Again: the commandments to love God with all the heart, (Deut. 6:5) and your neighbor as yourself, (Lev. 19:18) were not spoken by God's voice nor written by him, nor engraved on stone, but were spoken by Moses, written by him in a book and put in the side of the ark. Are they, therefore, merely ceremonial precepts, inferior to the decalogue and of a different nature from it? That is what the Advent argument proves if it proves anything. But we know it is false here for Jesus himself said that these two commandments were the greatest in the law. So the mere fact that the decalogue was written on stone is no proof of its superiority to other precepts.

Another proof of their two laws they find in Psa. 19:7, the law "is perfect" contrasted with Heb. 7:19, "the law made nothing perfect"—two different laws. Now see the fallacy of this argument: if the law can make a sinner perfect, then as Paul says, "righteousness should be by the law," (Gal. 3:21,) and "then Christ is dead in vain," (Gal. 2:21.) So the law could be perfect and yet fail to make anybody perfect. So there is no proof of two laws after all. So we could go through their whole list of contrasts and show that no such distinction exists as they claim.

PROPOSITION 3. *The ten commandments alone are never called "the law of the Lord" nor the "law of God."* Sabbatarians constantly use these two terms applying them to the decalogue alone. With them "the law of God" and "the law of the Lord" is just the decalogue and nothing more. They are the only ones who keep God's law as all others break the Sabbath, the 7th day. But now notice this fact which I know to be the truth, after a most thorough examination. The word law occurs in the Bible over 400 times, yet in only one single instance is the

decatalogue as a whole and alone called "the law." (Ex. 24:12.) It is never in a single instance called "the law of the Lord," or "the law of God." Of course the ten commandments are a part of the law of God, but only a part, not the whole. Examine a few texts: Luke 2:22, "The days of her purification according to the law of Moses;" verse 23, "It is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb;" verse 24, "It is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle doves;" verse 27, "To do for him after the custom of the law." Here "the law," "the law of the Lord," and "the law of Moses," all mean the same thing, viz.: the law touching the birth of a son. Again, sacrifices, offerings, Sabbaths, new moons and feasts are all required "in the law of the Lord." Thus: "He appointed also the king's portion of his substance for the burnt offerings, to-wit, for the morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the Sabbaths, and for the new moon, and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." (2 Chron. 31:3.) Scores of texts like these could be quoted, showing that "the law of the Lord" includes sacrifices, circumcision, feasts days and all the Jewish law. So "the law of God" is not simply the decalogue, but the whole law of Moses. Read Neh. 8:1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 14, 18. "The book of the law of Moses," "the law," "the book of the law," "they read in the book of the law of God," "the law which the Lord commanded by Moses," "the book of the law of God." The law of God, then, includes the whole law of Moses.

No Sabbatarian, therefore, keeps "the law," "the law of God," or "the law of the Lord," for if he did he would offer sacrifices, be circumcised, and live exactly as the Jews did. So all their talk about "keeping the law" amounts to nothing, for none of them do it. Moreover in their attempt to keep a part of that law they thereby bring themselves under obligation to "keep the whole law," as Paul argues in Gal. 5:3. But as none of them keeps the whole law, they bring upon themselves the curse of the law, by constantly violating one part while attempting to keep another. This is the very point which Paul made against Judaizing legalists of his day. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: For it is written, cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) That is, the person who keeps one precept of the law just because the law says so, thereby acknowledges that the law is binding on him. Then if he neglects some other part of the law, he thereby becomes a transgressor of the very law he professes to keep. This is exactly what Sabbatarians do. They keep the Sabbath because the law says so and thereby become "debtors to do the whole law." Gal. 5:3. Then they neglect many things in the same law and so are under the condemnation of the law. Gal. 3:10. But Christians do this or that, not because the law says so, but because the New Testament says so.

PROPOSITION 4. "The law" was given by Moses and the "Law of Moses" includes the decalogue. Not that Moses was the author of it, but it was through him God gave it to Israel. This is stated so distinctly and so many times that it is useless to deny it. Thus: "For the law was given by Moses," John 1:17. "Did not Moses give you the law?" John 7:19. "The law which the Lord had commanded by Moses," Neh. 8:14. "God's law which was given by Moses," Neh. 10:29. This includes the decalogue. "Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother," Mark 7:10. This is the fifth commandment. Again: "Did not Moses give you the law and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me?" John 7:17. The law against killing is here called the law of Moses.

In Heb. 10:28 it is said that "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses." Persons were not put to death for neglecting the ceremonial precepts, but were for violating the decalogue. See Deut. 17:6. They were put to death for breaking the Sabbath, Ex. 31:-

14, blasphemy, theft, and the like. Hence the decalogue is included in the "law of Moses." In acts 15:5 certain ones said they must "keep the law of Moses." But the council decided that Gentile Christians need not keep it except in four items, viz.: "Meats offered to idols," first commandment, and fornication, seventh commandment. So the law of Moses included the decalogue.

PROPOSITION 5. *"The law" was not given till the time of Moses and Sinai.* The texts above quoted prove this. Thus: "The law was given by Moses." John 1:17. "Did not Moses give you the law?" John 7:19. "For unto the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses." Rom. 5:13-14. The entrance of the law is here located at Moses. Again it is located under the Levitical priesthood. "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, for under it the people received the law." Heb. 7:11. So the giving of the law is located "430 years after the covenant with Abraham." "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." Gal. 3:17. This brings us to the very year the Jews came out of Egypt and arrived at Sinai. "And it came to pass at the end of 430 years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all of the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." Ex. 12:41. Beyond dispute, then, what the Bible calls "the law" was not given till Moses, 2500 years after Adam, or nearly half the history of the world.

PROPOSITION 6. *The law is no where found till Moses.* No copy of the law nor any reference to it can be found till Moses. Of course God's great moral and spiritual law condemning every sin and requiring every righteous act, that existed from Adam, nay, from eternity. But what in all the Jewish Scriptures is known as "the law," as drawn out in a code on Sinai whether in a book or on the tables of stone, this certainly did not exist till Moses. The whole dispute between Paul and the Judaizers of his day was over this law. See Romans, Galatians and Acts 15 and 21. The question was whether "the law," that which was written in "the book of the law," Gal. 3:10, and "engraved in stones," 2 Cor. 3:7, was to be kept under the gospel. Paul said No; they said, Yes. Sabbatarians now stick for the law of Sinai as did the Judaizers of old. To say that the *principles* of the law existed before Sinai, does not prove that the law existed. These principles could have been taught to Adam and his descendants in a different form from the law as afterwards given at Sinai. But where do you find the law or even one of the ten commandments as worded on Sinai, before that time? Nowhere.

PROPOSITION 7. *Their fathers did not have the decalogue as worded on the tables.* This Moses directly states. Deut. 4:12 13, says God spoke to them from heaven, and declared to them "his covenant," "even ten commandments." Chap. 5:2-3 says: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us." Then he repeats the ten commandments as spoken from heaven. Verses 4-22. That the main principles and requirements of this code were taught to the fathers in some way no one can doubt; but that the fathers had the law as worded and arranged at Sinai is directly denied by Moses as above.

PROPOSITION 8. *The law was given only to the Jews.* This is so manifest in every item of the law, that it needs no argument to prove it. Moses says, Deut. 4:7, that no nation has a law so good "as all this law which I set before you this day." Then he names the ten commandments as a part of it. Verses 10-13. "This is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel." Verse 44. Before whom? Israel, not the Gentiles. So again, chap. 5:1: "Hear, O, Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears.;" Then follows the decalogue.

So it is a hundred times over all through the law. It is addressed to the Jews and to them only. The very wording of the law shows it was designed for them only. The decalogue is introduced thus: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex. 20:2. To whom is that applicable? Only to the Jewish nation. Neither angels, Adam, nor Gentile christians were ever in Egyptian bondage. Then this law is not addressed to them.

The wording of the Sabbath commandment itself shows that it was made just to fit the condition of the Jewish nation in Canaan. Ex. 20:8-11. It speaks of their men servants and maid servants. These were not hired help as with us, but bondmen such as the Jews owned at that time. Verse 17 shows that they were their property the same as their cattle. The stranger within their gates was the Gentile who dwelt anywhere in their land and not simply within the enclosures of a man's farm. "Within thy gates" was a common expression for "within your villages," as towns were enclosed with walls and gates. See Deut. 14:29; 16:18; 18:6; 28:52. The commandment is addressed to a nation, and not merely to individuals. The fifth commandment, Ex. 20:12, refers to the land which God gave them, i. e., Canaan. The ninth commandment, verse 16, forbids false witness against a neighbor, that is swearing falsely in court; but not lying in general. A man would tell many lies without speaking against his neighbor. Common lying is forbidden in Lev. 19:11. All these things show that this was a national law worded to fit the condition of the Jews at the time.

PROPOSITION 9. *The Gentiles did not have the law.* This has been proved already; but Paul directly says so. Rom. 2:14: "For when the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves." This is too plain to need arguing. The Gentiles did not have the law. Paul says so directly and that ought to settle it, and does. To understand and obey the great moral principles of that law is one thing; to be under the letter, the exact wording of the law as given in detail on Sinai is quite another, as we will see further on.

PROPOSITION 10. *The rewards and penalties of the law were all temporal.* There are no promises of future rewards, nor threatenings of future punishments in all the Mosaic law. The learned Bishop Warburton has fully demonstrated this in his "Divine Legation of Moses." Every careful student of that law must be aware of this feature of it. The reason is evident: it was a national, temporal law, given for a national, temporal purpose. As a sample of all, see Deut. 28:1-19. If they keep the law, they shall be blessed in children, in goods, in cattle, in in health, etc. If they disobey they shall be cursed in all these. Stoning to death was the penalty for theft, murder, etc. Hence that was "the ministration of death written and engraved in stones," 2 Cor. 3:7, and "is done away," verse 11.

Paul states that the promise of Christ, and the future inheritance was made to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the law was given. From this he argues, and forcibly too, that the keeping of that law was not necessary in order to obtain Christ and the inheritance. Verses 16-18:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance *be* of the law, *it is* no more of promise: but God gave *it* to Abraham by promise." So to the Romans he wrote: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteous-

ness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Rom. 4:13, 14.

This plainly teaches that the law was not given with reference to the future inheritance. Certainly Abraham did not keep a law which was not given till hundreds of years after he died. But Abraham is the father of all the faithful, and not simply of those who were "of the law." (Rom. 4:13-16.) This point alone ought to open the eyes of those who contend so earnestly for the keeping of that law as necessary to salvation. We are the children of Abraham, (Gal. 3:29), and "walk in the steps of our father Abraham," who was never under the law. (Rom 4:12-16.) We are under the covenant of promise made to Abraham 430 years before the law, (Gal. 2:15-19), and not under the covenant of law from Sinai, which is bondage. (Gal. 4:21-26.)

PROPOSITION 11. *God's eternal law of righteousness existed before the law of Sinai was given.* This proposition is self-evident. Surely God had a law by which to govern his creatures, both angels and men, long before Sinai. But "the law," as worded in the decalogue and in "the book of the law," was not given till Moses, 2000 years after creation. Hence moral obligation did not begin with that law, nor would it cease if that law was abolished. "All unrighteousness is sin." (1 John 5:17.) And "sin is the transgression of the law." (Chap. 3:4.) This text is used by Sabbatarians to prove that every possible sin is always a violation of the ten commandments. But, 1. "The law" is the whole Mosaic law, not merely the decalogue. 2. A correct translation entirely spoils this text for them. The word law is not in the text in the original. The revised version gives it correctly. "Sin is lawlessness." This is the true meaning of the text. Sin is lawlessness, a disregard for some law, but not necessarily always the same law. Thus: "The angels sinned." (2 Pet. 2:4.) But they did not violate the law of Sinai, for it was not given till thousands of years after they fell and they were not under that law any way.

Adam "sinned" long before that law was given. So Paul says, (Rom. 5:12-14.) Cain sinned, (Gen. 4:7.) The Sodomites were "sinners," (Gen. 13:13) and vexed Lot with their "unlawful deeds." (2 Pet. 2:8.) Surely none of these violated "the law," which was not given till Moses hundreds of years afterwards. "Rom. 5:12-14, 20; Gal. 3:17, 19; Heb. 7:11. To say that they must have violated the *principles* of that law is not to the point. When the Jews killed Stephen, (Acts 6:59), they violated the principles of the law of Michigan, which forbids murder; but did they violate the "law of Michigan?" No; for it was not given for 1800 years after. And they were not under it any way. So neither the angels nor Adam, nor the Sodomites could have transgressed the law of Sinai, for it was not yet given. So Abraham "kept God's laws." (Gen. 26:5), but surely not "the law which was four hundred and thirty years after." (Gal. 3:17.) All this clearly shows that God had a law before the code of Sinai was given.

In whatever form or manner God chose to communicate his will to men, this would be "his commandments, his statutes, and his laws." (Gen. 26:5.) A disregard for his revealed will would be lawlessness—sin. But to claim that God gave the patriarchs his law in the exact form and words of the ten commandments is a proofless assumption, contrary to reason and all the facts in the case. The main principles of all the Jewish law, tithes, sacrifices, circumcision, the altar, the priesthood, etc., were well known to the patriarchs. Does this prove that the whole Jewish code was given to Adam? No; nor were the ten commandments either.

PROPOSITION 12. *This original law is superior to the law of Sinai.* When asked "Which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus said:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second *is* like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22:37-40.

Neither of these is in the decalogue; but that law hangs on this higher law, and so is inferior to it. In its very nature this great law of supreme love to God and equal love to fellow creatures, must be as eternal and everlasting as God himself. This law governs angels—governed Adam, the patriarchs, the Jews, while under "the law," and Gentile Christians now. It is applicable to all God's creatures, in all ages and all worlds. Idolatry, murder, theft, selfishness and "all unrighteousness," 1 John 5:17, are and always were violations of this supreme law of God. This great law might be worded in different ways at different times and yet the same essential idea be preserved. Thus Jesus stated the second great commandment in another form. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12. The idea is the same as "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The exact words or form in which this law is stated is not material so long as the idea is made plain. Evidently this supreme law must have been made known to Adam and to the patriarchs but in just what form we are not told. To say that it was in the exact words of the decalogue, is to affirm what can in no wise be proved.

PROPOSITION 13. *The Mosaic law was founded upon the higher and original law.* Jesus directly affirms this, Matt. 22:40, "On these two commandments hangs all the law." The principles of this great law were interwoven all through the law of Sinai, being the life, "the spirit," or "the righteousness" of "the law." Rom. 2:26-29; 8:4. As an example, examine Lev. 19. Here you have the second great commandment, verse 18, and the principles of every one of the ten commandments. Thus: 1st commandment, verse 52; 2nd, verse 4; 3d, verse 12; 4th, verse 30; 5th, verse 3; 6th, verse 17; 7th, verse 29; 8th, verse 13; 9th, verse 11; 10th, verse 35. Mingled among these are commandments about sacrifices, verse 5; harvest, verse 9; clothing, verse 19; priests, verse 22; first fruits, verse 23; wizards, verse 31; Gentiles, verse 34, etc. All these are founded upon this higher law and can be changed to fit circumstances without affecting the supreme law which is ever the same.

The particular wording of the law as adapted to the Jewish age was "the letter" or "form" of the law for the time being. While the spirit of the law can never change, the letter of it must change to fit the changing circumstances of God's people. If a Jew loved God with all his heart, he would have circumcised his sons, offered burnt sacrifices, paid tithes, kept the passover, the new moons, the Sabbath, and attended the temple worship, for this was "the law of the Lord." 2 Chro. 31:3; Luke 2:22-27.

But if a christian loves God he will be baptized, Acts 2:38, take the Lord's supper, 1 Cor. 11:24, attend church, Heb. 10:25, keep "the Lord's day," Rev. 1:10, and do many things very different from a Jew. Hence "there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. 7:12. This is both Bible and common sense. Those who make the mere letter of the Jewish law an iron rule, and contend for the exact wording under all circumstances, and in all ages, miss the spirit of the gospel, and are in bondage to a system out of date. Gal. 3:19-25; 4:21-25; 5:1-3, 13, 14, 2 Cor. 3:3-15.

PROPOSITION 14. *"The law" of Sinai was given to restrain criminals who would only obey God through fear.* Consider this proposition well. A failure to understand this simple fact is the cause of all the blunders of Sabbatarians and legalists in their extravagant and unscriptural praises of "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones." 2 Cor. 3:7.

On this point hear Paul state why that law was made and notice that it is of the moral precepts of the law that he speaks. "Knowing this that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers;" and so he goes on to name adulterers, thieves, liars, etc. 1 Tim. 1:9, 10. There can be no doubt that he refers to the code of Sinai, that which prohibited murder, theft, etc. This law he says was not made for a righteous man but for the lawless. Of this law in another place Paul says: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions." Gal. 3:19. Again, "The law entered that the offense might abound," Rom. 5:20, and, "until the law sin was in the world," verse 13. Hence it is manifest that sin, offense and transgression existed before "the law" was given, and that it was given to prohibit already existing crimes.

Evidently God put the race on trial from Adam to Moses under the same eternal law of right and love which governed the angels and holy men. But mankind failed shamefully. They did not live by that rule. They became lawless. Disregard of God and open violence towards men were increasing till life and property were insecure. Then God selected one nation, the Hebrews, and gave up the rest to their own ways. Rom. 1:20-28.

Up to this time God's people had not been a nation by themselves but had dwelt among other nations and had been subject to their civil laws which prohibited open violence and protected life and property. But as soon as they became a great nation by themselves, it became absolutely necessary to have a national law of their own which would prohibit and punish open crimes such as murder, theft, adultery, etc. Life and property would not have been secure without this because many among them were wicked, lawless men, "stiffnecked and rebellious." If all had been righteous, if all had loved God and their neighbors, there would have been no need of a prohibitory law with a death penalty. We can readily see the reason why Paul says "the law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless." These lawless ones would have robbed and murdered the righteous ones had there been no national, temporal law to protect them, for these wicked men would have cared little about God's higher law which pertains to the future judgment. But as the Jewish government was a theocracy, one in which God himself was ruler, the law required and regulated service to him as well as duties among themselves.

Hence to this nation God gave the law of Sinai. Ex. 20:2. Would it have been given if men had obeyed God without? Paul has settled that point: "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." 1 Tim. 1:9. Then the law was not made till man had sinned, Rom. 5:13, offended, verse 20, transgressed, Gal. 3:19, and became lawless. This then is not God's original law by which he prefers to govern men. It was a law largely of prohibitions, threats, pains and penalties. Its object was to restrain open crime, protect men in their natural rights and preserve the knowledge of God in the earth till Christ should come. Gal. 3:19-25. In order to keep that nation separate from all others, many burdensome rites were incorporated into the law which made it a yoke of bondage. Acts 15:10; Gal. 5:1,3.

When Christ came, and the Jewish nation was rejected, and dispersed and their national law overthrown, and the gospel went to all nations, that law had served its purpose, and so passed away as a system. Matt. 5:17-18; Rom. 10:4; Gal. 3:24; Heb. 7:12-19. Now Christians are not under the Aaronic priesthood, nor the Jewish law, Heb. 7:11, 12; but are under the priesthood of Melchisedic, verses 14-19, as was Abraham our father, Gen. 14:18-20, who never had "the law" of Sinai, Gal. 3:17, but walked by the higher law which governs angels and holy men. Gen. 26:5. The

Jewish law being removed, we now come under the same law by which Enoch and Abraham "walked with God." The sermon on the mount is a beautiful elucidation of that law—the rule by which all Christians should live, and by which all sinners will be judged at the judgment.

Now, as in the days before Moses, God's people are not a nation by themselves, but are scattered among all nations where they are governed and protected by the civil law of those nations. Hence the New Testament provides no civil law for the government of christians, no temporal penalties for criminals. It would be directly contrary to the nature of the gospel to do either. All this is left to the rulers of nations wherever christians happen to be. Open criminals, who will not obey from principles, the higher law, are now turned over to the civil magistrate. Paul makes this matter very plain and puts the question beyond dispute. Thus:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou, then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." (Rom. 13:1-6.)

There is where you find prohibitory law for "the lawless;" that is in the civil law where they live. This punishes their crime against society. Their offenses against God's great law will be recompensed at the judgment, but the saints of God must be governed by the higher law, the law of supreme love to God and equal love to fellows. Such obedience can come only from a heart renewed by the Spirit of God, (2 Cor. 3:3); and "if ye be led of the Spirit ye are not under the law." (Gal. 5:18.)

Is any man a christian who refrains from murder, theft, and adultery, simple because the law says, "Thou shalt not?" No, indeed, he must refrain from these from a higher motive than that. Then surely he must be governed by a higher law than the decalogue. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13:10.) The dispute between Paul and the Judaizers then was over the nature and obligation of the Jewish law. The dispute now concerning the Jewish Sabbath, involves the same point, the obligation of the letter of the Jewish law.

PROPOSITION 15. *The letter of the law is not binding upon christians as a coercive code.* Little argument ought to be needed to prove this; for if the letter of the law is binding, then we must be circumcised, offer sacrifices, keep the seventh day and all the Jewish ritual, for "the law" included the whole law, (Gal. 3:10; 5:3.) In Rom. 2:26-29 Paul teaches distinctly that a man may keep "the letter," and yet "transgress the law," verse 27. Then he says that now the true obedience "is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter," verse 29. This is plain. Rom. 7:6, says "we are delivered from the law" "that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter." The letter of the law is not the rule for the christian, Rom. 8:4 says that Jesus came "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." 2 Cor. 3:3-11, states very plainly that in the gospel the law is written "not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart," verse 2. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," verse 6. So Phil. 3:3, we "worship God in the spirit." The tenor of the whole New Testament is that we are now under the dispensation of the spirit.

PROPOSITION 16. *The law was changed.* Jeremiah predicted that under the new covenant, God's law would be written in the heart and not as it was before. "I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." Jr. 31:33. Paul refers to this when he says, Ye are our epistle "written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in the fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Cor. 3:3. So then God's law is not now written on tables of stone as at Sinai. This is a square contradiction to what Adventists teach. They claim that God's law is still on stones in heaven the same as of old. Paul says no, it is written by the spirit upon the heart.

This implied a radical change in the form of the law and the way it was to be taught. In Heb. 7:12 it is expressly declared that "there is made of necessity a change also of the law." The letter of the Jewish law is wholly unfitted to the condition of the christian church. It can only be a guide to us as modified and interpreted by the gospel. But in the gospel there is no injunction to keep the seventh day. Hence the letter of that command does not concern us.

PROPOSITION 17. *The decalogue on stones was the covenant from Sinai which is done away.* This is taught in the plainest possible manner. "He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." Deut. 4:13. "The tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you." "Two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant." Deut. 9:6-11. "He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Ex. 34:28. "There was nothing in the ark, save the two tables of stone." "I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." I Kings 8:9 21. The ten commandments, then, are the covenant which God made with Israel, when they came out of Egypt. It is pitiable to see the dodges, evasions, and false positions resorted to by Adventists to explain away the simple statements of these texts. They are exceedingly troubled over them as I know from long experience with them. They take various and contradictory positions about the covenants and are constantly trying to find some new turn to get out of the difficulty. But it does not avail them. The ten commandments was the old covenant and that covenant was to be done away. "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant I made with their fathers." Jer. 31:31-32. Then it will not be according to the decalogue. Paul says Jesus "is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8:6-7. Then he adds, "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." verse 13. So then the old covenant has passed away, and we are now under the new covenant, the gospel, verses 8-13. So in Gal. 4:21-25. Paul says: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" "For these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." In 2 Cor. 3:3-11. Paul says that under the new covenant the law is not written on stones; but that the ministration engraven on stones is done away. In Heb. 12:18-24, he says that we are not to go to Sinai, but to "Mount Zion," and "to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." So then the decalogue certainly, has now no coercive authority under the new covenant.

PROPOSITION 18. *The whole Mosaic system ended at the cross.* Surely this is so plainly taught all through the New Testament that no one should deny it. But we have clearly proved that "the law" included the whole code of laws given to Israel at Sinai, moral, civil, and ceremonial precepts, decalogue and all. This is confessed even by Eld. Butler who

now stands at the head of the Adventists. He says: "The term 'the law' among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical and civil," Law in Galatians, p. 70. That entire system of law was framed to fit the Jewish age and could not possibly be applied to Gentile christians in all parts of the world. Hence a "new way" Heb. 10:20, "new covenant" Heb. 8:13, a new "ministration," 2 Cor. 3:8, was introduced so there was "made of necessity a change also of the law," Heb. 7:12.

Examine carefully a few texts to which I will refer. "The law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," John 1:17. "This implies a change. 'Ye are not under the law, but under grace,' Rom. 6:14. 'Under the merciful dispensation of the gospel,' John Wesley. 'The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster,' Gal. 3:24-25. 'Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ,' Rom. 7:4. 'Now we are delivered from the law,' Verse 6. 'Christ is the end of the law,' Rom. 10:4. 'The ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious.' 'That which is done away was glorious,' 2 Cor. 3:7, 10. That ends the decalogue.

"Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments contained in ordinances," Ephe. 2:15. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days," Col. 2:14, 16. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope," Heb. 7:12, 18, 19. Certain ones have troubled "your souls, saying, *Ye must* be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no *such* commandment." Acts 15:24. In all these texts it is plainly declared over and over that the law ended at the cross. So in Acts 15 this very matter was fully discussed in a great council of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Some claimed that the Gentile christians "must keep the law of Moses," verse 5. But the council decided that it was a yoke which should not be imposed upon them, verses 19-29.

Why then does not this settle it that "the law" is not binding upon christians? O, it is said by Sabbatarians that "the law of Moses is only the ceremonial law and that it does not include the ten commandments." But we have abundantly proved that there is no such distinction as this claims. "The law" was the whole law system given to the Jews at Sinai through Moses.

SABBATARIANS DO NOT KEEP THE SABBATH.

The requirements of the law concerning the Sabbath are as follows:

1. It must be kept on the 7th day, Ex. 20:8-11.
2. From sunset to sunset, Lev. 23:32.
3. It must be a day of rest, Lev. 23:3.
4. No work can be done, Ex. 20:10.
5. Children, servants and cattle must rest, vs. 10.
6. Gentiles dwelling among them must rest, vs. 10.
7. No fire can be kindled in their houses, Ex. 35:3.
8. They can neither bake nor boil, Ex. 16:23.
9. Every Sabbath breaker must be stoned, Ex. 31:15.
10. Two lambs must be offered, Num. 28:9-10.
11. Egyptian bondage must be remembered, Deut. 8:15.
12. It must be kept as a sign between God and the children of Israel,

Ex. 31:17.

This is the law of the Sabbath. Every requirement must be obeyed or else the Sabbath is not kept. But it is not possible to keep half of this law in all parts of the earth. Seventh-day people make fires, bake potatoes and boil food, and so break the Sabbath. They neither offer lambs, nor remember Egypt, nor keep it as a sign between God and the children of Israel. They cannot stone the Sabbath breaker, nor compel the Gentiles to keep it. In the extreme north, where they do not see the sun for weeks together, they could not keep it from sunset to sunset. Nor can they do it in going around the earth. They are not even certain that they have the true seventh day, any way. How can they prove it? By history, and tradition. But there was no history for the first 2500 years and tradition is very unreliable. Besides, how do they know that the day line, only recently established by human authority, was God's day line of 6,000 years ago? These facts show that the Jewish Sabbath was never meant for all the world.

CHAPTER IX.

IF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS ARE ABOLISHED, IS THERE ANY LAW AGAINST SIN?

We have already seen that "the law was changed," Heb. 7:12, that "we are not under the law," Rom. 6:14, that "Christ is the end of the law," Rom. 10:4, that the decalogue was "the covenant from Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage," Gal. 4:24; Ex. 34:28, which is superceded by a "better covenant," the gospel, Heb. 8:6-13. But Adventists say that if this is so, then there is no law now. So there is no sin, and we can lie, steal, etc., with impunity. Such statements are only made for effect, not because there is any real foundation for them. The answer is easy.

The law of Sinai was not given till 2500 years after the creation. Was there no law, no sin, then, till Moses? Yes, for angels sinned, (2 Peter 2:4;) Adam sinned, (Rom. 5:12;) the Sodomites sinned, (Gen. 13:13.) But sin was in the world before the law, Rom. 5:13. So then, if there was sin before the decalogue was given, there could be sin after it ended. The law of Sinai was only the will of God expressed in that particular form for the time being. If God chose to express his will in some other way or words, would it not be his law just the same? Of course it would. God told Adam and Eve not to touch the fruit of a certain tree, Gen. 3:33. When they ate of the tree they disobeyed God, broke his commandments, and sinned, Rom. 5:12. The simple fact is that whenever God reveals his will to men—either personally, as to Adam, Gen. 3:3; through the patriarch, as to Abraham, Gen. 26:5; through angels, as in the case the law, Heb. 2:2; Acts 7:53; by the prophets, as through Moses, John 7:19; by the apostles, as through Paul, 1 Cor. 14:37; or by the Son, John 12:48-50,—in each and every case it is the law of God just the same, and disregard of his will thus expressed is sin and transgression, 1 John 5:17. A man must be exceedingly blind who will deny so manifest a scriptural truth as this.

When God speaks, is it not sin to disobey? Surely it is. Paul says:

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets. Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* son." Heb. 1:1-2. This says that God has spoken to men in various ways at different times. No matter in what way God's will was expressed, it would have been sin to disobey. "If the law of Sinai is gone, then there is no law, no sin," says Adventists. Indeed, then it is impossible for God to reveal his will to men, except in those exact words, letter for letter! Who believes such an absurdity? The whole controversy is reduced to simply this: Has God in the New Testament, plainly and fully revealed his will to men and told them what is right and what is wrong? Is the will of God revealed through his Son in the New Testament higher authority than the Old Testament, or is it not? Are the teachings of the New Testament to be modified to harmonize with the letter of the law in the Old Testament, or are the precepts of the Old Testament to be modified to harmonize with the gospel! The latter, certainly. But the gospel no where enjoins the seventh day.

The Jew contended that nothing could be higher authority than this law and this mode of worship, for they had for these the authority of (1)

Abraham, (2) Moses, (3) the Levitical priesthood, (4) the prophets, (5) angels, (6) God's covenant, (7) and finally, the voice of God himself from Sinai. But Paul in Hebrews goes through the whole list and sets Christ above them all. He is higher than (1) Abraham, chap. 7:1-7; (2) than Moses, chap. 3:1-6; (3) than the Levites, chap. 7:5-21; (4) than the prophets, chap. 1:1, 2; (5) than the angels, chap. 1:4-14; 2:1-3; (6) than the old covenant, chap. 8:6-13; (7) than the voice of God from Sinai, chap. 12:18-24. The grand argument culminates in placing the authority of Jesus above all who had spoken before, and even above the awful majesty of Mount Sinai at the giving of the decalogue.

Then is not the word of the Lord Jesus Christ law? Could there be any higher law? Said Jesus, "I and my Father are one," John 10:30, and "All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." John 5:23. Then the words of Christ are to be honored as highly as the words of God. They are law the same as God's words are. God promised to raise up Christ and put his words in his mouth, and he should speak as God commanded him, Deut. 18:18. Jesus said his Father sent him and commanded him what to say, John 12:49, 50. "The words that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day," verse 48. Then we shall be judged by the teachings of Christ, not by the old law. God said, "Hear ye him," Matt. 17:5. All authority in heaven and in earth is given to him, Matt. 28:18. "He taught them as one having authority," Matt. 7:29. He has a law, Gal 6:2. "Fulfill the law of Christ." "The isles shall wait for his law." Isa. 42:4. We are under his law, 1 Cor. 9:21. "Under law to Christ," [R. V., "Under Christ's law,"—Diaglott.] "Under the law of the Messiah,"—Syriac. The grandest summary of moral and religious truth the world ever heard was the sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5-7. It is as much superior to the decalogue as gospel is superior to Judaism. Here Christ forbids murder, Matt. vs:21, 22; adultery, verses 27-28; swearing, verse 34; hypocrisy, 6:1-5; covetousness, 6:19-34; and every wrong act, 7:12. Would it not be sin to disobey the precepts of Christ?

Jesus gave commandments to his disciples, Acts 1:2, and commanded them to teach them to all nations. Matt. 28:18-20. We are to keep his commandments. John 14:15, 21; 15:10. Then would it not be sin to break them? Who dare deny it? "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God," Eph. 1:1, said, "Put away lying," "sin not," and "steal no more," Eph. 4:25-28, and "The things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14:47. And yet Adventists will say, that if the old law is gone, there are no commandments against lying, stealing, etc. We know better, as the above teaches. Indeed, Paul says, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you," "for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 20:20, 27. Every sin of which the human heart is guilty is plainly forbidden in the New Testament over and over by the authority of Christ and his apostles, as all know. Yet nothing condemns sin but the decalogue. Pshaw!

The spirit of the Mosaic law, every moral principle in it, is reiterated over and over in the gospel, with all the authority of the Son of God. Not a christian duty can be named which is not taught in the New Testament. Not a single thing is forbidden by the Old Testament which it would be wrong for a christian to do, which is not also forbidden in the New, in some form. Excepting the Sabbath, the other nine commandments are in the New Testament, either in same words or in substance. But where do you find the requirement to keep the seventh day? No where. It can only be made out by far fetched, roundabout and unnecessary inference, not by a plain and direct statement.

Then is the Old Testament to be thrown away? God forbid. It should be received as the inspired word of God, a mine of precious truth; but it must be studied in the light of the New Testament, and modified by it. Nothing should be required of christians simply because it is found in the law of the Old Testament. To bind our consciences, it must be required by the New Testament. Here the seventh day fails entirely, for there is no requirement in all the New Testament to keep it; but its abrogation is plainly taught. Col. 2:14-16; Rom. 14:5; Gal. 4:10.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, WHAT ARE THEY?

S. D. Adventists have much to say about "the commandments of God." Rev. 14:12, and claim that these are the ten commandments. With them "the commandments" always mean just the decalogue, nothing more. Wherever they find this term they thus apply it. But such a position is wholly erroneous. There are over 800 texts where the phrase, "the commandments," in its various forms is used. I have carefully examined every one of them. I find that it is a general term for all the requirements of the Bible. According to my best judgment, in forty-nine cases out of fifty it means something more than the ten commandments. Let the reader examine the following texts:

Lev. 22 refers wholly to the duties of the priests and the offering of sacrifices. What the Lord commanded about these he calls his "commandments." Verse 31. In Deut. 31:27-28 what Moses commanded is called "the commandments or God." In Deut. 25:12-13 the term is used of the law of tithing. In Deut. 28:1, it is applied to all that Moses commanded them. With a concordance, any person can readily find hundreds of cases where this term means something more than the decalogue. When Jesus was questioned about the law he named as the greatest "commandment" two entirely outside of the ten. See Matt. 22:35-40.

So the precepts of Christ and His apostles are often called commandments. Jesus says: "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say." John 12:49. If God gave Christ commandments, and He gave them to His church, would they not be the commandments of God? Certainly. The old dispensation was passing away, and the Lord was proclaiming the commandments of God for the new dispensation, the gospel. So in the great commission He said, "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28:20.

Again Jesus said (John 14:15, 21): "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "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." How can we, in the face of these plain texts, say that Jesus gave no commandments? Who is it that loves Christ? He that keeps his commandments. This is what it is in the New Testament to be a "commandment keeper." So again (John 15:10, 14): "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

If, then, we do what Jesus commands us, is not that enough? and shall we not be safe and sure of his love and the love of his Father? But where did Jesus ever command to keep the seventh day? *Nowhere*. So Luke says he was taken up, "after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen" (Acts i. 2). If Jesus gave commandments through the Holy Ghost, would they not be the commandments of God? Are not these equal to those given through Moses? Now hear Paul as to what are the commandments in the gospel: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowl-

edge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (I. Cor. 14:37).

Then all Paul's writings are "the commandments of God." And the Apostle says, Let those who are spiritual acknowledge it. Will our Seventh-day brethren acknowledge it? They may see a new meaning in "the commandments of God" (Rev. 14:12) if they will. Again Paul says, "For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus" (I. Thess. 4:2). Then the Apostles did give commandments by the authority of the Lord Jesus." Peter bears a similar testimony (II. Peter 3:2): "That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior." Entole, the Greek word for commandment, occurs in the New Testament, in its singular and plural forms, sixty-eight times. In at least forty-eight of the cases it can not mean the decalogue, and in over half of the others it is used in a general way. In not a single case is it certain that it means all the ten and nothing more. There is not a hint that it means the decalogue in any one of the three passages where it occurs in Revelation. To claim that it does is to assume without evidence the very point to be proved. John, who wrote the book of Revelation, also wrote the gospel of John and the three epistles of John. He uses the word "commandments," plural and singular, twenty-eight times, and in not a single case does it refer to the ten commandments; but in nearly every case, if not in all, it refers to the commandments of Jesus. (See John 14:15-21; 15:10; I John 2:1-5; 3:22-24; 4:21; 5:1-3). And naturally we would suppose that he means the same thing by commandments in Rev. 14:12.

As Christ is our "Lord and Master" (John 13:13), the "Head" of the church (Eph. 1:22), "all in all" (Col. 3:2), having "all power in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18), and is judge to the world (John 5:22) at his judgment seat (Rom. 14:10), how reasonable that he should give the laws to that church. This is just what he did do (Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 1:1-2). If any one will obey the teachings of Christ he need not fear about his salvation. The Seventh-day Adventists preach the law and write and talk about the law and sabbath ten times as much as they do about Christ. This is not over stated, as an examination of their writings will prove. With them the law is first and Christ is second. This is a bad feature of that system, for it does lead many to trust more in *their* works than in Christ, as I certainly know.

"THE JEWISH SABBATH" A PROPER TERM FOR THE SEVENTH DAY.

Sabbatarians strongly object to our calling the seventh day the "*Jewish Sabbath*." They ask, "Where does the Bible call it the Jewish Sabbath? It is 'the sabbath of the Lord thy God.'" This simple argument has great force with many. But I am satisfied it is perfectly proper to designate the seventh day as the Jewish Sabbath.

Seventh-day brethren are constantly talking and writing about "the ceremonial law" and "the moral law," nor could they properly express their ideas of the "two laws" without using these terms. But neither of them is once used in all the Bible. How is this? Will they admit that their idea is unscriptural because these exact words are not used in the Bible? No. They freely use the terms "Jewish festivals," "Jewish sabbaths," "annual sabbaths," "sabbaths of the Hebrews," etc. (See "History of the Sabbath," pp. 82, 83, 84, etc.). Yet not one of these terms is found in the Bible, though they can not get along without them. It would be amusing to confine a Sabbatarian strictly to the Bible language and then hear him attempt to preach on the two laws and the different sabbaths. "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

1. We use the term Jewish sabbath because that sabbath was given to the Jews. "I gave *them* my *sabbaths* to be a sign between me and them" (Ezek. 20, 12). If God gave the sabbath to them, why isn't it their Sabbath? Of course it is, and it is proper to call it so.
2. There is no record that it was ever kept till they kept it. (Ex. 16.) Hence Jewish Sabbath again is proper.
3. There is no record that it was ever given to any other people. Hence Jewish Sabbath is proper.
4. Sabbath is purely a Hebrew word never found till the time of Moses. (Ex. 16:23.) It is never used except in connection with some Jewish season. Hence Jewish Sabbath is fitting.
5. Christians almost unanimously keep the first day in distinction from the Jews who comprise nearly all those who keep the seventh day. Hence Jewish Sabbath is intelligible and proper again.
6. The few christians who keep a different day from the great body of the church keep the Sabbath which the Jews keep. Hence, again, it is significant and proper to designate them as those who keep the Jewish Sabbath.
7. God himself calls the seventh-day Sabbaths "her Sabbaths" (Hosea 2:11), as we have shown on the following pages. Hence, with all these reasons, we are not afraid that we shall misrepresent the teachings of the Bible, nor be misunderstood, in using the term "Jewish Sabbath."

THE JEWISH SABBATH ABOLISHED. COL. 2:14-16.

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.

Let no man judge you therefore in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days:

Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." (Col. 2:14, 16, 17.)

When I was a firm believer in the seventh-day Sabbath, this text always bothered me more or less. The plain, simple reading of it seemed manifestly to teach the abolition of the Sabbath. I was impressed with the fact that it had to be *explained away*, and that it took a tremendous amount of fine, hair-splitting distinctions to do it. The more closely I examined it, the less satisfactory it was, till at length I became fully satisfied that our interpretation was unsound, and contrary to the real truth.

The simple facts, I believe, are these: Paul refers to the entire Jewish system, the law of Moses as a whole, of which the decalogue was only a small part. Every word of the ten commandments, Sabbath included, was written by the hand of Moses on parchment right in with the rest of the law of Moses. (See Deut. 5 and other places.) As an entire system, as a law taken in all its parts, it was a burdensome system, a yoke of bondage, a schoolmaster designed only to lead us to Christ (Gal. 3:24, 25.) As such it was nailed to the cross. The decalogue being written on parchment in the book of the law, it would be proper to speak of it as *blotted out*, nailed to the cross, etc., with the rest of the law. As meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and ordinances were prominent in the law of Moses, they are named as the reasons why that entire law was abolished. Time and again the weekly Sabbath is directly associated in the law of Moses with these meats, drinks, feast days, new moons, etc., and hence is properly classed with them by Paul in the New Testament, just as it was in the Old. The system as a whole had served its object and passed away to give place to an entirely new institution—the gospel.

That the Sabbath is repeatedly classed with these, just as Paul classes it in Col. 2:16, will be seen by the following scriptures: In Lev.

23, Moses gives a list of the Jewish holy days, and places the Sabbath first in the list, followed in their order by the passover and all the rest. Thus, 'Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts' (verse 2.) "Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest" (verse 3.) "In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's pass-over" (verse 5.) "And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread" (verse 6.) "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath" (verse 24.) "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement" (verse 27.) "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month" (verse 39.) "These are the feasts of the Lord" (verse 37.) "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts of the Lord" (verse 44.) Here we have the Sabbath directly associated with meats, drink, and all the Jewish feasts, just as Paul puts in Col. 2:16. It is, however, claimed by Seventh-day Adventists that the Lord separates out the Sabbath from all these, showing that it is of a differed nature, in these words (verses 37:38): "These are the feasts of the Lord: * * * besides the Sabbaths of the Lord," "and besides your *gifts*, and besides all your *vows*, and besides all your *free-will offerings*, which ye give unto the Lord." Not only the Sabbaths, but *gifts*, *vows* and *offerings* are also classed with the Sabbath in the same verse. The idea is this: the Sabbath, the gifts, vows and offerings are of a weekly or daily occurrence, whereas the other holy days and special offerings were to come only once a year at stated seasons. They were not to take the place of the regular daily and weekly services, but must be observed *besides* all these. Any one can see that this is the simple meaning of the words "besides the Sabbaths of the Lord, and besides your gifts," etc. The idea is not to distinguish the Sabbaths above the other feasts, but to say that these must be kept in addition to the regular service of the Sabbath and the daily offerings.

So (Num. 28:9-31, "And on the Sabbath day two lambs." "And in the beginning of your months (new moons) ye shall offer a burnt offering." "His meat offering . . . and their drink offerings." So also 1 Chron. 23:31: "To offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the Sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts." In no less than twelve different places is the Sabbath classed right in with these new moons and feast days. Yet I, like my seventh-day brethren, firmly believed and have said a thousand times, that the seventh-day Sabbath was never associated with new moons and feast days. It is now unaccountable to me how I ever could have been so blind.

But it is argued that as "the Sabbath days" of Col. 2:16 "are a shadow of things to come" (verse 17), and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same, for the Sabbath could not point both ways? The passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event (Ex. 12:11-17.) Yet it was also a shadow of Christ (Col. 2:16-17.) "Even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5:7.) So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know. Elder J. N. Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," chap. 7, admits this. But who would ever have thought of this if the Apostle had not said so?

If, then, these feast days could be both memorials and types, pointing both ways, so can the Sabbath. Paul says plainly that the Sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasonings. This is in harmony with Paul's argument in Heb. 4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really can not mean what it says; but there it stands and mocks all our theories. The Sabbath is a type, for inspiration says so.

Again, it is said that the Sabbath was instituted before the fall, but types could not be. Where does the Bible say so? Peter says of Christ: "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you" (1 Peter 1:20.) The revelator says, "The lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8.) If, then, Christ before the foundation of the world was ordained to die, then the Sabbath might have been designed even before the creation of the earth, as a type of Christ. So, on close inspection, every argument of our seventh-day brethren on Col. 2, fails them.

But that upon which they rely the most of all to save this text from applying to the Sabbath is the confident assertion that there were several yearly Sabbath days, and that Paul's language must apply to these instead of to the weekly Sabbaths. Thus Elder J. N. Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," says, "There were *seven* annual Sabbaths," and then he names all the Jewish feast days, as the pentecost, day of atonement, etc., and cites Lev. 23. It is true that in our English version the word *Sabbath* is applied to *four* of these feast days. Thus, "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath" (Lev. 23:24.) "Also on the tenth day . . . shall be unto you a Sabbath" (verses 27:32.) Also of the feast on the fifteenth and the twenty-second of the month, "the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath" (verse 39.) Here it is claimed are at least four annual Sabbaths, and to these are referred "the Sabbath days" of Col. 2.

We turn, to the Greek, in which Paul wrote, and find that the word for "sabbath days" is *sabbaton*, exactly the word and the only word that is ever used for the seventh-day sabbath. Is that the term used where the word *sabbath* is applied to the annual feast days? No, indeed, except in just barely *one* instance. The day of atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, is called a sabbath (*sabbaton*) in the Greek (Lev. 23:32.) The Hebrew word for sabbath is *shabbath*. In only this one instance is it ever applied to any of the annual festivals. The word "sabbath" in the English version, when applied to these annual feasts, is from the Greek term *anapausis*, and in the Hebrew from *shabbathon*. These words should not be translated "sabbath," but should be rendered "rest," as they are in the Revised Version. Thus all these texts read in the Revised Version: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, there shall be a solemn *rest* unto you" (Lev. 23:24.) "On the first day shall be a solemn *rest*, and on the eighth day shall be a solemn *rest*" (verse 39). So also in the English version of the Hebrew used by the Jews these words are translated *rest*, not sabbath. Thus: "In the seventh month, on the first day of the month, shall ye have a *rest*," not sabbath (verse 24). "On the first day shall be a *rest*, and on the eighth day shall be a *rest*" (verse 39).

Hence, except the weekly sabbaths, among all the feast days and holy days of the Old Testament only one single day in the whole year is called a sabbath. So it is not correct to speak of "the annual sabbaths," much less to say that there were seven of them. There was just one, and no more, and this one was included in the annual feast days. This even Elder Andrews confesses. He says "The annual sabbaths were a part and parcel of these feasts" ("History of the Sabbath," p. 86). So, then, that one annual sabbath was embraced in the term, feast days. Therefore, "the sabbath days" of Col. 2:16 can not possibly be applied to the annual holy days, for *sabbaton*, the word there used, is not the word used for these days. Feast days (*heortes*) is the term embracing all those days, as we have seen. Hence "the sabbath days" (*sabbaton*) must apply only to the weekly sabbaths.

An effort is made to prove that "the sabbath" of Lev. 23:11 is an annual sabbath. But the evidence is doubtful to say the least. On this scholars are divided, so it can not be counted as evidence either way.

So, to say the least, this term being pre-eminently, almost exclusively, applied to the weekly sabbaths, must include them any way, whether it did any others or not,

And if Paul had meant to name the weekly sabbath days he could have used no other term than those he did use, *sabbaton*. Let Sabbatarianism weigh this well. Now read together a few of the many texts where we certainly know the weekly sabbaths are meant. It will be noticed that the plural number is used, the same as in Col. 2:16. "Verily my sabbaths [plural] ye shall keep: for it [singular] is a sign" (Ex. 31:13). We know this is the weekly sabbath. "Keep my sabbaths" (Lev. 19:8). "Besides the sabbaths of the Lord" (Lev. 23:38). All claim this to be the weekly sabbath. "Keep my sabbaths" (Isa. 56:4). "I gave them my sabbaths as a sign." "My sabbaths they greatly polluted." (Ezek. 20:12-13). "On the sabbath days" (Luke 4:31). "Is it lawful on the sabbath days?" (Luke 6:9). "Three sabbath days reasoned" (Acts 17:2). "Let no man therefore judge you. . . in respect. . . of the sabbath days" (Col. 2:16).

Who can read this list of texts and not be profoundly impressed that by "the sabbath days" of Col. 2:16 Paul means just what the language means in all the other cases? Of course he did, and no other reasonable application can be made of it. Add to this the fact that in the Greek the same term is used in all these cases, and the conclusion is inevitable. Not only the same word, but precisely the same form of the word that is used in Col. 2:16, is time and again used for the weekly sabbath. Thus, Matt. 28:1, "In the end of the sabbath"; Luke 4:16, "On the sabbath day"; Col. 2:16, "the sabbath days." Exactly the same original word, letter for letter, in all these texts, as every one who can read a word of Greek knows. All the others mean the weekly sabbath. Then why not this also?

Once more. The word sabbath occurs sixty times in the New Testament. In fifty-nine of these times it is freely admitted by all seventh-day people that it means the weekly sabbath; but in the sixtieth case where exactly the same word is used, both in Greek and English, they stoutly contend that it must mean something else! (See Scripture References, p. 9). Does not this look a little suspicious? But, as we have seen, there are no other sabbath days to which it would apply. Further, Paul simply and squarely said "the sabbath days" without making any exception, hence the weekly sabbaths must have been included at least. It is certain that no Sabbatarian would ever have written as Paul did here. I have often wished that this text was not in the Bible, and it troubles my Seventh-day Adventist brethren as much as it did me, say what they will. But what settles it beyond a reasonable doubt that Col. 2:16 does refer to the weekly sabbaths is the fact that exactly the same list of holy days here given by Paul is given about a dozen times in the Old Testament, where we know it means the seventh day.

Turn to Num. 28 and 29, and you have a detailed law as to just what offerings shall be made on each day of the whole year. The first were the *daily*, or "continual," offerings of "two lambs," day by day, for a continual burnt offering. "The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at the even" (verses 3 and 4). The second were the offerings on the Sabbath. "And on the Sabbath day two lambs of the first year without spot" (verses 9 and 10.) None will deny that this was the weekly Sabbath. Third, in the very next verse come the new moons. "And in the beginnings of your months ye shall offer a burnt offering unto the Lord" (verses 11-15.) Fourth, comes the annual feast days. "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord" (verse 16.) Then follows a complete list of all the annual feast days, including the day of atonement, and closing with

these words, "These things shall ye do unto the Lord in your set feasts" (Num. 29:39.)

Here we have the law for the *daily, weekly, monthly* and *yearly* offerings; or, those on each day, on the weekly Sabbaths, on the new moons, and on the set or appointed yearly feast days. Now read the following texts, and notice how this list of daily offerings, offerings on the Sabbaths, on the new moons and on the set feasts, as were laid down in the law of Moses, is repeatedly referred to in almost exactly the words of Col. 2:16.

1 Chron. 23:30-31: "And to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even; and to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the Sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts, by number, according to the order commanded unto them." Here is a direct reference to the daily offerings, offerings on the weekly Sabbaths, new moons and set feasts, just as ordered in Num. 28 and 29. Can any one doubt that "the Sabbaths" here are the weekly Sabbaths, the same as there? Certainly not.

2 Chron. 2:4: "Behold, I build an house to the name of the Lord my God, to dedicate it to him, and to burn before him sweet incense, and for the continual shew bread, and for the burnt offerings morning and evening [daily], on the Sabbaths [weekly], and on the new moons [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly] of the Lord." Precisely the same list again, and in the same order, hence the weekly Sabbaths are the ones named. Besides, it would be absurd to suppose that Solomon would name all the other and minor holy days, but say nothing about the chiefest of all days, the weekly Sabbaths. Every candid man will admit that "the Sabbaths" here are the weekly Sabbaths, and so they are in all the passages which follow.

2 Chron. 8:13: "Even after a certain rate every day [daily again], offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the Sabbaths [weekly], and on the new moons [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly], three times in the year." Same list and order as before.

2 Chron. 31:3: "The morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the Sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." The same list, daily, weekly, monthly and yearly offerings, just in the order they would naturally come, and just as given "in the law of the Lord" (Num. 28 and 29.) But if these Sabbaths are not the weekly Sabbaths, then the Lord names the daily, monthly and yearly offerings, but skips the weekly offerings. Every thinking man knows that such an interpretation is false. But it is the only way the Sabbath can be saved from Paul's list (Col. 2:16), for that is the same as all these.

Neh. 10:33: "For the shew bread, and for the continual meat offering, and for the continual burnt offering, of the Sabbaths, of the new moons, for the set feasts." Same list again, daily, weekly, monthly and yearly. Either the weekly Sabbaths are meant here, or else reference to the worship of God on the Sabbath is always studiously avoided, while all the rest is carefully mentioned. The evidence is too plain to mistake which it is.

Ezek. 45:17: "Offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the Sabbaths." Here are named exactly the same days that Paul gives in Col. 2:16, and in the same order, yearly, monthly, weekly.

Ezek. 46:1, 3, 11: "The gate of the inner court that looketh toward the east shall be shut the six working days; but on the Sabbath it shall be open, and in the day of the new moon it shall be opened." The weekly Sabbath, sure. The next verse directs how the prince shall come in through that gate when thus opened on the Sabbath. Then it tells how the people shall do at the same time. "Likewise the people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the Sab-

baths and in the new moons" (verse 3.) Here "the Sabbath" of verse 1 is *Sabbaths* in verse 3, and in both places it is connected with new moons. After directing what shall be done on both these days, next the feast days are taken up (verse 11), "And in the feasts," etc. The Sabbaths, new moons and feasts again, as frequently mentioned before. Here we know that "the Sabbaths" are the weekly Sabbaths.

Hosea 2:11: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Same list of holy days that we have had over and over, where we know that Sabbaths mean the seventh day.

Col. 2:16: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day (Rev. Version), or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Here, as before, are the yearly, monthly and weekly holy days just as laid down in the law (Num. 28 and 29), where we know the weekly Sabbaths are meant. It is evident that Paul had in his mind those lists of holy days so often given in the Old Testament, where the Sabbath is included.

But in Hosea 2:11 an effort is made by Sabbath keepers to distinguish these Sabbaths from the weekly Sabbaths because they are called "*her* Sabbaths." But the assertion is unsupported by any proof. Why were the yearly holy days *her* days? Did the Jews appoint them? No; the Lord appointed them just as he did the Sabbath, and gave them to Israel to keep just as he gave them the Sabbath to keep. Hence, from one point of view they are the Lord's, but from another view they are *her* days. God's, because he commanded them; *hers*, because given to them. "I gave them my Sabbaths" (Ezra 20:12.) So we read of nearly every sacred institution of the Bible. In one place it is "the Lord's" and in the next it is "*hers*," "*yours*" or "*theirs*," but the same institution all the time. Thus we read of the temple: "Mine house" (Isaiah 56:7); "*your* house" (Matt. 23:38.) of the sacrifices: "The sacrifices of the Lord (Lev. 10:13); "*your* burnt offerings, and *your* sacrifices, (Deut. 12:6.) Of the law: "My law" (Jer. 6:19); "*your* law" (John 10:34.) Now notice particularly that the feast days are spoken of in exactly the same manner that the Sabbath is; that is, "*my* feasts" and "*her* feasts," "*my* Sabbaths" and "*her* Sabbaths." Thus: "The feasts of the Lord" (Lev. 23:4); "the sabbaths of the Lord" (verse 38); "*my* feasts" (verse 2); "*my* Sabbaths" (Ex. 31:13); "*a* feast unto the Lord" (Lev. 23:41); "the holy Sabbath unto the Lord" (Ex. 16:23); "*her* feast days, *her* new moons, and *her* Sabbaths" (Hosea 2:11.) These quotations are sufficient to show the fallacy of trying to make a distinction between "*my* Sabbaths" and "*her* Sabbaths." The same argument would prove that "*my* feasts" and "*her* feasts," "*my* sacrifices" and "*your* sacrifices," "*my* house" and "*your* house," etc., were entirely different. But everybody knows better. These expressions apply to the same thing from different standpoints: the Sabbaths of the Lord as appointed by him; *her* Sabbaths as kept by them; and this is the whole of it.

In the above from Hosea 2:11 is a plain prophecy that all these holy days should cease, just as we know has happened in fact; and in Col. 2:16 is proof that they were nailed to the cross.

On this text, John Bunyan, than whom no man ever studied his Bible more closely, says: "Here also as he [Paul] serveth other holy days he serveth the Sabbath, he gives a liberty to believers to refuse the observation of it. Nor hath the apostle, (since he saith, or of the Sabbath) one would think, left any hole out at which men's inventions could get." Again: "The old seventh-day Sabbath is abolished and done away." [Bunyan's complete works, pp. 899, 900.] So on this text Dr. Scott says: "Doubtless, this last related principally to the weekly Sabbath, which, as observed on the seventh day, was now become a part of

the abrogated Jewish law." So also Dean Alford, the Pulpit Commentary, Dr. Paley and others.

To the same effect, Paul says again: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom. 14:5. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." Gal. 4:10-11. But it is said that this view of Paul's language abolishes all holy days and leaves the church without any rest day. The answer is easy and manifest. Paul was treating of the old institutions which had been nailed to the cross. Col. 2:14. Hence his language has no reference to the new institutions of the gospel, of which there might have been a dozen holy days so far as these texts are concerned.

After the most careful investigation on both sides, I solemnly believe in the fear of God that the above position on Col. 2:16 is correct. I have not one doubt about it.

CHAPTER X.

THE DECALOGUE EXAMINED.

WITH Seventh-Day Adventists the decalogue is the one supreme moral and spiritual law of God, than which there is none higher. It is the law which governs the angels in heaven. "The law of God existed before man was created. The angels were governed by it. After Adam and Eve were created, God made known to them his law."—Mrs. E. G. White, "Spirit of Prophecy," vol. 1, p. 261. It governs all men in all ages, and in the world to come. These ten commandments cover the whole duty of man, so that there is no sin which can be committed that is not a violation of this law, while at the same time it enjoins every virtue. (See "Perfection of the Ten Commandments, p. 4.) But these claims are extravagant and unfounded. A desire to sustain the seventh-day Sabbath has led to this false position on the decalogue.

Twenty-five hundred years, nearly half the entire history of the world, passed away before the decalogue was given at all, as we have proved (see page 107.) This is strange if the decalogue is so all-important. Does any one claim that this code was given in this form before Sinai. They can give no proof whatever for such an assertion. The mere fact that the *principles* of the ten commandments existed from Eden is no proof that this code was drawn up there in its present form. Not one of the ten commandments as given in the decalogue is found anywhere in the Bible before Sinai and to several of them not even a reference can be found. Hence there is not the slightest evidence that the decalogue, as given and worded on Sinai, existed before that time.

Let us examine it. Moses says distinctly that *all* the words which the Lord spoke were written on the tables of stone: "And the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone, written with the finger of God: and on them was written according to *all the words* which the Lord spake with you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire."—Deut. 9:10. This text is too decisive to be evaded. All that God spoke was written on the tables and was a part of the decalogue. Here are the first of those words: "And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me," etc.—Ex. 20:1-3. These words are as much a part of the decalogue as any of the rest of it. They were spoken by God from heaven, written by his finger, were engraven on the stone, and put in the ark. Now look at the law chart which Seventh-Day Adventists hang up as the "law of God;" are these words on there? No, indeed. Why are they left off? Because, if put on, they would spoil their whole theory of that law. They claim that this law is binding upon the angels. But how would this sound to the angels: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Were the angels in bondage in Egypt? Would not that sound a little queer to Gabriel and the seraphs, to be told that they had been in bondage in Egypt! Read it to Adam. That would have been news to him to learn that he had been in bondage in Egypt! Read it to a free-born American, read it to all the redeemed hosts in heaven. To whom are the words applicable? Just

to the Jewish nation and to no others. For them the decalogue was framed and to them it was given. For years I searched to find one text stating that this law was ever given to any people but the Jews. I never found it. These first words show plainly that it was addressed only to them.

Seventh-Day Adventists assert that the Sabbath precept is the only thing in the decalogue that tells who gave it. Thus: "Without the fourth commandment the decalogue is null and void;" it "constitutes the seal of the law."—"Thoughts on Revelation," chap. 7:1-3. This is not true. The introductory words tell plainly enough who gave the decalogue. It was the God who brought them out of Egypt. Here is the name, signature, and seal of that law in the first words of it.

What an unnatural and unheard of thing it would be in giving an important document to sign the name of the author in the middle of it as Sabbatarians say the Lord did in giving the decalogue! In our time the name is signed at the close of a document; but anciently, specially among the Jews, the name of the author was always given *first*, in the first sentence of the document. Thus: "Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra," etc.—Ezra 7:12. "The vision of Isaiah," etc.—Isa 1:1. "The words of Jeremiah," etc.—Jer. 1:1. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ," etc.—Rom. 1:1. "James, a servant of God," etc.—Jas. 1:1. "Peter, an apostle," etc.—1 Pet. 1:1. So it is all through the Bible, the name and authority are given first, then follows the body of the document. Just so the Lord, according to this ancient custom then in use and familiar to all, in giving the decalogue first announces his name, Jehovah thy God, and his authority, that brought thee out of Egypt. This he does in the opening words of that law. Here, then, in the very first words of the decalogue, and not in the Sabbath precept in the middle of the law, is the name, sign and seal of the law-giver, Jehovah who brought them out of Egypt. This settles it that this law was not given till then, was given only to the Jews and was designed for no others. To illustrate: Opening to a law passed by the legislature of Michigan, Feb. 16, 1882, I read: "Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the state of Michigan," etc. Now suppose that some one should claim that this law was passed one thousand years ago and was designed for the whole world. Would not these opening words show that this law was not enacted till Michigan became a state and that it was designed only for the people of Michigan? Assuredly. Just so the opening words of the decalogue show that this law was not given till God brought Israel out of Egypt, that it was given to them and to no others. If any one will find a copy of the decalogue before this time, we will give up the case. All the way through it there are evidences that it was worded to fit only the Jewish nation in their peculiar circumstances.

Take the Sabbath commandment: "Thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates."—Ex. 20:10. Think of that commandment being given to angels in heaven! "Sons," "daughters," and "thy neighbor's wife" (verse 17), when they neither marry nor are given in marriage! Again: "Cattle," "ox," "ass," etc.—do the angels own cattle and work oxen and asses in heaven? So "man servants and maid servants." This means bond servants or slaves, such as the Hebrews owned in those days. This is shown by the tenth commandment, verse 17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's . . . man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass." These were his property, servants or slaves, oxen, asses, etc. But do the angels own slaves? Did Adam have servants in Eden? Will the redeemed own them hereafter! Pshaw, what nonsense to apply this law to the angels and to Eden and to heaven. This wording was specially adapted to the social condition of the Jews as a nation in the land of Canaan, and to no others.

Once more: "Thy stranger that is within thy gates." Verse 10. As everybody knows, "the stranger" was the Gentile. "Within thy gates" was a common expression for within your borders. See Gen. 23:10; Deut. 14:28; 16:18. Hence this referred to the Gentiles living among the Jews in Canaan. This command, then, could not apply to any but the Jews there. Again, the fifth commandment: "The land which the Lord giveth them," verse 12, plainly refers to Canaan which God gave them. The ninth precept: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." This does not relate to lying in general, but only to a false oath against a neighbor in court. See Deut. 19:15-19. A man could tell a hundred lies which would not be false witness against a neighbor. The command against lying is found in Lev. 19:11: "Neither lie one to another." This is a moral precept much broader than the ninth commandment.

So the commandments against murder, adultery, and theft, were evidently given to prohibit those open crimes against society. They did not relate to the thoughts. Jesus plainly shows this when he quotes these and then puts his standard as higher than these: "But I say unto you that if you are angry or think evil, you are sinners." The tenth commandment is the only one that prohibits evil thoughts. If it is claimed that the commandment against adultery prohibits the thought of adultery, then it would cover the same ground as the tenth commandment. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife." If it is claimed that the commandment against stealing prohibits the thought of theft, then it covers the same ground as the tenth one, "Thou shalt not covet anything, that is thy neighbour's," for the thought of stealing is coveting. This would be bungling work for a perfect law.

Every principle contained in the decalogue is also found time and again laid down in the law of Moses, either in the same or similar words. Thus, for example: Lev. 19 reiterates every principle found in the ten commandments, with many more besides. How erroneous, then, to call one the moral law and the other the ceremonial law, when both are of the same nature, the decalogue simply being representative precepts from the law of Moses.

But the chief argument used to prove the superior nature of the ten commandments is, that they were spoken by God's voice, written by His finger, on stone, and placed in the ark, while all the rest of the law was written by the hand of Moses in a book. Why were these commandments thus selected out and given in such a manner if not to exalt them above all others? According to the custom of those times, any solemn contract or covenant was commemorated by selecting some object as witness or testimony of it. Thus: Jacob erected a pillar as a witness of his vow to God. Gen. 28:18. Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones as witness of their covenant. Gen. 31:48. Abraham set apart seven lambs as "a witness" of his covenant with Abimelech, Gen. 21:27-30.

Just so when the solemn covenant was made between God and Israel at Sinai, the Lord gave them the tables of stone to be always kept as witnesses or "testimony" of that agreement. Hence they are called "the tables of testimony," that is witness: Ex. 31:18. So the tabernacle was "the tabernacle of testimony," Num. 1:59; or, "the tabernacle of witness," Num. 17:7. These tables of stone, then, containing some of the chief items of the law were always to be kept as "witness" of the covenant which Israel had made to keep that law. Evidently *this* is the reason why the decalogue was given as it was, and not because it was a perfect and eternal law in and of itself.

Manifestly it would have been impossible to carry around the whole law if written on stones; hence only a few samples out of that whole law could be selected and put on stones to be kept as a witness of that

covenant. So the reason why God spoke these words was not because it was a perfect law, but to impress their minds so that they would never forget it. This is just what God says himself: "I will make thee hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live." Deut. 4:10. How much more simple and manifest these reasons are than the imaginary ones invented by Sabbatarians.

Seventh-Day people urge as a strong argument for the perpetuity of the decalogue, the fact that it was put in the ark in the most holy place. But the golden pot and Aaron's rod were also in the same place. Heb. 9:3-4. Are they, therefore, also eternal? No, they were put there simply as witnesses or memorials, the same as the tablets of stone were. See Ex. 26:33; Num. 17:10. That is all there is to that argument.

Again, it is argued that the temple on earth was an exact type of a real temple now in heaven. Hence the ten commandments must be in the ark in the most holy place of the heavenly temple. This is considered their very strongest argument for the unchangeable nature of that law. But, as we have seen, Aaron's rod and the pot of manna were there too. Are they also in heaven? But worse still; the entire law of Moses, the book of the law, was also in the most holy place in the side of the ark. Deut. 31:24-26. Then it also must now be in the most holy place in the temple in heaven. Hence if this argument proves that the decalogue is binding on us, then it proves that all the Mosaic law is also binding on us! That is all there is to this imaginary argument.

Again, if the fact that the decalogue was spoken by God's voice written by his finger, engraved on the stone and put in the ark, if this proves that that is applicable to the whole world and of perpetual obligation, then it proves the same thing for all the words which were thus given, these with the rest: "I am the Lord, thy God, which have brought thee out the land of Egypt." -Ex. 20:2. These words were written on the tables with the rest. Deut. 9:10. Are these in the ark in heaven and so addressed to Christians and to all the universe? We have already shown the absurdity of applying this language to any but Jews. This proves the absurdity of the idea that this law is now in heaven as a universal law for all creation.

That the decalogue was merely the national law for the Jews and temporal in its obligation, is proved by the fact that stoning to death was the penalty for its violation. When death was thus inflicted upon a man, he had paid the penalty of that law, and all the penalty there was. But is stoning to death the penalty for God's moral law? No, that is eternal death at the judgment. A man who is hung for murder has paid the penalty of the law of our land, the same as the Jew who was stoned paid the penalty of the law of his land. Will God judge a man the second time at the judgment by the law of our land after he has once paid its penalty by hanging? No, but he will also be judged by another and a higher law, the great spiritual law of God. And so it will be with the Jews. They will never be judged the second time by the decalogue for that was only national, but by the higher law, the one that requires supreme love to God and equal love to man.

The mere fact that the decalogue was spoken by God from heaven, written by his finger on stone and placed in the ark, is no proof of its superiority over that which was written by Moses in a book and placed in the side of the ark. This is shown by the fact that the two "great commandments," namely, to "love God with all your heart" and "your neighbor as yourself," were not put on the tables of stone nor in the ark, but were written by Moses in a book and placed in the side of the ark. Yet Jesus said of these, "There is none other commandment greater than these," Mark 12:31; and "On these two commandments hang all the law." Matt. 22:40. Here we see that it is a square contradiction of the word of Christ to say that what was written on stone was supe-

rior to what was written by Moses in the book. According to Adventists, these two great commandments belong to the ceremonial law and were abolished at the cross because they were written by Moses in a book and placed outside the ark. What an absurdity.

Seventh-day Adventists claim that the ten commandments are a perfect law, condemning every possible sin, sin requiring every possible virtue. But this is all assumption and contrary to the manifest truth. Which one of the ten commandments condemns pride, boasting, drunkenness, unthankfulness, love of pleasure, anger, filthy talk, impatience, variance, selfishness, and the like? Which one of the ten commandments requires us to feed the poor, to visit the fatherless and the widow, to suffer long and be kind, to be gentle, meek, temperate, to pray, to repent, to go to meeting, to forgive, and the like? No, the decalogue does no such thing, because it was made for no such purpose. It was merely prohibitory in its nature. The man who merely did nothing, who simply avoided crime kept that law. But the law of God by which a Christian must live, requires him to *do*, and to do much. He must love God, love his neighbor, love his enemies, visit the widow and the needy, suffer wrong, be patient, entertain strangers, and be active in every good work.

The decalogue alone is never called the law of God, nor the law of the Lord, nor a perfect law, nor is it said that any one will be judged by it, or that it is binding on Christians.

THE CATHOLIC DIVISION OF THE DECALOGUE.

Seventh-day Adventists have made a great ado over the way Catholics divide and number the ten commandments. They have gotten up a chart showing in one column the decalogue "as changed by the pope" and in another "as given by God." Here they show how "the pope has changed God's law in fulfillment of Dan. 7:25." According to this, the Catholics included in the *first* commandment what we have in the *first two*. Then our *third* is their *second*, our *fourth* their *third*, and so on till our *tenth* of which they make *two*. Adventist claim that the pope did this to get rid of the second commandment and to change the Sabbath. But the whole thing is utterly false, as may be seen under the word decalogue in any religious encyclopedia. The Shaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says:

"There have been three arrangements of the decalogue—the Talmudic (Jewish), the Augustinian (adopted by the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches), and the Hellenistic (Greek), the view of Philo, Josephus, Origen, the Greek and Reformed churches, etc. The following table exhibits the differences, the record in Ex. 20 being used:

TALMUDIC.	HELLENISTIC.	AUGUSTINIAN.
1. I am the Lord, etc. (v. 2)	1. Against idols, (v. 3).	1. Against idols and images, (3-6).
2. Against idols and images, (3-6).	2. Against images, (4-6).	2. Blasphemy.
3. Blasphemy.	3. Blasphemy.	3. The Sabbath.
4. The Sabbath.	4. The Sabbath.	4. Filial Obedience.
5. Filial Obedience.	5. Filial Obedience.	5. Murder.
6. Murder.	6. Murder.	6. Adultery.
7. Adultery.	7. Adultery.	7. Theft.
8. Theft.	8. Theft.	8. False witness.
9. False witness.	9. False witness.	9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's h. (17)
10. Coveting.	10. Coveting.	10. The rest of v. 17.

It will be seen here that the Catholics have simply followed the early fathers in this, while we have followed the Greeks. The pope had nothing to do with making this division of the commandments. It will be seen that according to the Talmudic (Jewish) division which is the oldest of all, the first commandment is the words, "I am the Lord thy God which

brought thee out of the land of Egypt," etc. The modern Jews follow exactly the same division of the decalogue which the Catholics do. So there is not a word of truth in the assertion of the Adventists that the Catholics have changed the decalogue.

LUTHER AND OTHERS ON THE ABOLITION OF THE DECALOGUE.

Many of the most eminent, devout, and learned men of the church have held that the decalogue was abolished, though they were far from being Anti-nomians. Luther says: "The ten commandments do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt. If he says no, then say, 'How, then, does Moses concern me, since he speaks (in the ten words) to the people that have been brought out of Egypt.' In the New Testament Moses comes to an end and his laws lose their force."

That the decalogue was abolished at the cross was taught by such eminent Christians as Milton, Baxter, Bunyan, Doddridge, Whately, Grotius, Locke, Sherlock, Watts, Cox, Hersey, and a host of others. The early Christian fathers held this view. Thus, Justus Martin, A. D. 140, says: "The law promulgated on Horeb is now old and belongs to yourselves (Jews) alone; but this is for all universally. Now law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it."—Dialogue with Trypho, chap. xi. On this Elder Andrews says: "That Justin held to the abrogation of the ten commandments is also manifest."—Testimony of the Fathers, p. 43.

Dr. Adam Clarke says: "In subjection to it (the law) that in Him, all its designs might be fulfilled, and by His death, the whole might be abolished; the law *dying* when the Son of God expired upon the cross." On Gal. 4:4. Says Dr. Dobbs: "Nor is this 'new and dangerous teaching.' It was the doctrine of the Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century. Calvin argues in this strain in his Institutes. The eminent Baptist scholar and commentator John Gill, says, writing on Ex. 20:1, 2: 'Verse 2 shows that this body of laws was delivered out to the people of Israel, and primarily belongs to them; for of no other people can the above things be said.' On Matt. 5:17, and II Cor. 3:7-11, Gill is emphatic in similar teaching. Read this, on the latter passage: 'The law is that which is done away; not merely the ceremonial law, or the judicial law, but the whole ministry of Moses; and particularly the law of the decalogue.' I close by citing an incident related by Mrs. Emily C. Judson, in the Life of Adoniram Judson, by his son, Dr. Edward Judson. Mrs. Judson says that her husband once reproved her for introducing some lessons from the Old Testament into her Bible classes, 'comparing it to grouping among shadows when she might just as well have the noonday sun.' Mrs. Judson in relating this incident, says: 'My impression, drawn from many a long talk, is that he considered the Old Testament as the Scriptures given to the Jews especially, and to them only. He did not like the distinction commonly drawn between the moral and the ceremonial law, and sometimes spoke with an earnestness amounting to severity, of the constant use made of the ten commandments by christians. He thought the Old Testament very important as explanatory and corroborative of the New—as a portion of the inspiration which came from God, etc., but binding on christians only so far as repeated in the New Testament. He used to speak of the Mosaic law as fulfilled in Christ, and so having no further power whatever; and to say that we have no right to pick out this as moral, and therefore obligatory, and the other as ceremonial and no longer demanding obedience. Practically we had nothing to do with the Old Testament law.'

Able men in all denominations hold that the decalogue was abolished, and each year the number is increasing.

"NOT UNDER THE LAW."

Several times Paul says directly that christians "are not under the law." See Rom. 6:14, 15; Gal. 3:23-25; 4:21; 5:18. It would seem as though this ought to settle it that christians are not to be governed by that law; for surely if we are not under a law we are under no obligation to obey it. Living in Michigan, I am under the law of this state; but I am not under the law of England, hence it has no claim on me. So if we are not under the law, it has no claims on us. In opposition to the plain meaning of this term, Seventh-day Adventists say that it means that we are not under the *curse* or condemnation of the law. But Paul does not say that we are not under the curse of the law; but it is the law itself that we are not under. Every text where the term occurs shows that it means under the authority of the law.

This subject is so plain that Seventh-day Adventists themselves are divided over it, one party writing against the other. Eld. Waggoner leads one party and Eld. Butler the other. I quote from Butler against Waggoner in "The Law in Galations," pp. 51, 52. "But it is thought that in this verse (Gal. 3:23) the expression 'under the law' must refer to the sinner under the condemnation of the moral law. Lengthy arguments have been made in support of this; but we fail to see evidence to prove this position." Then he admits to the other party that "under the law" sometimes means under its condemnation though this is not its primary meaning. He had to say this to save himself on other texts but I deny that it ever has that meaning. He continues: "We read in Matt. 8:9 of a man *under* authority having soldiers under him, i. e. authority over him and he was in authority over the soldiers, and each was to obey; not that he was under the condemnation of authority or the soldiers under his condemnation. . . . The very nature of the expression itself signifies this, 'under the law' simply meaning the law being above or having authority over the persons who were under it. This is the primary, simplest meaning of the term; and unless strong reasons can be adduced to the contrary, we should always give the expression this signification." "Greenfield . . . gives no instance where it is used in the sense of being subject to the condemnation of the law." "We are no longer under a pedagogue, [the law] i. e., no longer under his authority; his authority is no longer over us because his office ceased when the seed came." So writes Eld. Butler, and he states the truth: but he tries to limit this to the ceremonial law. Here he fails for it is "*the law*," not a part of it.

Here is what the lexicons say of the word *under*: "In relation to something that governs. In a state of subjection; subject;"—Webster. Under is from the Greek word "*hupo*" which is thus defined: "Of subjection to a law. Rom. 6:14."—Greenfield. "To express subjection; under his sway; under its guidance; subject to."—Liddell and Scott. "Subject to,"—Groves' Gr. and Eng. Dict. "Under subjection to, Rom. 14."—Bagster's Gr. Lex. So all the authorities I have consulted define 'under' to mean under the authority of, subject to. Now Paul says, "Ye are *not* under the law," Rom. 6:14; that is, not under its authority, not subject to it. This is plain enough.

Turning to the commentators, I read: "Under the law; in subjection to it."—Clark on Gal. 4:4. "Subject to the law," "Bound by its requirements."—Barnes on Gal. 4:4. "Not under the law; not under a legal dispensation."—American Tract Society, notes on Rom. 6:14. "Under the law, under the legal dispensation."—Scott on Gal. 3:23-25.

Thus all agree that "under the law" means subject to its authority. But we are not under the law, not under its authority. Read a few texts as to its meaning. "Edom revolted from *under* the hand of Judah." 2 Kings 8:20. "Israel went out from *under* the hand of the Syrians." 2 Kings 13:5. "Ye purpose to keep *under* the children of Judah." 2 Chro.

28:10. In every case it means under the authority of. Again: "A man under authority, having soldiers under me." Matt. 8:5. "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Rom. 6:14. "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them are under the law." "To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law." 1 Cor. 9:20-21.

This passage shows beyond a doubt what Paul means by "under the law." The Jews were under the law. When with them he did as they did to gain them. He kept the law as they did. See for proof Acts 16:3, when he circumcised Timothy, and Acts 21:20-26, where he shaved his head and offered offerings. Those without law were the Gentiles who were never under the Jewish law. When with them he lived as they did to gain them. He did not keep the Mosaic law. But Paul is careful to add that he was under the law to Christ, or more correctly, "Under law to Christ."—Revised Version. "Under Christ's law."—Diaglott. "Under the law of the Messiah."—Syriac. "Under the law of Christ."—Clarke. "The law enjoined of Christ."—Barnes. Paul says he was under Christ's law. Does he mean that he was condemned by the law of Christ? Surely not; but he was not under its authority.

Again: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Gal. 3:23-25. Before Christ came they were under the law as a teacher who was preparing them for the great teacher. When Christ came they were no longer under that old schoolmaster, the law. Proceeding with his argument Paul says: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Gal. 4:4. This again is decisive as to the meaning of "under the law." Christ was born under the law, that is subject to the law the same as any Jew. He carefully obeyed that law 'till it was abolished at His cross. He certainly was not born under the condemnation of the law, for He was without sin. To the Galatians who were going back to the observance of the law Paul says: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Gal. 4:21. Did they desire to be under the curse of the law? Nonsense. They desired to obey the law just as Adventists do now. Finally Paul says to them, "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Gal. 5:18. If they accepted Christ, they had no further need for the old law. So, then, Christians are not under the authority of the law for it was nailed to the cross. On this point Dr. Adam Clarke forceably says: "*Under the law*: In subjection to it, that in Him, all its designs might be fulfilled, and by His death, the whole might be abolished, the law dying when the Son of God expired upon the cross." On Gal. 4:4.

That "under the law" means subject to the authority of the law is plainly proven by Rom. 3:19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." The Jew readily admitted that all the Gentiles were sinners; but the point was to prove that the Jews themselves were also sinners. So in verses 10-18 he makes several quotations from their scriptures saying that, "There is none righteous, no, not one," etc. "Now," says Paul, "you cannot apply this to the Gentiles for it is in your own law and we know that a law speaks to those who are subject to it and not to those who are not. So it must mean that not one of you Jews are righteous. Hence, as all the Gentiles are sinners, and this proves that all Jews are sinners too, therefore all the world are guilty." Again, Paul argues that the law speaks only to "those who are under the law." But does the law speak only to those

who are condemned by it? That is false and absurd. To every man in Michigan our law says, "you shall not steal," whether they have stolen or not. So the Mosaic law was addressed to all the Jews: "Hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you." Deut. 4:1. Who was to hearken to that law? All Israel, for it spoke to them all. This fact was so manifest that Paul said, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." What, then, does he mean by *under the law*? He means under the authority of the law, subject to the law, and this is what it always means. But Paul says over and over that Christians "are not under the law."

CHAPTER XI.

THE SABBATH IN GENESIS.

The Sabbath is not mentioned by name till the time of Moses. Ex. 16:23; Gen. 2:1-3 states that God finished creation in six days and rested on the seventh day; and that he blessed and sanctified the seventh day "because that in it he had rested." Some contend that he sanctified the day then and there in Eden. Others argue that this was not done till the exodus. Plausible arguments are used on both sides; but the simple fact that the most godly and learned men have always disagreed about the institution of the Sabbath in Eden should teach us caution how we build a theory upon a disputed text so meager in statement and so far away in time. In all fairness it must be owned that the definite time when the Sabbath was instituted can not certainly be determined from this text.

There is no statement that any of the patriarchs kept the Sabbath or knew anything about it. Though the record from Adam to Moses covers a period of 2500 years; though we appear to have a full account of the religious customs and worship of the patriarchs such as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, etc.; though we are told about circumcision, the altar, the sacrifices, the priests, the tithe, the oath, marriage, feast days, etc.; yet never a word is said about any one keeping the Sabbath. This does not prove positively that they did not keep the Sabbath, but it does show a strong probability against it. This is the sum of what can be fairly said about the Sabbath in Genesis. When men go away back in Genesis to find this principal argument for the Sabbath, is it not going a long way and finding little upon which to establish a christian duty? Would it not be wiser and safer to build our faith upon the plain requirements of the New Testament?

TESTIMONY OF EMINENT MEN.

Justin Martyr, who wrote only 44 years after the death of St. John and who was well acquainted with the doctrine of the apostles, denied that the Sabbath originated at creation. Thus after naming Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, and Melchizedek, he says: "Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God." Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 19.

Irenaeus, about A. D., 170, says of Abraham that he was "without observance of Sabbaths." Book 4, chap. 16.

Tertullian, A. D., 200, in his answer to the Jews, chap. 2, declares that Adam was "inobservant of the Sabbath;" affirms the same of Abel, Noah, Enoch, and Melchizedek. And in the beginning of chapter three, he classes the Sabbath with circumcision, and asserts that Abraham did not "observe the Sabbath."

Eusebius, A. D., 315, the father of church history, says: "They (the patriarchs) did not therefore regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, nor do we." Eccl. Hist., book 1, chap. 4.

From this it will be seen that the early church did not believe that the Sabbath originated at creation. The same doctrine has been maintained by such eminent men as Paley, Hesse, Bishop, Bramhall, etc.

But on the other hand a great host of eminent scholars have held that the Sabbath originated in Eden. All this plainly shows that it is an open question on which candid men may honestly differ as to whether the Sabbath originated at creation or at Moses. Hence its origin in Eden can not fairly be assured as the reason why the seventh day must be kept now. If its observance is necessary to salvation, there should be clearer proof than this for it.

THE SABBATH AT THE EXODUS.

The first mention of the Sabbath observance is in Ex. 16, where it was kept by the Jews after they left Egypt. Here again the record does not positively state whether the Sabbath was first kept here or not, though the narrative seems to imply that they knew nothing about keeping the Sabbath before. See verses 23-30, how the people failed to understand that they must rest that day, until Moses had repeated the commandment three times. This first record of Sabbath keeping closes thus: "So the people rested on the seventh day."—Verse 30. This language certainly indicates that here was where they first began to rest on that day. Several scriptures harmonize well with this idea. Thus, Neh. 9:13, 14. "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai. . . . and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." This implies that it was not known before. In harmony with this Ezek. 20:10-12 says: that God brought them out of Egypt into the wilderness and "*gave them my Sabbaths.*" So Ex. 31:17 says, "It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel." We have already proved that the Sabbath commandment as worded in the decalogue is applicable only to the Jews. Deut. 5:15 states that the Sabbath is to be kept as a memorial of Egypt. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence. . . . therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." This indicates that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution. Then the prohibition of fires on the Sabbath, Ex. 35:3, indicates that it was a local institution designed only for that warm climate.

No where are Gentiles required to keep the Sabbath except such as dwell among the Jews. They were also required to keep the other feast days. Lev. 16:29. All through the Old Testament the Gentiles are denounced over and over for all other sins, but not once for breaking the Sabbath, though none of them kept it. The reason for this must be that it was not binding upon them.

THE SABBATH IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

From Joshua to Job not a word is said indicating that the Sabbath was for any one but Jews; hence no argument can be drawn from this source to bind it upon Gentile Christians.

THE SABBATH IN THE PROPHETS.

The Sabbath is not even mentioned in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiasties, Daniel, and most of the minor prophets. Nothing is said about it by any of the prophets which can fairly be made to apply to Christians. Several texts are applied by Seventh-Day Adventists to our times, but it is all assumption without proof. For instance, Isa. 58:13, is applied by them to their work of Sabbath reform. But is there anything in the context to support such a view? Not a word. It is all assumption. So Ezekiel 22:25-30 is boldly applied to our times and to Gentile Christians. But God himself applies it to the Jewish nation when they were overthrown by Babylon 500 years before Christ. Com-

pare verses 26:31 with Neh. 13:17,18. There is where it applies, not here. I became fully convinced that it was by a lot of such groundless assumptions as these, by roundabout and far fetched arguments that the seventh-day theory is sustained. When you look for one plain, direct statement in all the Bible requiring Gentile Christians to keep the Sabbath, it cannot be found. It has to be *inferred* from this, *guessed* from that, and *concluded* from the other; all inference, nothing direct.

Isaiah 56 is quoted to prove that Gentiles should keep the Sabbath. See verses 3, 4, 6. A blessing is pronounced upon the Gentiles who will keep the Sabbath. But in the same chapter it says of these Gentiles: "Them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar." verse 7. Either, then, this applies to the Jewish age and to those Gentile proselytes who embraced Judaism and were circumcised (Ex. 12:48) and observed all Jewish rites; or if it applies to the Christian age, then these terms "Sabbath," "altar," "sacrifice," "my house," "my holy mountain," must be taken figuratively, for Christians do not offer sacrifices, nor have a literal altar, nor go to Jerusalem to worship in that house nor on that mountain. It is the most common thing in the prophets when foretelling gospel events to use terms familiar to the Jews, though they refer to quite different things under the gospel. Any one familiar with the Bible will readily remember many places where the words Jerusalem, Zion, Israel, altar, temple, sacrifice, etc., are used by the prophets when entirely different things are meant under the gospel. So Sabbath may be used in Isa. 56 if the passage relates to the gospel. So the Old Testament furnishes no evidence that Christians are to keep the Sabbath. If such proof is to be found, it must be in the New Testament itself. But we have already seen that the New Testament is entirely silent as to any requirements to keep the seventh day.

SPECIAL TEXTS CONSIDERED.

GENESIS 26:5. "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." From this text Seventh-day Adventists claim that Abraham kept the Sabbath, for he kept the commandments and the Sabbath was one of them. How easy! ANSWER.—The ten commandments and "the law which was four hundred and thirty years after" Abraham, Gal. 3:17, can not be meant, for they were not yet given. Moses says the fathers did not have the decalogue. See Deut. 4:13; 5:2, 3. Hence their argument on this is mere assumption. Abraham obeyed whatever God told him and thus kept his commandments.

I CHRON. 16:15-17. God's covenant commanded to a thousand generations. The decalogue is God's covenant. Deut. 4:13. Hence it must be kept for 1000 generations; there have been less than 200 generations from Adam till now, so that law must be kept for ages yet. ANSWER.—The term "a thousand generations" is manifestly an expression meaning for a long time, not just 1000 generations, no more nor less. If it means just 1000 generations, then it would end at that date and this would overthrow the Adventist theory that the decalogue will be eternal. The whole passage is poetry, see verse 7, and the license of poetry is used. Moreover the text has no reference to the ten commandments. It is "the covenant made with Abraham" and renewed to Isaac and Jacob "saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." Verses 15-18. That covenant is found in Gen. 15:18; is renewed to Isaac, Gen. 26:3, and to Jacob, Gen. 28:13. This is a fair sample of how the Adventists play upon the mere jingle of words without any regard to the real meaning.

PSALMS 19:7. "The law of the Lord is perfect." This is the decalogue. It was perfect. Hence it can not be altered and God would not abolish a perfect law. ANSWER.—1. The margin says "*doctrine*" instead of law. 2. The decalogue is never once called the law of the Lord. 3. The law of the Lord was the whole Mosaic law including offerings, sacrifices, feast days, etc. See Luke 2:22-24; 2 Chron. 31:3. So if this text proves the perpetuity of the law, then the whole Jewish law must be kept, for that was "the law of the Lord." Here is another case where Adventists assume the very point to be proved, namely, that the law of the Lord is just the decalogue and nothing more.

PSALMS 89:34. "My covenant will I not break nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." The decalogue is God's covenant, Deut. 4:13, and it was spoken by His lips. Here is proof that it will never be altered. ANSWER.—The text has not the least reference to the ten commandments. Read the connection from verse 19 to 36. It is the covenant made with David concerning his seed and his throne. "Once have I sworn by My holiness that I will not lie unto David." Verse 35. This is the covenant which God will not break, the promise of his lips which he will not alter. See here again how scripture is perverted to sustain their theory. The ignorant accept it without a question and believe it without a doubt.

PSALMS 119. This whole Psalm has much to say about the law and the commandments. Adventists apply it all to just the decalogue. ANSWER.—The *law* is the whole Mosaic law, and the commandments are all the statutes which God gave through Moses, as I have proved on another page of this book. Hence, what is said here of God's law and commandments refers as much to what they call ceremonial law as it does to the ten commandments. Whatever it proves for one it does for the other.

PROV. 28:14. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Those who refuse to keep the Sabbath turn away from the law and God does not hear their prayers. ANSWER.—"The law" is the whole law and not simply a part of it. Sabbatarians break the law constantly for it requires sacrifices, feast days, and a hundred things, as well as to keep the Sabbath. See here again how they constantly assume that "the law" is just the decalogue and no more."

ECCLE. 12:13. "Fear God and keep His commandments for this is the whole duty of man." This is the ten commandments, and hence they are a perfect law covering man's whole duty both to God and man. All will be judged by this law. Verse 14, Those who do not keep the Sabbath will be condemned. ANSWER.—See here again how they go through the Bible proving their doctrine by assuming the very point to be proved, viz: that this is the decalogue only. 1. It does not say that this is the ten commandments. 2. There is nothing in the context indicating it. 3. This was written under the Jewish law, by Solomon a Jewish king, and written to Jews under that law. Was it not the duty of a Jew to circumcise his sons? to offer sacrifices, pay tithes, keep the passover, eat unleaven bread, etc., etc.? Certainly. Do the ten commandments require any of these things? No. Then Solomon must have meant more than the decalogue by the commandments which cover the whole duty of man. 4. The decalogue does not contain the whole duty of man now, nor half of it. It does not require a man to visit the fatherless and the widow, to be meek, patient, kind, longsuffering, to pray for our enemies, go to church, support the gospel, and a hundred other duties. 5. The commandments, in the days of Solomon, under the law included the whole law of Moses. See Deut. 28:1, 15. That which was "the commandments" under the law has been abolished by

Christ, (Eph. 2:15). 6. Christians are to live by the commandments which Christ and his apostles gave. See Matt. 7:24; 17:5; 28:20; John 14:15, 21; 15:10; Acts 1:2; I Cor. 14:37. Thus falls one of the main pillars of Seven-Day Adventism.

ISAIAH 42:21. "He will magnify the law and make it honorable." This is the decalogue. If Jesus magnified it he could not abolish it; if he set it aside he would not have honored it. ANSWER. See the ready assumption again that "the law" is just the decalogue. Does it say so? No. If the reader will bear in mind once for all that "the law" is the whole Mosaic code, he will easily dispose of all their proof texts. Jesus did magnify the law; first, by carefully observing every precept of that law, both moral and ceremonial; second, by fulfilling all its predictions and types and thus accomplishing the object for which it was given. Accept for a moment the Seventh-Day Adventist idea of the two laws, the moral and ceremonial. They themselves claim that Christ abolished the ceremonial law. Well, did he thereby belittle and dishonor that law? They dare not say so. No, he magnified and honored it, as they must admit. Then a law can be honored and magnified and yet set aside as having fulfilled its purpose. This is just what Christ did to the law as a whole.

ISAIAH 66:22-23. In the new earth the saints will come to worship God "from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another." This shows that the Sabbath will be kept in the new earth. Hence it must be eternal and so should be kept now. ANSWER: It proves just as plainly that the new moons will also be kept there. So we ought to keep them now. Why then do they not keep the new moons? Let them answer.

DANIEL 7:25. "He shall think to change times and laws." This refers to the pope. He was to change God's law, the decalogue. He changed the Sabbath and thus changed times. ANSWER: 1. It does not say that it was the decalogue; this they assume. 2. To change the fourth commandment and the Sabbath would change only one law and one time; but the prophecy says *laws* and *times*, both plural. This shows that the prophecy is of much wider scope than they give it. 3. There is not a word of truth in the assertion that the pope changed the Sabbath. (See pages 66-81 of this book.) So this application is false. 4. The law was changed by Christ, not by the pope. Paul says: "There is made of necessity a *change also of the law.*" Heb. 7:12. See also pages 131-139, where it is clearly shown that the decalogue was abolished. So their theory is wholly false. 5. In a hundred ways the pope has fulfilled this prediction outside of the Sabbath by legislating for the church in many things contrary to the laws of Christ.

MATT. 5:17-19. Jesus says he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. And "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Whoever breaks any one of these commandments is guilty. This law is the decalogue. Jesus says that every jot and tittle of it will stand till heaven and earth pass away. This shows that this law is unchangeable and still binding. The Sabbath is a part of it and therefore the seventh day must still be kept. ANSWER: Seventh-Day Adventists consider this the strongest text in the New Testament for the law. They are constantly quoting it. If this fails them they have no stronger fort. I am sure it teaches no such thing as they claim. 1. Seventh-Day Adventists themselves admit that Jesus fulfilled and ended what they call the ceremonial law. He abolished it at the cross. Well, did he come to *destroy* that law? Certainly not, and yet he did it away. So, then, it is one thing to *destroy* a law, and quite another to bring it to a close by *fulfilling* it. He says he came to fulfill the law. 2. It does not say that every jot and tittle of the law will

stand till heaven and earth pass away; but it does say that it will not pass away *till it is all fulfilled*. This teaches that it would all be fulfilled and pass away sometime. The idea is that sooner would heaven and earth pass away than one letter of the law would fail of being fulfilled. Luke's words make this matter very clear. "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. Here we cannot mistake the meaning; the idea is not the length of time the law is to last, but the certainty that it will not fail to be fulfilled. 'Fulfilled' is defined thus by Webster: "To fill up, to make full or complete; so accomplish." The Greek word is *Plarosai* and is defined by Greenfield, "To fulfil, to complete; to bring to a close, end, finish, complete." So Jesus did not come to destroy the law, but to finish it. The translation of Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge renders it: "Heaven and earth shall sooner perish than one iota or one tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end." That is the idea exactly. Sawyer's translation says: "I am not come to destroy, but to complete." At the beginning of his ministry Jesus said he came to fulfil the law. After his resurrection he said: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me." Luke 24:44. And then Paul says: "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree." Acts 13:29. So it was all fulfilled at the cross. Hence Paul says it was nailed to the cross. Col. 2:14-16. "Christ is the end of the law." Rom. 10:4. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Gal. 3:24:25. What could be plainer than that the law ended at the cross?

3. The law here spoken of is not simply the decalogue, but the whole law of Moses. No candid man will deny this. All commentators and scholars admit it. The proof is abundant. Thus: "The law and the prophets was a customary phrase for the whole Old Testament." Whedon's Commentary (Methodist) on Matt. 5:17. "By the law or prophets are meant the writings of the Old Testament including the five books of Moses called the law and the writing of the prophets or rest of the Old Testament." Notes on Matt. 5:17 by George W. Clarke. "As everywhere else, so here, the word *nomos* (law) refers to the *whole* law, and not merely to the Decalogue." Lange's Com. on Matt. 5:17. "By *ton nomon* (the law) must be meant, in some sense, the law of Moses." Bloomfield's Notes on Matt 5:17. So all commentators.

The Jewish scriptures were divided into the "book of the Law" which included the five books of Moses and the "book of the Prophets" which included the books written by the prophets, as the historical books, etc. Sometimes a third division was recognized, viz: the Psalms, or poetical books. I have before me the Jew's Bible which is divided that way. Portions from the book of the law and also from the prophets were read in the synagogues every Sabbath. This division of the Old Testament is often referred to in the New Testament. Paul says: "All things which are written in the *book of the law*." Gal. 3:10. Again: "It is written in the *book of the prophets*." Acts 7:42. Once more: "After the reading of the *law* and the *prophets*." Acts 13:15. Hence "the law and the prophets" became a common term for the whole Old Testament. The law was the five books of Moses. Read a few texts: "This is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12. "All the law and the prophets prophesied until John." Matt. 11:13. Here the law can not mean just the decalogue for the law *prophesied*. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22:40. "The law and the prophets were until John." "They have Moses and the prophets." "If they hear not Moses and the prophets." Luke

16:16, 29, 31. Here the law and the prophets is the same as Moses and the prophets. "Him of whom Moses is the law and the prophets did write." John 1:45. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets," "which was written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Luke 24:27, 44. "All things written in the law and in the prophets." Acts 25:14. "Which the prophets and Moses did say." Acts 26:22. Paul preached "out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets." Acts 28:23. "Witnessed by the law and the prophets." Rom. 3:21. See how common this phrase was then for the whole Old Testament. Hence Jesus said, "I am not come to destroy the law or the prophets." Matt. 8:17. In the light of the above facts any one can see that Jesus here meant the whole Old Testament the same as in all the other texts.

It is absurd to say that he meant only the decalogue and the prophets. This would leave out the books of Moses entirely. So, then, the law here is the whole law of Moses. Now if every jot and tittle of that law is binding till the end of the world, then we have the whole Jewish law to keep as well as the Sabbath. This shows the fallacy of the Seventh-day Adventists position. The simple truth is that Christ fulfilled the law and it passed away after serving its purpose.

MATTHEW 19:16-21. The young man asks what to do to have eternal life. Jesus said, "Keep the commandments." When asked which, he said, Do not murder, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness; honor father and mother and love your neighbor as yourself. Here Jesus teaches that we must keep the commandments to have life. He then quotes five of the ten showing that to be the law he meant. The Sabbath is a part of that law, hence we must keep it.

ANSWER.—1. It is noticeable that Jesus carefully omits the Sabbath not only here but on all other occasions like it. He must have done this purposely. 2. Of course no one would gain eternal life and break the commandments which Jesus mentioned. 3. And it is manifest he did not mention all the commandments which must be kept. 4. If it is said that in quoting a part of the decalogue, he thereby implied and endorsed the whole of it as binding, then we reply that by quoting a part of the law of Moses he thereby bound all the rest of that law upon us also. The command to love your neighbor is not in the decalogue but in "the book of the law." So in Mark 10:19, he quotes "defraud not" from Lev. 19:13, the law of Moses. Is then all the Levitical law binding on us because Jesus quoted a part of it? No. Then it by no means follows that the whole of a law is binding on us because Jesus quotes a part of it to a young man still under that law. We object to swallowing a whole ox because we are told that a piece of the flesh is good.

ROM. 3:31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea, we establish the law." The law is the ten commandments. It is not abolished but established. This is a positive statement that the law is still binding under the gospel. The Sabbath is a part of the law and therefore must be kept.

ANSWER: 1. A few isolated texts can not be interpreted to conflict with the general tenor, and many direct statements of the New Testament that we are not under the law but that it ceased at the cross. 2. There is nothing in the text or context that says or intimates that it is the decalogue only of which Paul speaks. 3. Paul has argued through these three chapters that no one has ever kept the law, neither Gentiles nor Jews. So he reasons that no one can be justified by "the law of works," but all can be justified "by the law of faith." Chap. 3:27. Then he "concludes that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Verse 28. Then he anticipates that some one will object that he is an Antinomian, setting aside all law. Verse 31. This he denies. Because

the Jewish law is abrogated, it by no means follows that all law is abolished. So he says: "Do we then nullify law through the faith? By no means; but we establish law."—Diaglott. This is a literal translation of the Greek and gives the idea correctly. Paul does not say *the* law, but simply *law* in general. The definite article *the* is not used before *law* in the original. Hence in this verse we understand Paul to speak of law in general and not of "the law" of Sinai. Here are other reliable translations of the text, giving the same idea. "Do we then make void law through faith? Far be it, yea, we establish law."—American Bible Union Translation. "Do we, then, make law unless through the faith? By no means, but we establish law."—Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge. "Do we, then, make law of none effect through faith? God forbid; nay, we establish law."—Revised Version, marginal reading. The marginal reading in the Version where it differs from the authorized text as it does here, was supported by two-thirds of the learned translators present at the last reading. (See their preface.) This, then, is well supported.

Hence this text does not speak of the decalogue, nor even of the Mosaic law, but of law in the abstract. Paul affirms that faith in Christ does not nullify the use of law. This is exactly what I believe. God's great moral law remains unchanged through all ages, while particular expressions of that law adapted to local circumstances as was the Jewish law, may be changed.

ROMANS 7:12. "Wherefore the law is holy and the commandment holy, and just and good." This is the decalogue as shown by verse 7. As late as A. D., 60, Paul said it was holy, just, good, and spiritual, verse 14, and that he delighted in it, verse 22. Certainly then it was not abolished.

ANSWER.—Whoever has access to Dr. Clarke's Commentary on this chapter will find all the Seventh-Day Adventist argument fully and finely answered. I will note but a few points. In Rom. 7, Paul is arguing with a Jew about the insufficiency of the law. While it pointed out and condemned sin it offered no remedy. He shows how a conscientious Jew under the law felt condemned by the law while he admired it, but had no power to keep it. By the illustration of the wife and two husbands, he shows that the law, the first husband, is dead and Christians are married to Christ the second husband. Viewed in the light of its many excellent precepts, the law was holy, just and good and even spiritual; yet failing to accomplish man's salvation it was superceded by a better system which does what it could not do. A full examination of the chapter would exceed my limits.

ROMANS AND GALATIANS COMPARED.

The leading party among Seventh-Day Adventists argue that Romans treats only of the moral law and teaches its perpetuity, while Galatians treats only of the ceremonial law and teaches its abolition. After a careful study of both books I am satisfied that it is the same law in both and that Paul's argument is substantially the same in both. I make the following table of comparisons between them for those who will look up the matter for themselves:

1. The law treated of in Romans is exactly the same law that is treated of in Galatians.
2. "The law" in each book is "the whole law," embracing all its precepts, moral, civil and ceremonial.
3. The argument of Paul in both books is substantially the same.
4. In each book Paul teaches that the law ended at the cross and was superceded by the gospel. The moment I became convinced of these facts my faith in the perpetuity of the law was gone. To see the force of the following comparison of these two books as I have seen it, the reader should slowly

study it with Bible in hand. We will make Galatians the standard and compare Romans with it.

Gal. 2:11-14 refers to the ceremonial precepts of the law concerning eating. "Before that certain came from James, he (Peter) did eat with the Gentiles" and thus offended weak brethren of the Jewish Christians. Rom. 14:1-6, 14, 15, treats of exactly the same thing. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs." See all the verses. Same subject in both books.

Gal. 2:16. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3:20. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Exactly the same.

Gal. 2:16. We are justified "by the faith of Jesus Christ." Rom. 3:22. "By faith of Jesus Christ." Same again.

Gal. 2:19. "I through the law am dead to the law." Rom. 7:4. "Ye also are become dead to the law." Who can fail to see the likeness in both?

Gal. 3:2. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Rom. 9:31. "Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law."

Gal. 3:6-18. This quotation is too long to insert here, so read it from the Bible. Paul takes up the case of Abraham, his faith, God's promises to him, the gospel to the Gentiles through him, the inheritance by faith and not by the law, etc. Now read Rom. 4:1-16, where Paul goes through the same argument on the case of Abraham and the law. Is must be the same law in both cases.

Gal. 3:6. "Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Rom. 4:3. "Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness." Exactly the same.

Gal. 3:7. "They which are of faith, the same are children of Abraham." Rom. 4:11. "He (Abraham) might be the father of all them that believe." Same idea.

Gal. 3:10. "It is written, cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Where is this written? In Deut. 27:15-26. This quotation refers wholly to moral duties; hence Paul must be speaking of the moral precepts of the law. This proves that Galatians refers to something more than the "ceremonial law." The "book of the law" embraced the five books of Moses, and the decalogue was written in this book and must be included in the "all things" of Gal. 3:10. Besides the "curse of the law" comes from a violation of the moral precepts and not from a neglect of the ceremonials. Hence the law in Galatians must include the moral law. So Gal. 3:13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." This proves beyond question that Paul here refused the moral law for that is the only law which curses the sinner.

Gal. 3:11. "The just shall live by faith." Rom. 1:17. "The just shall live by faith." Same letter for letter.

Gal. 3:12. "And the law is not of faith; but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." Rom. 10:5. "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth these things shall live by them." Here Paul quotes from the Old Testament exactly the same text in both books, and in both books calls it "the law." This proves beyond the possibility of a mistake that he is treating of the same law in both books; for the same text can not mean one law in one book and another law in another book.

Gal. 3:16-18. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made;" "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Rom. 4:13. "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his

seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Here again we have exactly the same argument in both books. It is simply and always "the law" in each book. He does not say "the moral law" in Romans and the "ceremonial law" in Galatians. It is "the law" in both and the cases cited from the Old Testament are the same, and his argument and conclusion are the same in both. Hence "the law" is the same law in both books.

Gal. 3:18, "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Rom. 4:13, "For if they who are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Same thing again in both.

Gal. 3:19, "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions." Rom. 5:20, "The law entered that the offence might abound." Exactly the same thought: men sinned first, then the law was given to prohibit such things. As Paul says again: "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners." The prohibitory law was thundered from Sinai to terrify transgressors.

Gal. 3:19, "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Rom. 10:4, "Christ is the end of the law." Exactly the same idea in both cases: the law ends at Christ.

Gal. 3:21, "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid." Rom. 7:7, "Is the law sin? God forbid." Reader, is not Paul arguing the same thing in both books? Is he not referring to the same law? Of course he is.

Gal. 3:22, "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin." Rom. 11:32, "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief."

Gal. 3:23-25, "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed: Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith; But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster."

Rom. 10:4, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every-one that believeth." Rom. 6:14, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Here in both epistles, Paul in the plainest possible language says that the law ended at Christ, and that we are not under the law.

Gal. 3:27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Rom. 6:3, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?"

Gal. 3:28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek." Rom. 10:12, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek."

Gal. 3:29, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Rom. 8:17, "Heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ."

Gal. 4:5-6, "That we might receive the adoption of sons . . . God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." Rom. 8, "Ye have received the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba Fatherr."

Gal. 4:10, 11, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years! I am afraid of you." Rom. 14:5, "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Here again we have the same subject in both books, the keeping of the holy days of the old law. This must have included the Sabbath.

Gal. 4:17, "They zealously affect you but not well." Rom. 10:2, "They have a zeal of God but not according to knowledge."

Gal. 4:21; 5:18. "Tell me ye that desire to be under the law." "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Rom. 6:14. "Ye are not under the law." Isn't this the same law in both cases?

Gal. 4:22, 23. Paul refers to the two sons of Abraham. Rom. 9:7-12 he takes up the same subject.

Gal. 4:24. Isaac and Ishmael "are the two covenants, the one from Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage." The decalogue was the covenant from Sinai, Deut. 4:13. "He declared unto you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." Paul says this gendereth to bondage and is now to be cast out. How could anything be plainer? Rom. 9:4. "The covenants and the giving of the law," etc. Same subject. Gal. 4:28, 29. "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now" Rom. 9:8. "That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Gal. 5:1. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." The old law, the school master, the old covenant, the decalogue and all its belongings which was bondage, is gone and we are free in Christ. So Rom. 8:2. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Same thought again. Gal. 5:3. "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Rom. 2:25. "For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law." It is readily seen that the idea is the same in both texts. Because circumcision and eating of meats are spoken of in Galatians the Adventists claim that this epistle treats only of the ceremonial law." But the same things are also discussed in Romans as we see. So that this also is the ceremonial law if that proves it.

Gal. 5:14. "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This text entirely upsets the theory that Galatians treats only of the ceremonial law, for this quotation is from the moral law. Paul says that "all the law" is fulfilled in this command, for it embraces all the moral requirements of the law concerning our neighbors. Hence it takes in the last six of the ten. Then "the law" in Galatians embraces all the law, moral and ceremonial. If Paul has not made it plain that he means all the law I do not know how he could have done it, for he says, "*All things* which are written in the book of the law;" Gal. 3:10, "*the whole law*," Gal. 5:3; and "*All the law*." Gal. 5:14. Yet Adventists contend that he means only part of the law! Strange. Rom. 13:9, 10. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Here we have the same argument on it that we have in Galatians, showing that "the law" in both books is the same.

Gal. 5:18. "If ye be led of the spirit, ye are not under the law." Rom. 8:14. "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Compare also Gal. 5:15-26 with Rom. 13:13, 14; Gal. 6:1 with Rom. 14:1-13; Gal. 6:2 with Rom. 15:1-3; Gal. 6:3 with Rom. 12:3; Gal. 6:8 with Rom. 8:5-6.

These comparisons between these two books make it plain beyond doubt that it is the same law treated of in each. That law is the whole law system given to the Jews at Sinai. It ended at Christ and so Christians are not under it. This fact settled overthrows the main argument of the Adventists on the two laws.

James 2:8-12. Here James quotes two of the ten commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not kill." He says that whoever shall keep the whole law and yet break one precept he is guilty of all. This shows that all the decalogue must be kept and the Sabbath is a part of it.

ANSWER.—As we have proved over and over in this book, “the law” is the whole Mosaic law of which the decalogue is only a part. If this text requires us to keep all the law, then we must be circumcised and live just as the Jews did. And if the quotation of two of the ten commandments binds all the rest upon us, then the other quotation from the book of the law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” binds all the law upon us and so we must turn Jews wholly. The evident fact is that the gospel writers quote so much of the Old Testament as is applicable to christians and leave out that which does not fit their cases. Hence the Sabbath precept is never once quoted by any of them in all their numerous writings. Notice here in one of their strongest texts, that their argument for the Sabbath is only *inferential*. If the Sabbath is binding, why do we not have some direct statement to that effect, as we do for all the other commandments?

1 John 3:4. “Sin is the transgression of the law.” Adventists use this text on all occasions to prove that all sin is always a violation of the decalogue and nothing else. It is like many of their arguments where they build a mountain out of a mole hill. 1. “The law” is the whole law of Moses and not merely the decalogue. This we have proved abundantly. 2. But sin existed for 2500 years before that law was given at all. Hence sin is not always a violation of the decalogue. 3. But what spoils this text for Sabbatarians is the fact that, correctly translated, it does not mention the law! Read a few translations: “Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness.”—Revised Version. “Who-soever committeth sin, committeth iniquity, and sin is iniquity.”—Douay, Catholic Bible. “Everyone who practices sin, also practices iniquity; and sin is iniquity.”—Diaglott. “Everyone that practices sin perpetueth iniquity; for all sin is iniquity.”—Syriac. So then this text simply affirms that all sin is iniquity without stating that is a violation of any particular law, much less the decalogue. The transgression of any law is sin and this is all the text teaches. This is another illustration of how the Adventists strain a point to make out a case.

CHAPTER XII.

AN EXPERIENCE OF TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS IN ADVENTISM.

I long hesitated about bringing personal matters into this book, but I could see no way to tell my story without it. My experience illustrates the power which error and superstition have over men. I am amazed at myself that I was held there so long when my better judgment was convinced that it was an error. I propose to tell the simple facts, just as they were, lit whom they may. Public men become public property and as such their conduct and work should be laid open and discussed. This is my reason for criticising the course of Eld. White and wife and others. They invite criticism by claiming to be reformers, better than other people.

I was born in Kinderhook, Branch county, Mich., Sept. 22, 1840. I had no religious training till I was sixteen. I was converted among the Methodists under the labors of Rev. Mr. Hazzard and baptised by him in 1858. I soon went to Albion, N. Y. to attend school. Here, in 1859, I heard Eld. and Mrs. White. He preached on the Sabbath question. I was uneducated and knew but little about the Bible. I had no idea of the relation between the Old and New Testaments, the law and the gospel, or the difference between the Sabbath and the Lord's day. I thought he proved that the seventh day was still binding and that there was no authority for keeping Sunday.

As I was anxious to be right, I began keeping Saturday, but did not expect to believe any more of their doctrine. Of course I attended their meetings on Saturday and worked on Sunday. This separated me entirely from other christians and threw me wholly with the Adventists. I soon learned that all other churches were Babylon, in the dark and under the frown of God. Seventh-Day Adventists were the only true people of God. They had "the truth," the whole truth and nothing but the truth. They defended Mr. Miller's work of 1844, believed in the visions of Mrs. White, the sleep of the dead, the annihilation of the wicked, feet washing, etc. At first these things staggered me and I thought of drawing back, but they explained them plausibly and smoothed them over and said they were no test any way. Having no one to intelligently aid me, I began to see things as they did and in a few weeks came to believe the whole system. I was again baptized so as to get clean out of Babylon. I dropped the study of all else, listened to their preaching, devoured their books and studied my Bible day and night to sustain these new views. I was now an enthusiastic believer and longed to convert everybody to the faith. I had not a doubt that it was the pure truth. This is about the experience of all who go with them, as I have since learned.

In May, 1864, I was licensed to preach. Soon began with Eld. Van Horn at Ithaca, Mich. We had good success; raised up three companies that year. In 1865 worked in Tuscola county, and had excellent success. Was ordained by Eld. White that year. Up to this date I had not had a doubt about the truthfulness of our faith. As I now began to see more of Eld. White and wife, and the work at headquarters, I learned that there was much trouble with him. I saw that he ruled everything, and that all greatly feared him. I saw he was sometimes cross and unreasonable. This troubled me a little, but not seriously. In 1866 I was sent to Maine with Eld. J. N. Andrews, the ablest man among them. This

was a big thing for me. I threw myself into the work with great enthusiasm. Eld. A. was strong in the faith and very radical, and I partook of his spirit. We had excellent success. By this time I had become quite a writer. I returned to Battle Creek in 1867. At that time there was great trouble with Eld. White, and many church meetings were held to investigate the matter. It was clear to me that he was wrong, but Mrs. White sustained him in her "Testimonies" and severely blamed the church. Eld. Andrews and a few others proposed to stand up for the right and take the consequences. My sympathies were with them. But others feared, and finally all wilted and confessed that "we have been blinded by Satan." This was signed by the ministers and humbly adopted by the whole church. (See "Testimonies," vol. 1, p. 612.) This shook my faith a good deal, and I began to question Mrs. White's inspiration.

But I dared not open my mind to a soul. I was only a youth, and had little experience. Older and stronger men had broken down and confessed. What could I do? I said nothing, but felt terribly. I wished I had never heard of the Adventists. By this time I was back on my field in Maine. Busy with my work, preaching our doctrine, and surrounded with men who firmly believed it, I soon got over my doubts. I have since learned that scores of others have gone through a similar trial.

In 1868 I went to Massachusetts. Being away from the troubles at headquarters, I got on finely. But in May, 1869, I was in Battle Creek for a month. Things were in bad shape. Eld. White was in trouble with most of the leading men, and they with him. I was well convinced that he was the real cause of it all, but Mrs. White sustained him, and that settled it. They were God's chosen leaders, and must not be criticised or meddled with. I felt sad. I was working hard to get men into "the truth," as we called it; to persuade them that this was a people free from the faults of other churches; then to see such a state of things among the leaders, this disheartened me greatly. So far, I myself had had no trouble with any one, and Eld. White had been very cordial to me. But I saw then that if ever I came to be of any prominence in the work I should have to expect the same treatment from him that all the others got. The more I saw of the work the more objections I saw to it. I will not stop to give them here, as I have given them together on pages 15 and 16.

I had been so thoroughly drilled in the Advent doctrines that I firmly believed the Bible plainly taught them all. To give up the Advent faith was to give up the Bible. So all my brethren said and so I thought. Hence I swallowed my doubts and went on. That year I went to Iowa to work where I remained four years laboring with Eld. Butler, who now is president of their general conference. We had good success and raised up three churches the first year. I finally opened my mind to Eld. Butler and told him my fears. I knew these things troubled him as well as myself. He helped me some and again I gathered courage and went on feeling better. Still I came to see each year more and more that some how the thing did not work as I had supposed it would and ought. Wherever Eld. White and wife went they were always in trouble with the brethren, and the best ones too. I came to dread to meet them or have them come where I was for I knew there would be a fuss with some one or about something and it never failed. I saw church after church split up by them, the best brethren discouraged and maddened and driven off, while I was compelled to apologize for them continually. For years about this time the main business at all our big meetings was to listen to the complaints of Eld. White against his brethren. Not a leading man escaped, Andrews, Waggoner, Smith, Loughborough, Amadon, Cornell, Aldrich, Walker, and a host of others had to take their turn at being

broken on the wheel. For hours at a time and times without number I have sat in meetings and heard Eld. White and wife denounce these men till I felt that there was little manhood left in them. It violated all my ideas of right and justice and stirred my indignation. Yet whatever vote was asked by Eld. White we all voted it unanimously, with the rest. Then I would go out alone and hate myself for my cowardice and despise my brethren for their weakness.

These with other things threw me into doubt and discouragement and tempted me to quit the work. I saw many an able minister and scores of valuable men leave us because they would not stand such treatment. I envied the faith and confidence of brethren who went on ignorant of all this supposing that Battle Creek was a little heaven, when in fact it was as near purgatory as anything I could imagine. Many poor souls have gone there full of faith and hope but have soon gone away infidels. In 1872 I went to Minnesota where I had good success. By this time I had written much and so was well known to all our people. In July 1879 myself and wife went to Colorado to spend a few weeks with Eld. White and wife in the mountains. I soon found things very unpleasant living in the family. Now my turn had come to catch it, but instead of knuckling down as most of the others had, I told the elder my mind freely. That brought us into an open rupture. Mrs. White heard it all but said nothing. In a few days she had a long written "testimony" for wife and me. It justified her husband in everything and placed us as rebels against God with no hope of heaven only by a full surrender to them. Wife and I read it over many times with tears and prayers; but could see no way to reconcile it with truth. It contained many statements which we knew were false.

Then I thought seriously of leaving the Adventists, but still my confidence in much of the doctrine and my fear of going wrong held me; but I was perfectly miserable for weeks, not knowing what to do. However, I preached awhile in Colorado and then went to California, where I worked with my hands for three months trying to settle what to do. Elders Butler, Smith, White and others wrote to us and tried to reconcile us to the work. Not knowing what else to do, I finally decided to forget all my objections and go along as before.

So we confessed to Eld. White all we could possibly and he generously forgave us! But from that on my faith in the inspiration of Mrs. White was weak. Eld. White was very friendly to me again after that. We were together much in California. In 1875 we returned to Michigan. Eld. Butler was now out with Eld. White, who took every possible opportunity to snub him; but I was in high favor, was sent to attend their state meetings in Vermont, Kansas, Ohio and Indiana. With Eld. Smith was sent as delegate to the Seventh-Day Baptist general conference. In 1876 I was sent to Minnesota, then to Texas and so on through most of the southern states to look after our interests there. Each year greater responsibilities were laid upon me. That year I raised up a large church at Rome, N. Y. and labored over the state. Went with Eld. White and wife to Indiana and Illinois and was then sent to Kansas to hold a big debate, and to Missouri for the same purpose. This year I was elected a member of the General Conference Committee of three with Eld. White and Eld. Haskell, and continued on the committee two years. It is the highest official authority in the denomination.

In 1877 I went to New England where I raised up two churches and did other work. I spent 1878 in general work in various states as Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Colorado and Ohio. In the fall was made president of the Ohio conference.

In 1879 labored in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee. At the general conference at Battle Creek in the fall, things were in a bad shape. Eld. White was cross, and Mrs. White bore down

heavy on several ministers. Harshness, fault-finding and trials were the order of the day. I felt that there was very little of the spirit of Christ present. I got away as quickly as possible. I saw more and more clearly that a spirit of oppression, criticism, distrust and dissension was the result of our work, instead of meekness, gentleness, and love among brethren.

For the next whole year these feelings grew upon me, till I began to fear we were doing more harm than good. My work called me among old churches, where I could see the fruit of it. Generally they were cold and dead, backslidden, or in a quarrel, or nearly extinct, where once they had been large and flourishing churches. I lost heart to raise up more churches to go in the same way. One day I would decide to quit them entirely, and the next day I would resolve to go on and do the best I could. I never suffered more mental anguish in my life. I labored that year in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio.

In the fall of 1880 I resolved to leave the Adventists and, if I could, go with some other church. I went east, resigned my office, and wrote to Eld. White that I could go with them no longer.

For three months I taught elocution. I knew not what to do. I talked with ministers of other churches, but they did not seem to know how to help me. I could settle on nothing, but was all broken up in doctrine. I held on to my Christianity and love for Christ and the Bible, and preached and worked as I had opportunity, I was glad I had left the Adventists, and felt much better. Finally, I met my present wife, who was an Adventist. Then I had a long talk with Eld. Butler, Eld. White, Mrs. White and others, and was persuaded that things were not as I had imagined. They said I was in the dark, led by Satan, and would go to ruin. All the influence of old friends, associations, habits and long cultivated ideas came up and were too strong for my better judgment. I yielded and resolved again to live and die with them. In my judgment and conscience I was ashamed of the surrender I had made, yet I tried to feel right and go on.

Was sent in the summer to attend the state meetings in Canada, Vermont, Maine, New England, Pennsylvania, New York and Michigan. This year Eld. White died. He had some excellent qualities and doubtless meant to be a Christian but his strong desire to rule and run everything together with an irritable temper kept him always in trouble somewhere.

Under date of Battle Creek, Mich., July 13, 1881, just a few weeks before he died, Elder White wrote me thus: "I have repeatedly abused you, and if you go to destruction, where many, to say the least, are willing you should go, I should ever feel that I had taken a part in your destruction." In excusing his wife's course he says: "The pressure has been terribly hard upon my poor wife. She has been impressed very much by elders Butler and Haskell and my mistakes have given intensity to the matter. . . . I do not see how any man can labor with me. . . . Forgive my mistakes and believe me when I say every part of your long letter seems just and right." I had refused to work with him and told him pretty plainly the reasons.

Before he died Eld. White lost the leadership of the people, Eld. Butler having won the place. His influence was largely gone. He was very hostile to Butler and Haskell and was working hard to get them out of office and get back himself when he suddenly died. Eld. Butler told me that his death was providential to save the body from division. Was elected member of the state executive committee of Michigan that fall. I worked another year in Michigan. But I was unhappy. I could not get over my doubts. I had no heart in the work. Several leading ministers in the state felt about the same. I then decided to quietly drop out of the ministry and go to farming. This I did for two years but retained my membership with the church and worked right along

with them. But I was in purgatory all the time trying to believe what I could not believe. Yet I was not settled on any other church and feared I might go wrong and so stood still.

In the fall of 1884 Eld. Butler, my old friend, and now at the head of the Advent work, made a big effort to get me reconciled and back at work again. I attended a camp meeting, met old friends and associations, tried to see things as favorable as possible, heard explanations, etc., etc., till at last I yielded again. I was sick of an undecided position. I thought I could do some good here anyway, all my friends were here, I believed much of the doctrine still, and I might go to ruin if I left them, etc. Now I resolved to swallow all my doubts, believe the whole thing any way and stay with them for better or for worse. So I made a strong confession of which I was ashamed before it was cold.

Was I satisfied? No. Deep in my heart I was ashamed of myself, but tried to feel that it was not so. But I soon felt better, because I had decided. Gradually my faith came back, till I really felt strong in the whole doctrine again, and had no idea I should ever leave them. In a few weeks I was sent to attend large meetings in Pennsylvania, New York, Minnesota, Iowa, and New England; assisted in revival meetings in Battle Creek; was appointed with Eld. Butler to lecture before the ministers on how to labor successfully; conducted a similar course in the academy at South Lancaster, Mass.; was at the state meetings in New York, Michigan, Indiana and Ohio. In the spring of 1886 was appointed to lecture before the theological class in the Battle Creek college, and associate editor of the *Sickle*.

By my urgent appeal an effort was made to bring up our ministers to some plan of study in which they are very deficient. I was on the committee to arrange this. I selected the course of studies and framed all the questions by which they were to be examined. I was then furnished a short hand reporter and in the summer was sent to ten different states from Ohio to Colorado to attend their state conferences, examine their ministers, report their meetings for the daily press, etc., and this I did.

In our conflict with the Disciples at Des Moines, Iowa, it was agreed that each side should select a representative man and hold a debate on the Sabbath question. They selected Prof. D. R. Dungan, president of their university. Our people selected me. We expected a big time and I made every possible effort to be ready. That preparation did much to convince me of the unsoundness of some of our positions on the covenants, the two laws, etc. In our General Conference that fall, a sharp division occurred between our leading men over the law in Galatians, one party held it was the ceremonial law, the other the moral law, a square contradiction. After a long and warm discussion the conference closed, each party more confident than before. There was also much disagreement over other points of doctrine and a good deal of warm party feelings. This with other things brought up my old feelings of doubt and decided to me that it was time for me now to examine and think for myself and not be led nor scared by men who could not agree among themselves.

I used every minute I could get for several weeks carefully and prayerfully examining all the evidence on the Sabbath, the law, the sanctuary, the vision, etc., till I had not a doubt left that the Seventh-Day Advent faith was a delusion. Then I laid the matter before the leading men at Battle Creek, resigned all the positions I held, and asked to be dismissed from the church. This was granted Feb. 17, 1887. That was the first and only time I ever withdrew from the church, nor was any charge ever made against me during the 28 years I was with them. From the time I was licensed in 1864, my ministerial credentials were renewed each year except one, when I was farming and did not ask for them.

The Jewish Sabbath Abolished

(16 pages, 6x9 inches.)

By D. M. CANRIGHT.

Price, 5 Cents; 50 Cents per dozen by mail.

WHY CHRISTIANS KEEP SUNDAY.

(8 pages, 6x9 inches.)

By D. M. CANRIGHT.

Price, 3 Cts. each; 30 Cts. per Doz.; \$2 per 100, post paid.

ONE HUNDRED FACTS AGAINST KEEPING THE JEWISH SABBATH AND THE LAW.

(8 pages, 6x9 inches.)

By D. M. CANRIGHT.

Price, 3 Cents each; 30 Cents per dozen; \$2 per 100, post paid.

THE BIBLE FROM HEAVEN.

(300 PAGES, 4½x7 inches.)

By D. M. CANRIGHT.

Price, Cloth, 80 Cents, post paid.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM RENOUNCED,

(This Book), post paid, Paper, 50 cents; Cloth, 75 cents.

A copy free to the person selling five. The usual reduction on larger quantities of any of the above.

AGENTS WANTED, in every town, especially where Adventists are.
Address,

D. M. CANRIGHT,

OTSEGO, Allegan Co., Mich.

