

15. Why preach the law when no one can be saved by obeying it? Furthermore, man is morally unable to keep the commandments.

16. By preaching the law you endeavor to deprive Christians of the glorious liberty of the gospel.

17. The Bible repeatedly and emphatically declares that no one can be justified by keeping the law. Hence to preach the keeping of the law is to preach another gospel. "Whosoever of you are justified by the law; you are fallen from grace." Gal. 5:4

18. 1 Timothy 1:9 proves that the Christian has nothing to do with the law, for we read there that "the law is not made for a righteous man

19. Seventh day Adventists teach that a man must keep the commandments in order to be saved

## **Section II Sabbath**

20. Seventh day Adventists declare that the seventh day of the week was set apart as a Sabbath by the blessing and sanctification of God at the creation of the world. They thus seek to prove that the Sabbath preceded the Jewish race and applies to all men. But Genesis, which contains the record of God's resting upon and blessing the Sabbath, was written by Moses two thousand five hundred years after creation, or about the time of the Exodus. Moses simply set down in that Genesis reference to the Sabbath a statement of what God actually did for the seventh day at Mount Sinai.

21. Exodus 16:29 and Nehemiah 9:13, 14 prove that the Sabbath was not given until Israel left Egypt. The very silence of the Scriptures regarding anyone's keeping it before that time is strong corroborative proof.

22. The Sabbath is Jewish. It was given only to the Jews and was part of the old covenant that was made only with the Jews. Further, Deuteronomy 5:15 states explicitly that God commanded the Jews to keep the Sabbath as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt. There for it has no meaning for us who are Gentile Christians.

23. In Exodus 31:14 we read that Sabbath violators were to be stoned to death. Do you believe the same penalty should be enforced today? If you say that the penalty feature of the Sabbath law is done away, then you have really declared the Sabbath abolished, for a law has no force if there is no penalty provided for its violation. Again, in Exodus 35:3 we read that no fires were to be kindled on the Sabbath. If you believe the Sabbath law is still in force, why do you kindle fires on that day?

24. When we as Sunday keepers declare that the ten-commandment law was abolished at the cross, Adventists try to embarrass us by asking us if we believe it is all right in the Christian Era to steal or kill or do any other of the heinous deeds prohibited by the Ten Commandments. We do not. We believe that God has great moral principles that have governed the universe from all eternity and will continue to govern it to all eternity. The Ten Commandments was simply a partial reflection of these principles. The principles remain, but the Ten Commandments is gone. Hence the Sabbath is gone.

25. The fourth commandment in the Ten Commandments is not inherently a moral precept, but the other nine are self evidently moral commands. "All moral principles are discoverable by the light of nature- or reason, but the necessity of keeping the seventh day is not thus discoverable. For example, all men naturally know that it is wrong to steal, kill, commit adultery, et cetera, but no one would thus know that a particular day had been set apart as holy. That required a direct revelation from God. Hence the Sabbath command is not moral. Furthermore, there is nothing inherently holy in the seventh day of the week. Hence "it would never have been wrong to work on the seventh day unless God had given a command to rest on it."

26. "The Sabbath was not a day of special religious worship. . . . In God's plan, the keeping of the seventh day on the part of His earthly people was to be an external form, or rite; the performance of a definitely prescribed ceremony, stipulating the cessation of all work on a given day, or a day of complete physical rest. Only when connected with the annual feasts was it observed as a day of religious significance." All this proves that the seventh day Sabbath was simply one of the ceremonial

Sabbaths. All those Sabbaths, in common with every other ceremonial statute, were abolished at the cross.

27. That the fourth command of the Ten Commandments is ceremonial, but the other nine are moral, "is clearly proved by the fact that Jesus, according to the strictest Sabbatarians of His day, broke the fourth commandment and was criticized by them for doing so. Furthermore, Jesus distinctly says, 'The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless.' [Matt. 12:5] Would He have dared to say this if the fourth commandment were a moral law? Could the seventh commandment, or any other of the ten except the fourth, be broken by the priests, and the fact that they were broken in the temple make them blameless?

28. Though the Ten Commandments were abolished at the cross, nine of them were re-enacted in the New Testament, and thus are binding on Christians, but the fourth command was not; hence we are not obligated to keep it.

29. Paul specifically declares, in Colossians 2:14-17, that the Sabbath is abolished.

30. "The word 'Sabbath' occurs some sixty times in the New Testament. In every case except one the Adventists admit that the weekly Sabbath is meant. In the one case, however, where the word, in the Greek, is the same (Col.2:16), they insist that it means something different. Why is this so? Is it not because they know that this one verse . . . completely shatters all their arguments for Sabbath keeping by Christians?

31. Many who were converted to Christianity in apostolic times came out of heathenism and lived in countries where Sabbath keeping was unknown. "It would have been necessary to instruct them as to the particular day they should observe. The New Testament is absolutely silent on the point." If the Sabbath is still in force, why was it not mentioned in Christ's reply to the rich young ruler (Matt. 19:17-27), or in the gospel commission (Matt. 28:19), or on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), or in the decision of the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15)?

32. If Paul were living, he would offer the same condemnation of Seventh day Adventists that he did of the Galatians. (See Gal. 4:9, 10)

33. The Old Testament prophets foretold that the time was coming when the Sabbath would be done away. (See, for example, Hosea 2:11.) In Amos 8:5 the question is asked, "When will the Sabbath be gone?" The prophet answers that this would take place when the sun went down at noon and the earth was darkened in a clear day. (Amos 8:9) The earth was thus darkened when Jesus was crucified. Hence the Sabbath came to an end at the

34. The psalmist prophesied that there would be a new day of worship. (See Psalms 118:22-24.) The "day" mentioned in Psalms 118:24 can refer only to Sunday, the day on which Christ became the headstone of the corner.

35. Noted astronomers have discovered that our world is twenty-four hours behind the rest of the universe in point of time. The Bible record of Joshua's long day -twenty-three hours and twenty minutes-and of the turning back of the sun forty minutes in Hezekiah's day accounts for this twenty-four hours. Hence both Jews and Seventh day Adventists are wrong about the time of the Sabbath. Our blessed Lord brought the Sabbath and the first day of the week together, merging them into the glorious day on which He arose from the dead, the day we celebrate as the Sabbath.

36. The Sabbath day is abolished because Paul says that it is all right to consider every day alike in the Christian Era. (See Rom. 14:5).

37. The days of creation were not literal, twenty-four-hour days, but long indefinite periods, millions of years in length. Therefore Seventh day Adventists are not warranted in using the creation story of Genesis 1 as an argument for the holiness of the literal seventh day of the weekly cycle.

38. The phrase, "the seventh day," in the fourth commandment means simply one day in seven. Therefore I am keeping the spirit of the Sabbath law so long as I keep one day in seven. And is not Sunday one day in seven?

39. Seventh day Adventists insist that a particular seventh day, coming down through from creation in cycles of seven, is the day God blessed and therefore the day that all should keep as the Sabbath. But no one now knows what that day is. Besides, calendar changes have confused the reckoning.

40. Seventh day Adventists declare that the Sabbath was intended for all men in all lands. But it is evident that it was intended only for the Jews in the little land of Palestine. How could anyone keep the definite seventh day Sabbath up in the Arctic Circle, where there is six months day then six months night? Or how would a person keep track of the order of the days of the week in traveling around the world, for you lose a day if you travel in one direction and gain a day if you travel in the other direction?

41. The Sabbath was changed from Saturday to Sunday at the time of Christ's resurrection. One of the strong proofs of this is the fact that Christ, after His resurrection, always met with His disciples on that day. A further proof is the fact that the Holy Spirit was poured upon the disciples on Sunday.

42. From earliest apostolic days Christians kept Sunday in honor of Christ's resurrection. This is clearly revealed in two scriptures, Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 16:2.

43. The apostle John calls Sunday the "Lord's day," and declares that he was "in the Spirit" on that day. This proves that Sunday is the sacred weekly rest day of the Christian world and that the Sabbath has been abolished.

44. Pages of authentic statements, selected from the writings of primitive Christian authors, could be quoted in proof of the fact that the first (day of the week ... was continuously observed as a day of Divine worship from the Savior's resurrection on through the succeeding early centuries of the present dispensation. But despite this evidence "Seventh day Adventists teach (supposedly by 'inspiration') that the change came in with Constantine, the first so-called 'Christian emperor' of Rome, 'in the early part of the fourth century.' (See *The Great Controversy*, p. 53) And by the same authority, they, contradicting themselves, also teach that 'the Pope changed [the Sabbath] from the seventh to the first day of the week.'

(See *Early Writings of Mrs. White*, p. 33, edition of 1916)

45. The resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity; therefore we keep Sunday. Sabbath keepers are not Christians, because they do not commemorate the great event of Christ's rising from the dead.

46. Seventh day Adventists make a great point out of the fact that the Sabbath memorializes creation. But we are not so much concerned with creation as with redemption, which is greater. Therefore we keep Sunday, the great memorial of our redemption.

47. The phrase "the first day of the week" in Matthew 28:1 should be translated "the first of the Sabbaths," or "one of the Sabbaths." This proper translation indicates that the apostle spoke of the resurrection Sunday as the first of a new order of Sabbaths.

48. Seventh day Adventists say that everyone who keeps Sunday has the mark of the beast. Such a teaching places under God's condemnation all other Christian people, and dooms forever all Sunday keeping Christians who died before Seventh day Adventists began to preach. By teaching that a person cannot be saved unless he keeps the Sabbath, Seventh day Adventists make Sabbath keeping the means of salvation instead of Christ.

49. I don't believe that a God of love would keep men out of heaven just because of a day. I think Seventh day Adventists put too much emphasis on a certain day that should be kept holy.

50. The Sabbath cannot save anyone. Why not preach Christ instead?

51. I have the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit has given me to understand that I do not have to keep the Sabbath.

52. We should keep all days holy in the Christian dispensation. But inasmuch as the law of the land has marked out a certain day-Sunday-as the particular day for rest, we should obey the law of the land, and

keep Sunday.

52. If Saturday is the right Sabbath, why do not more leading men believe it? If what you preach about the Sabbath is true, why wasn't it discovered before?

53. If I should keep the Sabbath, all my friends and neighbors would ridicule me.

54. If I keep the seventh day Sabbath, I won't be able to make a living.

### **Section III: Second Advent**

56. The Seventh day Adventist Church sprang from the religious movement of the 1840's, known as Millerism, which set a time for the coming of Christ. Such a historical background reveals how irrational and unworthy of serious consideration that church is.

57. The Millerite, or Second Advent movement, out of which Seventh day Adventism sprang, was tainted with weird fanatical actions such as the wearing of ascension robes by the deluded followers of Miller, who sat on housetops and haystacks to await the coming of Christ. Multitudes were made insane by the fanatical preaching. The fanaticism was rampant both before and after 1844. This proves that God was not in the movement that brought forth Seventh day Adventism.

58. Seventh day Adventists say that they constitute a prophetic movement raised up by God to preach His last message to the world. At the same time they admit that their movement sprang from the soil of Millerism, whose leaders taught that Christ would come in 1844. Is God the leader of a movement that preached error at the outset and suffered great disappointment and confusion as a result of that error?

59. The Millerites thought they found in Daniel 8:13, 14 the proof that Christ would come on October 22, 1844. After their disappointment some of them, the founders of Seventh day Adventism, sought to maintain their claim that God was leading them by inventing a new interpretation to Daniel 8:13, 14, which enabled them to maintain that the prophecy was indeed fulfilled in 1844, but by an event that took place in heaven. Hence Seventh day Adventism was born of a dilemma.

60. For several years after the 1844 disappointment Seventh day Adventists believed that probation had closed for the world. Was God leading a movement that believed so un-Scriptural a teaching as that?

61. Christ's second coming is not literal, but spiritual. He comes to the Christian at conversion or at death.

62. It is revolting to the Christian idea of love to believe that Christ will come as a destroyer and wreak vengeance on the world.

63. We should spend more time helping people to make this a better world rather than stir them up about another world, as is the case when the Second Advent doctrine is preached.

64. Christ Himself said that He would come as a thief in the night. The apostle Paul made a similar statement. Seventh day Adventists are therefore unwarranted in claiming that they can know something definite as to the time of Christ's coming.

65. One of the best proofs that no one can tell whether Christ will come tomorrow or a thousand years from now is the fact that the apostles thought He would come in their day. But they were all mistaken. So will Seventh day Adventists be.

66. By preaching the soon coming of Christ, Seventh day Adventists are falsely creating hope and excitement. Misguided people through the centuries have repeatedly thought His coming was at hand. That fact is best illustrated by the excitement that spread throughout Europe in AD. 1000, when multitudes waited, in fanatical fervor, for Christ's coming.

67. Seventh day Adventists declare that the great meteoric shower of November 13, 1833, was a fulfillment of the prophecy that the stars shall fall from heaven as one of the signs of the nearness of Christ's coming. But we need not seek some supernatural, miraculous explanation of this starry event.

## Objection 20

Seventh day Adventists declare that the seventh day of the week was set apart as a Sabbath by the blessing and sanctification of God at the creation of the world. They thus seek to prove that the Sabbath preceded the Jewish race and applies to all men. But Genesis, which contains the record of God's resting upon and blessing the Sabbath, was written by Moses two thousand five hundred years after creation, or about the time of the Exodus. Moses simply set down in that Genesis reference to the Sabbath a statement of what God actually did for the seventh day at Mount Sinai.

The first fact that here stands out clearly, and should be noted at the outset, is this: It is admitted that the Genesis record of the blessing of the Sabbath at creation carries with it a powerful argument in behalf of the universality of the Sabbath for all peoples in all ages.

The second fact is this: The objector poses as possessing a knowledge of Moses' literary procedures that is remarkable to say the least. How did he gain it? He has access to no other sources of knowledge than those known to all Bible students. And such students, including eminent commentators, have rather uniformly through the years held that Moses, in the book of Genesis, is giving a historical record of creation week when he mentions the blessing of the Sabbath day. And they have held this view despite the fact that they were Sunday keepers. But, in all honesty, what else could they do but hold this view? Let us examine the facts.

1. What is the nature of the book of Genesis? It is plainly, from beginning to end a book of history. It sets forth a brief narrative, in chronological order, of events from creation through to the death of Joseph. Therefore, in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, we should consider the various parts of it, the accounts of what men said and did, and likewise the accounts of what God said and did, as being historical incidents occurring at the time indicated in the narrative. The account of God's resting on the seventh day of creation week and blessing and sanctifying it fits as naturally into the historical sequence as do any other incidents mentioned in Genesis. There is nothing in the context to suggest differently.

2. The fact that the book of Genesis was written some twenty five hundred years after creation has no bearing on the matter whatever. All books of history are written after the events described. And obviously any history book that essayed to record twenty-five hundred years of history would have to be written at least that long after the incidents of the first year took place. To say that a history writer projected back into the year one an event occurring in the year 2500, or thereabouts, is to make a statement that could be believed only if we were ready to charge the author with fraud and deception. We are not ready to do that with Moses.

3. But note the point at which the objector claims the record ceases to be historical and becomes a throwback from an incident that occurred twenty-five hundred years later. He carries the narrative through the creation week, including God's resting on the seventh day from all His work. (Gen. 2:2) At this point, the objector declares, the break comes, and the immediately following words are a throwback: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all his work which God created and made." Verse 3.

Now why should God rest? Not because He was weary. His resting, which is faithfully recorded by Moses, must have had a meaning. The next verse reveals the meaning. The resting was the reason for the blessing. He blessed and sanctified the seventh day "because that in it He had rested from all his work." Verse 3. And what reason is there for contending that God rested on the seventh day of creation week in order to provide the occasion for blessing it, and then waited twenty-five hundred years to pronounce the blessing? None whatever.

4. Let us note the instances of blessing that are recorded in the creation narrative:

Event	Blessing
<b>Fifth Day</b> "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly." Gen. 1:20.	<b>Fifth Day</b> "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply." Verse 22.
<b>Sixth Day</b> "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature.... Let us make man in our image."	<b>Sixth Day</b> "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply " Verse 1:28.

Gen. 1:24-26.

**Seventh Day**

"And he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." Gen. 2:2.

**Seventh Day**

"And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Verse 2:3.

The objector is willing to agree that the blessings upon the acts of the fifth and sixth days follow immediately the incidents described. Parallel literary construction and the complete absence of any suggestion of a break in narration require him to agree that the blessing of the seventh day follows immediately upon the incident of God's resting on that day.

5. Note also the parallel constructions, so far as tense is concerned, that are found in the fourth commandment itself. Here the Lord is speaking to Israel:

- a. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth."
- b. "And rested the seventh day."
- c. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Note the four verbs, all in the past tense: "made," "rested," "blessed," and "hallowed."

It is this consistent past tense that gives maximum force to the word "remember," that introduces this command. The obvious meaning of the verb "remember" is to call to mind a past event or experience of some kind. Israel was commanded to "remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," and why? Because God was now going to bless it? No, but because God had blessed it.

With these facts before him the reader should have no difficulty in deciding the question in controversy.

## Objection 21

**Exodus 16:29 and Nehemiah 9:13,14 prove that the Sabbath was not given until Israel left Egypt. The very silence of the Scriptures regarding anyone's keeping it before that time is strong corroborative proof.**

Two claims are here made: First, that the Sabbath was instituted in a Jewish setting. This claim is intended to prepare the way for the next, that the Sabbath was made only for the Jews.

Exodus 16:29 and Nehemiah 9:13,14, whatever they state, are supposed to neutralize the statement in Genesis 2:2,3 and quite expunge it from the record. But does one Scriptural statement do that to another? No. When one text appears to contradict another we may be sure that we have made a mistake in our interpretation of one or the other of the texts. We have already seen-objection 20-that Genesis 2:2,3 stands firmly as a testimony that God rested on the seventh day of the first week of time and then and there blessed it. Thus we are prepared at the outset to believe that whatever Exodus 16:29 and Nehemiah 9:13,14 teach, they do not teach contrary to Genesis 2:2, 3.

Exodus 16:29 is part of the narrative of the giving of the manna, which was to be collected each day for the six working days, with twice as much to be collected the sixth day, because God gave no manna on the seventh day. But some of the Israelites, contrary to God's command, went out on the Sabbath day to collect it. This caused the Lord to inquire of Moses: "How long refuse you to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he gives you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Ex. 16:28, 29.

Nehemiah, long afterward, recalls what God did for Israel in bringing them out of captivity, declaring in part: "Thou came down also upon mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and made known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and, commanded them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." Neh. 9:13, 14.

These passages deal with essentially the same incidents and are so similar in construction that they may be considered together. Let us note certain phrases:

1. "The Lord bath given you the Sabbath." Ex. 16:29.
2. "Gave them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments." Neh. 9:13.
3. "Made known unto them thy holy Sabbath." Neh. 9:14.

We believe that the answer to the objection before us is found clearly revealed in the second of these three phrases. If, as claimed, the construction of the first and the third phrase requires the conclusion that the Sabbath law did not exist before the Exodus, then the construction of the second phrase requires us to conclude that the wide range of statutes, laws, and commandments that were formally stated at Sinai did not formerly exist. Therefore, not only would it have been no sin to work on the seventh day, previous to the Exodus, but it would have been no sin, previous to Sinai, to have done any of the things prohibited by the various laws and commandments which God "gave them" at that time.

But no one will claim that it would have been right to do the latter, for he agrees that nine of the Ten Commandments are an expression of eternal moral principles. When, at Sinai, God commanded, "Thou shall not commit adultery," it might be said, in one sense of the word, that He then gave Israel the law against immorality. It was the first formal proclamation of that principle to the newly formed nation that stood in need, at the outset, of a clearly expressed code of laws. But no one believes for a moment that previous to the giving of that law against adultery from the flaming mount, there was no divine ban on adultery and therefore no sin in indulging in immoral acts.

Even so with the Sabbath law. It, along with the other great precepts of the Ten Commandments, and many other statutes, was formally made known to Israel as they began their national life. The long darkness of Egypt had quite blurred their understanding of God's will. Now by the light of the pillar of fire, God made dear to them all His requirements, including the Sabbath.

God declares, "I made myself known unto them [The Israelites], in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt." Eze. 20:9. Would the objector reason from this text that God did not exist before the Exodus? No. Then why contend that the Sabbath did riot exist before that time simply because God then made it known to Israel? The facts are that the knowledge both of God and of the Sabbath had largely faded from the minds of the Israelites during their long Egyptian bondage.

Only a word need be said in reply to the claim based on the fact that the Scriptures are silent about anyone's keeping the Sabbath before the Exodus. The few pages of the Bible that precede the account of the Exodus cover some twenty-five hundred years. Obviously, only a few high lights of the long record could be penned. Chiefly, Moses sought to provide it running narrative to connect creation

with the events that followed the fall of man, on down through the Flood, the call of Abraham, the rise of Israel, and their exodus from Egypt. Little is mentioned of the religious activities in which men engaged during those twenty-five hundred years. To present this silence of Scripture its a proof against the seventh day Sabbath is to rely on art exceedingly weak argument.

Those who promote the importance of Sunday generally include in their reasoning that man needs a recurring day of worship each week, nor do they set any bounds of time or place on that claim. Hence those who lived before the Exodus were in need of such a recurring day. Seeing they were, would God fail to provide for that need? Indeed, did He not do that very thing when, at creation, He set apart for a holy use the seventh day? And do we need to find a specific mention of their keeping that day before we reasonably conclude that holy men like Enoch, Noah, and Abraham kept that holy day? In fact, what other conclusion would be reasonable?

## Objection 22

**The Sabbath is Jewish. It was given only to the Jews and was part of the old covenant that was made only with the Jews. Further, Deuteronomy 5:15 states explicitly that God commanded the Jews to keep the Sabbath as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt. Therefore it has no meaning for us who are Gentile Christians.**

This reasoning goes over much the same ground covered by the claim that the law given at Sinai was intended only for the Jews. See under objection 4, where evidence is presented to show that the whole Bible was written by Jews, much of it directly addressed to Jews, that both old and new covenants were made with the "house of Israel," and that Christ Himself declared that "salvation is of the Jews." Yet all Protestantism turns to the Bible, both the Old and the New Testament, for spiritual guidance. We all claim a right to the new covenant relationship, and we all preach that "salvation" which Christ declared "is of the Jews", is for every man in every land.

We would ask this simple question, Why is the seventh day of the week more Jewish than the first day of the week? The Westminster Confession, which is the clearest expression of the Protestant view on the sacredness of a weekly rest day, declares that the Sabbath "from the beginning of the world till the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week." That is a period of at least four thousand years. Yet for the first half of this long period there were no Jews. Did the seventh day of the week suddenly acquire a different character and quality at Sinai as God was leading His chosen people from Egypt to the Promised Land?

Someone may venture to say yes, and to support his answer by reference to those Old Testament declarations that the Sabbath was a distinguishing mark and a sign between God and the children of Israel. But if this answer proves anything, it proves too much, for the very same Old Testament records which thus describe the Sabbath reveal to us also that God describes Himself as being in a very peculiar and distinctive way the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Why should not the Lord enjoin the Sabbath of the Lord upon the Lord's own people?

The reason that the observance was confined to the Jews in the last part of that four-thousand-year period before Christ was that no other people on the face of the earth were true followers of God. They were pagans and heathen. Of course the Sabbath was closely associated with the Jews during the time of their national history; and as we have noted, so was everything else of the revealed will of God, including all the prophets of God and all the writings that make up the Holy Word.

"But," someone may reply, "The Bible does not say anywhere that the Savior and salvation were to be confined to the Jews." Very true. Neither do we read anywhere that the Sabbath was to be confined to the Jews. On the contrary, we have very specific declarations of Scripture to show that the Sabbath was intended of God to have a worldwide application. Let us enumerate a few of these:

1. The Sabbath commandment itself specifically declares that not only were the Jews to rest but also the stranger that was within their gates. (See Ex. 20: 10) The strangers were those not of the family of Israel; they might belong to any other race or people or nation.

2. Christ declared that "the Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. He did not say "Jew," but "man," and there is no justification for confining the meaning of the word "man" to the Jews. If we should thus confine the word, we would soon come into great difficulty. We read that Christ is "the true light, which lights every man that comes into the world." John 1:9. Did Christ bring light only to such men as are Jews? Furthermore, the Sabbath was given so that men might have the blessing of rest and the worship of their Creator. Why should God desire that only a small fraction of His created beings—for the Jews have ever been a very small part of the world's population—should partake of the happiness of rest and worship?

3. How could the Sabbath have been given only to the Jews, when it was made at creation, which was long before the days of Abraham, the father of the Jewish race? (See Gen. 2:2, 3).

4. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of the closing days of earth's history, when God's "salvation is near to come," talks of the blessing that will come upon "the son of the stranger" that "keeps the Sabbath."

(See Isa. 56:1-84)

5. Finally, in the new earth, where there will be people of every race and nation, the Sabbath will be kept. (See Isa. 66:22, 23)

Now what of Deuteronomy 5:15, which is said to prove that the Sabbath was given only to the Jews? The text reads as follows: "Remember that thou was a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day."

Note the setting of this text. The fifth chapter of Deuteronomy consists of a summing up by

Moses, with appropriate comments, of the great event at Sinai forty years before, when God spoke the Ten Commandments. That Moses was not attempting to repeat verbatim the commandments, but rather to urge the keeping of the well-known precepts, is shown by verse 12, where he says "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee."

Therefore the first point to note is that this recital of the commandments in Deuteronomy cannot be taken as a substitute for the form of the commandments found in Exodus 20. In Exodus we find the record of the commands as God spoke them, and to this record Moses specifically referred Israel when he urged them, "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee." And whatever reasons or appeals are presented by Moses must be considered as an addition to, and not as a substitute for, the reasons given by God when He originally spoke the commandments.

God declared that the seventh day is the Sabbath on which all should rest, because "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day." And He added, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20: 11.

Let us look again at the context of Deuteronomy 5. Moses proceeds with his paraphrase of the Sabbath command, and closes the fourteenth verse—which describes how servants as well as masters were to rest—by adding: "That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." Then follows immediately verse 15, which reminds the Israelites of how they were servants in Egypt, etc.

What is the natural conclusion, then, for us to read? Simply this, that Moses was giving an added reason for the keeping of the Sabbath commandment, especially that feature of it which had to do with the servants' resting.

This, we say, is the natural conclusion to be reached. It becomes the inevitable conclusion when certain parallel passages are quoted.

A little further on Moses gives instruction as to the treatment of a servant, and how, after he had served six years, he should be released in the seventh and sent away with liberal provisions from the flocks and herds of the master. "And," added Moses, "thou shall remember that thou was a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee: therefore I command thee this thing to day." Dent. 15:15. Shall we conclude that liberality and love toward servants are a command originating at the Exodus, that all who lived before that time might deal grudgingly with their servants without incurring God's displeasure, and that only Jews are required by God to display such kindness toward servants?

Again, let us read a more detailed command: "You shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure of just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall you have. I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall you observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: I am the Lord." Lev. 19:35-37. Shall we take this verse by itself and build up the argument that the command to deal justly in the various affairs of life originated with the Exodus, that previous to that a man might shortchange his neighbor with impunity, and that only Jews are required by God to refrain from shortchanging anyone?

Or take this further statement: "I am the Lord that brings you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: you shall therefore be holy, for I am holy." Lev. 11:45. Are we to conclude from this that the command to "be holy" is intended only for literal Israel, who were brought "up out of the land of Egypt"? We believe that even the most vigorous opponent of the Sabbath would hesitate to endorse such an idea. But if both holiness and Sabbath keeping have a certain relationship to deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and yet we agree that all men should be holy, we surely cannot use Egypt as an excuse for violating the Sabbath.

In the light of these passages, and others that might be given, how evident it is that the fact of their Egyptian bondage, when they were treated unkindly and unjustly, was cited by Moses simply as an added reason why they, now that the Lord had graciously delivered them from such conditions, should deal justly and lovingly with others. The law of just dealings with others, especially with those in an unfortunate condition, has been binding on men from the beginning of the world. But it took on added force and obligation when applied to those who had been so lately compelled to work as slaves in Egypt.

Instead of weakening the Sabbath command, Deuteronomy 5:15 simply serves to show how exceeding broad is the command, and how God intended the Sabbath to prove a source of refreshment and blessing even to servants.

## Objection 23

**In Exodus 31:14 we read that Sabbath violators were to be stoned to death. Do you believe the same penalty should be enforced today? If you say that the penalty feature of the Sabbath law is done away, then you have really declared the Sabbath abolished, for a law has no force if there is no penalty provided for its violation.**

**Again, in Exodus 35:3 we read that no fires were to be kindled on the Sabbath. If you believe the Sabbath law is still in force, why do you kindle fires on that day?**

Exodus 31:14 reads, "You shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defiles it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever does any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people."

If the reader will turn to Deuteronomy 13:6, 10; 21:18, 21; 22:21-28, and all of Leviticus 20, he will read there a whole series of injunctions concerning the putting to death of persons who were idolaters, who were rebellious to their parents, who committed adultery or were guilty of incest, who cursed father or mother. In fact, who violated any part of the moral code. Indeed, someone has estimated that no less than nine of the Ten Commandments are specifically mentioned in connection with the penalty of death for their violation.

Now we would ask the Sabbath objector: Do you believe that the idolater, for example, ought to be put to death, or the son who curses his father? Of course you answer no. Then, according to your logic, if you believe that this penalty should not be enforced today, you evidently believe that it is no longer wrong to be an idolater, for example, or for a son to curse his father. But such a conclusion would obviously be monstrous, to say nothing of being unreasonable. Yet it would be no more unreasonable than tile contention that because present-day Sabbath keepers do not believe Sabbath breakers should be put to death, therefore the Sabbath law is abolished. This kind of reasoning proves too much, and thus proves nothing.

We agree that if a law has no penalty, it has no force. But it does not follow that because we do not believe in stoning people, therefore we believe there will be no punishment for those who violate the Sabbath or any other part of the law of God.

The only difference between the ancient Jewish order of things and ours today is as regards the time of punishment and the executor of the punishment. When God was the direct ruler, He saw fit to have an immediate punishment inflicted. Now the evildoer must look forward to the last great day of judgment. (See Heb. 10:26-29)

Therefore let not the Sabbath breaker feel at ease in his mind simply because God has not suddenly brought judgment upon him for his violation of the fourth precept of the Ten Commandments, which declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, Creator of heaven and earth.

The story is told of a certain godless man who found special delight in flaunting his disobedience of the Sabbath command. He lived in a locality where the other farmers near him were devout Sabbath keepers. When October came and he harvested his crop, he found that he had even more in his barn than his neighbors.

Meeting the Sabbath keeping minister on the street one day, he gloatingly mentioned this fact. The minister's only reply was: "God does not always make a full settlement in October." No better answer could have been given.

The faithful Sabbath keeper awaits the day of final judgment to receive his full reward for obedience to God, the Creator of the whole earth. And likewise, the Sabbath violator must await that last great day of accounting in order to receive the final reward for his failure to obey the explicit command of God. The violation of the law of God is sin, the Scriptures inform us (1 John 3:4), and the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23). Is that not sufficient penalty?

What of the command against kindling fires on the Sabbath? Exodus 35:3 reads, "You shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." Our answer, briefly, is this:

1. The prohibition against kindling a fire is not part of the fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments. And it is the precepts of the Ten Commandments that we consider moral and thus eternally binding.

2. There were many civil as well as ceremonial statutes given to Israel that had limited duration. For example, there were civil statutes that declared how a slave should be treated. (See Ex. 21:1-11) The Sabbath objector finds in these statutes of the holding of slaves, for example, no justification for slavery today. Instead, he agrees with the Sabbath keeper that many of the statutes given to Israel through Moses were an adaptation of great moral principles to the degree of moral

understanding of the Israelites, or to particular situations that existed locally. Therein lies the basic distinction between the moral commands of the Decalogue given to Israel directly by God on Sinai, and the host of other statutes given through Moses.

Now if the Sabbath objector feels free to discard the statute on the care of slaves while holding that nine of the ten command of the Ten Commandments are still in force, are we not equally reasonable in discarding the statute against kindling fires on the Sabbath while holding that all ten commands of the Ten Commandments are still in force?

3. It is not even certain, from the context, that the command to the Jews against Sabbath fires was intended to apply to other than their wilderness journeying. The command comes as a preface to a series of commands concerning the erection of the tabernacle, which commands had life only so long as the tabernacle was under construction, and then died by limitation. The Jews themselves have never been agreed on whether the prohibition against Sabbath fires extended beyond the wilderness period.

In the wilderness the temperature was rather generally warm, hence fire would hardly be needed to protect against sickness. The Israelites were instructed to bake and seethe oil the sixth day such of the manna as they desired to eat in that form on the Sabbath day. Hence there was no need to kindle a fire for cooking on that day.

Again, to "kindle" a fire in those times meant to engage in very real and extended labor. As the Pulpit Commentary in its comments oil Exodus 35:3 observes:

"The kindling of fire in early times involved considerable labor. It was ordinarily effected by rubbing two sticks together, or twisting one round rapidly between the two palms in a depression upon a board. Fire only came after a long time. Moreover, as in the warm climate of Arabia and Palestine artificial warmth was not needed, fire could only have been kindled there for cooking purposes, which involved further unnecessary work. . . . The Jews generally view the precept as having had only a temporary force."

In the light of these facts, how could the prohibition against kindling fires raise any possible doubt as to the moral quality and permanency of the fourth command of the Ten Commandments?

## Objection 24

**When we as Sunday keepers declare that the ten-commandment law was abolished at the cross, Adventists try to embarrass us by asking us if we believe it is all right in the Christian Era to steal or kill or do any other of the heinous deeds prohibited by the Ten Commandments. We do not. We believe that God has great moral principles that have governed the universe from all eternity and will continue to govern it to all eternity. The Ten Commandments was simply a partial reflection of these principles. The principles remain, but the Ten Commandments in gone. Hence the Sabbath is gone.**

How does the objector know that God has had these great moral principles from eternity? Does he have access to heavenly information that we do not have? No! Christianity is a revealed religion. It does not rest on the philosophical speculations of wise men, but on a revelation from God, and that revelation is contained in a written record called the Bible. What we may deduce from viewing God's creation, or from communing with our own spirit, must ever be corrected by what we read in the Book. That is the historic Protestant position.

No the objector has no authoritative source of information that we do not possess. That is why he fails to give us any information as to what these "moral principles" are. He carefully leaves them undefined and undescribed. He is wholly warranted in affirming that God has had "moral principles" in force through all eternity. Reason and common sense assure us that a universe governed by a holy God must certainly be controlled by "moral principles," or more exactly, moral laws, for Christian theology always speaks of the universe as being divinely governed by moral laws. But neither reason nor common sense can define with certainty just what is comprehended in those laws. We repeat, only by a study of the revealed will of God in the Bible can we know for certain what those laws are.

We do know from the Bible that when God first called out a people for His own name He delivered to them in His own handwriting Ten Commandments, or laws, which were to be the moral basis of their government. Now, we would ask the objector whether he believes that any of these ten commands were part of the eternal moral laws. We can imagine his quickly agreeing that at least nine were the commands against false gods, making idols, blasphemy, killing, adultery, stealing, lying, covetousness, and the command to honor our parents. Thus by the admission of the objector himself, when God saw fit to reveal to men His eternal moral laws, He gave to them the Ten Commandments, nine tenths of which consisted of eternal moral laws.

God's speaking from Sinai simply made those eternal moral laws audible to men. And His writing them out simply made them visually evident. Thus men might both hear and see and thus know for certain those eternal moral laws that should govern their lives. To say that the Ten Commandments was simply a "reflection" of eternal moral laws, as though it were a shadowy image and not the enduring reality, is to confuse simple truth by subtle words. We might as appropriately say that God's voice that spoke the Ten Commandments, and His hand that wrote it, were merely a shadowy reflection of Himself. The commands of the Ten Commandments were as truly a projection of the eternal moral laws into the realm of men as the divine hand and voice were a projection of God into our mortal realm. Thus it would be as irrational to speak of destroying the Ten Commandments while preserving the eternal moral laws as it would be to speak of destroying the divine voice and hand while preserving God.

Therefore, when someone declares that the Ten Commandments was abolished at Calvary he is, in strict logic, really asserting that God's eternal moral laws, or at least nine of them, were then abolished. In other words, after God had supernaturally revealed nine of His eternal moral laws to men and had exhorted them repeatedly through the prophets to be obedient, He suddenly abolished these nine eternal moral laws at Calvary. That is what the objector really declares. Yet he feels that it is grossly unfair for us to conclude that the logic of his declaration permits him to lie and steal and kill, and so on.

We do not believe that those who declare that the Ten Commandments has been abolished really think that they may now kill steal. We simply affirm that the premises from which they reason logically lead to that conclusion, and that the defenses they erect against the conclusion will not stand up. We seek to show, not that their moral standards are bad, but simply that their logic is, and most evidently so because of the bad premise on which it rests and the bad conclusion to which it leads.

And how do the advocates of this abolition doctrine seek to avoid this obvious conclusion? By a variety of arguments, some of which have already been considered. For example, that in the Christian Era we are fulfilling the law if we have love to God and man, and that such love will not permit us to bow down to idols or lie or steal, et cetera. But does love, which has ever existed, make unnecessary

the eternal moral laws which, he admits, have ever existed? No, love simply gives us spiritual discernment to see and a heart tender to obey these moral laws. Furthermore, the prime importance of love to God and man is revealed in the Old Testament. Yet there was a need for the Ten Commandments in Old Testament times. Why not also in our times?

The objector's primary reasons for claiming that the abolition of the Ten Commandments permits him to break the fourth commandment, but does not permit him to break the other nine, are these:

1. The fourth commandment alone, of the ten, was ceremonial, and with all the other ceremonies, expired at Calvary. Therefore we are not required to keep it.

2. The other nine commandments, because they are moral, were re-enacted by the apostles, and thus are binding on us.

Though these two contentions are really parts of the objection before us, and must be answered before a full reply is provided, they also carry us into new areas of discussion. Hence they will be examined separately in the following pages.

## Objection 25

**The fourth commandment in the Ten Commandments is not inherently a moral precept, but the other nine are self-evidently moral commands. "All moral principles are discoverable by the light of nature" or reason, but the necessity of keeping the seventh day is not thus discoverable. For example, all men naturally know that it is wrong to steal, kill, commit adultery, et cetera, but no one would thus know that a particular day had been set apart as holy. That required a direct revelation from God. Hence the Sabbath command is not moral. Furthermore, there is nothing inherently holy in the seventh day of the week. Hence "it would never have been wrong to work on the seventh day unless God had given a command to rest on it."**

The most direct reply may be presented in terms of answers to the following three key questions:

### First Question

Do all men naturally know that it is wrong to steal, commit adultery, worship idols, or violate any other of the nine commands that the objector certainly agrees are moral?

This question obviously challenges the very foundation on which the whole objection before us rests. Fortunately, a clear and sure answer can be given. Let us start with the first commandment. This command not only forbids polytheism but also requires that we worship one certain God, the true God. Do all men naturally know that it is wrong to worship more than one god? Or do they naturally know who the true God is? The answer to both questions is no. Though most men of all races and ages have felt that they should worship some god or gods there never has been agreement as to which god or gods should be worshiped.

Says Paul, "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor. 1:21. His sermon on Mars' Hill is an exhibit of such preaching. And how did Paul know the true God? By the revelations given to him and by his study of that revelation called the Scriptures.

The one true God is pure and holy, and though just, is merciful. The gods of the nations have been anything but holy, and their mercy at best has been capricious. Now, the first commandment calls on us to worship the one true God. Hence we must know His nature and holy requirements if we are truly to obey that command. But only revelation can provide that knowledge.

Let us take the second commandment. Do men know by reason or nature that it is wrong to make a likeness of God or of any creature and use it as an object of religious worship? No. The history of almost all mankind is a history of idol worship. Indeed, Roman Catholics declare that there is nothing sinful in making images and bowing down before them. And how do we as Protestants seek to show the evil of idols, either Catholic or heathen? Do we rest our case on reason and nature? No. On revelation.

Take the third commandment. The reason why we see force and meaning in the prohibition against taking God's name in vain is that revelation presents to us a picture of a most pure and holy God to whom we owe all and to whom we must someday give an account. But the heathen, even the most enlightened Greeks, who possessed no revelation, thought of their gods as altogether like themselves, lustful, depraved, vindictive, even murderous. Would it have seemed reasonable to a Greek to believe that there was anything wrong in taking lightly the name of any of his gods?

Let us turn to a commandment that deals with man's relation to his fellow man and see whether reason and nature prove sufficient here. We who are Christians are shocked at the thought of adultery in any of its evil manifestations. And when we send missionaries to far lands we seek to turn men from this evil, along with all other evils. But these missionaries do not make their appeal on the basis of reason and nature. They would be ridiculed if they did. That is the testimony of many who have preached to non-Christian peoples. Instead, they preach morality and chastity in terms of a revelation from God and a command of God.

But why lengthen the survey of the nine commands that the objector admits are moral? We believe that reason and nature play some part in giving us a knowledge of right and wrong, of God and the judgment, so that men are without excuse. But how limited a part they play is sadly revealed in the long, sinful history of man. We believe that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah had enough knowledge of God and right and wrong to be morally accountable and justly entitled to the fiery destruction that descended upon them. But our Lord declared that it would be more tolerable in the day of judgment for Sodom and Gomorrah than for those cities that refused to receive the message that His disciples would bring to them. And why? Because the disciples would bring to them a revelation from God, received through Jesus Christ. Said Christ, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not

had sin: but now they have no cloak [margin, "excuse"] for their sin." John 15:22.

How clear it is that a divine revelation is needed, not simply, in regard to the fourth commandment, but in regard to the others also! Thus the very foundation on which this impressive objection has been reared, disappears. Strictly speaking, it should not be necessary for us to deal further with this objection. But let us look briefly at the other questions involved.

### Second Question

What are the proofs that Seventh day Adventists can offer to support their claim that the fourth commandment is moral rather than ceremonial, and thus eternally binding like the other nine?

We answer:

1. "Moral duties and precepts are such as grow out of the attributes of God. Creative power is the distinguishing attribute of the living God, and the Sabbath grew directly out of the exercise of this attribute in the creation of the world." \*

\* *This and other non-Biblical quotations in this series of proofs that the Sabbath command is a moral one are taken from the pamphlet "The Morality of the Sabbath", written in 1875 by none other than D. M. Canright. His later defection from the Seventh-day Adventist Church no more invalidates these proofs than does the defection of a minister from the Christian religion invalidate the reasons he formerly presented in behalf of Christianity. Rather, they stand m an indictment of the man's defection.*

2. The second reason follows closely on the first: "Man's moral duty to love and obey God rests chiefly upon the fact that the Lord created all things, which fact the Sabbath was given to commemorate.

3. Man's nature, physically and mentally, requires just such a day of rest as the Sabbath precept provides, and hence, like all moral precepts, it provides for a natural and universal want of the race.

4. "Man's moral and spiritual well-being requires just what the Sabbath precept provides, and hence it is moral.

Proofs three and four are identical with those used by ardent Sunday law advocates, except that when they say "Sabbath-they mean "Sunday." They present medical and scientific evidence to show that those who take a day of rest at regular intervals of about one week can better carry on their work during the next week. They also point to religious history which shows that in so-called Christian lands where a weekly day of worship has riot been faithfully observed, religious life wanes.

Thus it is a well-established fact that Sunday leaders in Protestantism see a moral quality in the fourth commandment as certainly as Seventh day Adventists do. Their contention is that the command is partly moral and partly ceremonial. The moral part, say they, is the command to keep holy one day in seven; the ceremonial part, the particular day that was set apart. They must claim that part of it is moral in order to enforce Sunday; they must claim that part of it is ceremonial in order to justify their changing the day of worship.

In taking this position they overlook the following facts:

a. As has already been shown, the moral quality of the Sabbath command resides not simply in the physical, mental, and spiritual needs of man. Most primarily the moral quality springs from the relation of the command to the creative act of God.

b. The creative act displayed itself in a certain time sequence, six days in which God labored and the seventh day on which He rested.

c. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work." Gen. 2:3.

d. The very reason offered in the fourth commandment as to why men should keep the Sabbath is this historical fact of creation and God's resting on the last day of creation week. "The seventh day is the Sabbath: . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . : wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20: 10, 11.

How, could language make more clear that a particular day is involved in the Sabbath command? And that that day memorializes a specific historical event? Or how could language make more clear that the sanctifying of this particular weekly rest day springs from the fact that this specific historical event occurred on that day, the seventh day?

The "wherefore" in the Sabbath command refers back to this incident and to the particular day God blessed. Remove the "wherefore," and the reason for the Sabbath command disappears. But that is exactly what Sunday advocates do when they invoke the Sabbath command in favor of one day's rest in seven but discard the reason for a weekly holy day. When they contend that the weekly rest-day feature of the command is moral, but the seventh day feature is ceremonial, and hence of relatively minor importance, they are in the curious position of asserting that a great moral principle enunciated in the Ten Commandments rests upon a ceremonial, and thus relatively minor, act of God.

5. "The Sabbath precept, like all moral precepts, applies equally well to all nations, in all countries, and at all times." This follows from the fact that recurring periods of physical rest and similar periods of religious exercise are as much needed by one people as another, in all climes and in all ages.

6. "The Sabbath precept guards the right of property the same as the eighth commandment does; and hence, like that, is moral." The Lord divided the seven-day week into two parts, six days man might use as he desired in honest labor, the seventh God reserved. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20: 10.

The Lord speaks of the Sabbath as "my holy day." (Isa. 58:13.) It is as morally wrong to steal from God the holy time that belongs to Him as it is to steal from our neighbor some possession that is his. Hence the command that prohibits such stealing from God is a moral command.

7. "Marriage is a moral institution. The Sabbath institution, being made at the same time, by the same authority, for the same persons, and in a similar manner, is also moral for the same reason."

Only those who are ready to contend that marriage rests, not on a moral, but on a ceremonial, law, should logically contend that the Sabbath rests simply on a ceremonial law. It is in this setting that we better see how unreasonable is the argument that although the Sabbath institution is moral, because all men naturally know that rest is needed, the particular day mentioned in the Sabbath command is ceremonial, because men do not naturally know the day on which we should rest. No Christian would be impressed with the argument that though the marriage institution is moral, because men naturally know that marriage is needful, the monogamous feature of it is simply ceremonial, because men do not naturally know that a man should have only one wife. We would respond that even if men do not know this naturally, they do know it by revelation, and then we would cite God's act in Eden in uniting one man and one woman, and His declaring that "they twain shall be one flesh." We would not consider it necessary to do more than this to prove the moral quality of monogamy, that one joined to one is right, but one joined to two or more is not. Christians believe that God's act and declaration can give a moral quality even to arithmetic.

By precisely the same reasoning we may dispose of the argument about the ceremonial quality of that part of the Sabbath law that speaks of a particular day.

8. One of the most distinguishing marks of the various ceremonial laws in the Bible is that they were all given after man sinned, were made necessary in some way or other by man's sinful state, and expire by limitation while man is still on this present world. (The ceremonial statutes given to the ancient Jews expired at the cross; the ceremonial rites of Christians, for example, the Lord's supper-expire at the Second Advent.) That is not true of the Sabbath, which was given to sinless Adam and Eve in Eden, and will be kept by the redeemed in Eden restored. (See Isa. 66:23.)

9. The very fact that God placed the Sabbath command in the heart of the Ten Commandments, known to all Christians as the moral law, is in itself the most convincing proof that that command is moral. God confined His audible law giving to ten commands; He confined His writing to ten commands. How unreasonable to believe that with brevity so distinguishing a mark of this code, with weighty and eternally moral precepts on both sides of it, God should insert in the midst a ceremonial statute that was to expire at Christ's first advent! But we are not required to entertain so unreasonable an idea. The series of proofs here given reveal beyond all reasonable doubt that the fourth commandment is moral.

### **Third Question**

What of the claim that "it never would have been wrong to work on the seventh day unless God had given a command to rest in it? The objector here most evidently seeks to prove that the Sabbath is a ceremonial statute, which owes its authority, not to any inherent moral quality, but to an arbitrary command of God. The point is really covered in what has already been presented. But two observations more may help to reveal fully the fallacy of the objection.

I. Through the ages there have been those who preached and practiced free love. Even in nineteenth-century America some societies formed of people that claimed kinship with Christians, advocated free love and thus the abandonment of marriage. Now, how would the Sabbath objector answer such a free-love advocate who contended that it never would have been wrong to practice free love if God had not commanded that there should be marriage, with twain as one? We think we hear him responding immediately and with vigor: "What more do we need than God's command to determine what is right or wrong?" Nor would he countenance for a moment the argument that seeing men do not know naturally that monogamy is right, therefore the Christian rule of monogamy is arbitrary and may be abandoned by those who desire greater freedom. Even so with the Sabbath command.

2. We earlier noted that one of the reasons for the Sabbath command was to guard property rights. The seventh day belongs to God. It was because God set apart the day as His own, with blessing and sanctification, that He commanded men to regard it as different from other days, to rest from their own toil on that day, and to keep it holy. Hence the objector is forgetful of the historical facts and sequence when he declares that "it never would have been wrong to work on the seventh day unless God had given a command to rest in it."

The wrongness of using the day for secular interests resides in the fact that the Sabbath is God's holy day. The command springs from that fact. It is therefore not an arbitrary command, but a moral one growing out of the nature of the seventh day, the sanctified possession of God.

There is something very strange about the claim that the Sabbath command is ceremonial. Those who set it forth generally are devout Sunday keepers who deplore the widespread profanation of Sunday and often seek to secure civil legislation to protect it, even as their spiritual fathers in past generations did. They quite \*uniformly hold that the keeping of Sunday is a moral matter, certainly not ceremonial, though they can cite no command of Scripture in support of this belief, no action of God in blessing or sanctifying the day. They must fall back on the fourth commandment, albeit with alterations and a sixteenth-century new interpretation, in order to make out the appearance of a case for the moral quality of Sunday keeping. (See page 545 for the historical evidence in support of this statement.) Yet we who keep the Sabbath are declared to be resting our case on a ceremonial law, though we appeal to the same fourth commandment, and in the exact form that God gave it.

All this surely adds up to the conclusion that the real controversy is not over whether a weekly rest day is a moral requirement of God-the Sabbath institution soon begins to disintegrate unless it is so viewed-but which day of the week the fourth commandment calls on us to keep, the seventh or the first?

(See objection 38 for a discussion of this point. See also objections 26 and 27 for a discussion of other aspects of the claim that the Sabbath is ceremonial.)

## Objection 26

**"The Sabbath was not a day of special religious worship. . . In God's plan, the keeping of the seventh day on the part of His earthly people was to be an external form, or rite; the performance of a definitely prescribed ceremony, stipulating the cessation of all work on a given day, or a day of complete physical rest. Only when connected with the annual feasts was it observed as a day of religious significance." All this proves that the seventh day Sabbath was simply one of the ceremonial Sabbaths. All those Sabbaths, in common with every other ceremonial statute, were abolished at the cross.**

By two unwarranted claims this objection seeks to drop the seventh day Sabbath down to the level of the ceremonial Sabbaths, which were blotted out at the cross. Let us consider them in order:

### First False Claim

The seventh day Sabbath was merely an "external form," which called simply for "complete physical rest." Hence it could not be that essentially spiritual, morally binding, holy day that Seventh day Adventists declare that it is. It is difficult to understand how anyone acquainted with the Bible would make this statement. Let the Bible provide the refutation. The creation of the Sabbath reveals that it is distinguished in two ways: (1) by God's resting on it, and (2) by His blessing and sanctifying it. And as earlier stated, to sanctify means to set apart for a holy use.

When the Lord sought first to impress on the new nation of Israel the significance of the Sabbath, which had doubtless been forgotten by many during their Egyptian bondage, He caused manna to fall for the six working days, and then withheld it on the seventh. The Israelites were to gather extra on the sixth day, and to rest on the seventh. When they came to the first Friday and found that they were able to gather twice as much as on preceding days, Moses said to them, "This is that which the Lord has said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath." Ex. 16:23. The Sabbath presented was not only as a day of "complete physical rest" but also as "the holy Sabbath."

When Nehemiah long afterward referred to the formal giving of the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai he declared that God there made known unto them His "holy Sabbath." (Neh. 9:14)

Nehemiah found certain Jews working on the Sabbath and buying wares on that day. With indignation at this threat to the life of the nation, now rising from its long captivity, he cried out:

"What evil thing is this that you do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? Yet you bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." Neh. 13:17, 18.

It is only holy things that are capable of being profaned. How strange to Nehemiah's ears would have sounded the words of those who today try to dismiss the Sabbath as merely an "external form" that dealt only with "physical rest." Would God, who bore so long with the most grievous iniquities of Israel, have uprooted the Jewish nation and sent it into captivity because of a failure to keep a merely "external form, or rite"?

The Lord, through Isaiah, offers a special blessing to those who truly keep the Sabbath:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable. And shall honor him, not doing your own ways, nor finding your own pleasure, nor speaking your own words. Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. 58:13, 14.

### Second False Claim

The seventh day Sabbath acquired a "religious significance" "only when connected with the annual feasts." Hence it owed its religious or spiritual quality to its connection with obviously ceremonial, annual Sabbaths. And can that which is blessed-in this case, given "religious significance"-be on a higher level than that which blesses it? All this proves that the seventh day Sabbath was simply one of the ceremonial Sabbaths.

But we have discovered that the seventh day Sabbath has an inherent holiness given to it by God in Eden. There were no annual feast days with which it might possibly be connected until twenty-five hundred years later. When the manna was first given, Moses described the seventh day as "the holy Sabbath", though no annual feasts, with which it might be "connected" had yet been given. When God announced the Sabbath as a part of the Decalogue, it could be described as His "holy Sabbath", wrote

Nehemiah. But the giving of the Ten Commandments preceded the setting forth of the laws that created the annual feast days. We found nothing in the context of the passages in Genesis, Exodus, or Isaiah which speak of God's holy Sabbath, that gives any suggestion that it needed to be "connected" with any annual feast in order to possess holiness.

Strictly speaking, we need not, therefore, spend time in discussing annual feasts. However, an examination of them really adds further proof that they are essentially different from the seventh day Sabbath. From Leviticus 23 we learn that there were seven annual Sabbaths:

1. The fifteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, known also as the Passover Sabbath.
2. The twenty-first day of the first month, the last (day) of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.
3. The fiftieth day from "the morrow after the" fifteenth of the first month, known later as Pentecost.
4. The first day of the seventh month, called "a memorial of blowing of trumpets."
5. The tenth day of the seventh month, known as the Day of Atonement.
6. The fifteenth day of the seventh month, the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles.
7. The twenty second day of the seventh month, the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles.

These annual convocations were properly called "Sabbaths," for the Hebrew word shabath, from which our English "Sabbath" is translated in the Old Testament, simply means "rest." And on those annual Sabbaths the people rested from their labors. But the mere fact that these annual holy days are called "Sabbaths" does not in itself warrant placing them in the same class with the seventh day Sabbath. Both are rest days, to be sure, but that does not mean that they are of the same character or standing. In terms of the Hebrew language, we could properly describe a modern holiday as a "Sabbath," a rest day; we could also describe a Christian Era holy day as a "Sabbath." But how foolish would be the person who decided, therefore, that holidays and holy days are of the same nature, and thus stand or fall together, simply because both are rest days, or "Sabbaths," according to the Hebrew. Though they have one point in common, namely, rest, their dissimilarities are many. Thus with the annual Sabbaths and the seventh day Sabbath. Their dissimilarities are many and great. Let us note them:

### **Seventh day (Ten Commandments) Sabbath**

1. Made at the creation of the world. Gen. 2:2,3.
2. Memorialized an event at beginning of time, the creation, before there was a Jewish people.
3. Intended ever to turn men's minds back to creation. Ex. 20:8-11.
4. God rested on the seventh day Sabbath and specifically blessed and sanctified it. Gen. 2:2, 3.
5. Commemorates a world that had come forth perfect from Creator's hand.
6. Tied to weekly cycle and the same day of the week always.
7. Could be kept anywhere in world, because weekly cycle operates free of all calendars.
8. Kept every week.
9. "Made for man." Mark 2:27.
10. Will continue beyond this world. Isa. 66:23.

### **Annual (Ceremonial) Sabbaths**

1. Made at Sinai, about twenty-five hundred years after creation. Leviticus 23.
2. Memorialized events in current Jewish history. For example, Feast of Tabernacles. Lev. 23:43.
3. Intended to turn men's minds ever forward to cross, etc. "A shadow of things to come." Col. 2:17. For example, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5:7.
4. God did not rest on these days, nor set them apart with distinctive blessing or sanctification.
5. Commemorates and foreshadows events in a world plagued with sin.
6. Tied to the Jewish calendar, and thus a different day of week each time celebrated.
7. Could be known and kept only where the Jewish calendar is in existence.
8. Kept only once a year.
9. A part of the ceremonial ritual "which was against us." Col. 2:14.

10. Abolished, taken "out of the way," at Christ's crucifixion. Col. 2:14.

Though it is true that all things that pertain to the service of God at any time have a certain holy quality, and though, in the present instance, these annual Sabbaths had some features in common with the seventh day Sabbath, the dissimilarities are so real and so great as to leave no doubt that the former should not be confused with the latter.

When the Lord instructed Moses concerning the annual feasts, known as "holy convocations," which revolved around the seven annual Sabbaths, He declared in conclusion, "These are the feasts of the Lord, which you shall proclaim to be holy convocations . . . beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." Lev. 23:37,38.

Thus are we instructed by God Himself that the annual Sabbaths are apart from, and in addition to, "the Sabbaths of the Lord."

As the Bible commentary by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown well observes:

"Leviticus 23. 38 expressly distinguishes 'the Sabbath of the Lord' from the other Sabbaths." - Comment on Col. 2:16.

## Objection 27

**That the fourth command of the Ten Commandments is ceremonial, but the other nine are moral, "is clearly proved by the fact that Jesus, according to the strictest Sabbatarians of His day, broke the fourth commandment and was criticized by them for doing so. Furthermore, Jesus distinctly says, 'The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless.' [Matt. 12:5] Would He have dared to say this if the fourth commandment were a moral law? Could the seventh commandment, or any other of the ten except the fourth, be broken by the priests, and the fact that they were broken in the temple make them blameless?"**

We would like to ask two questions:

1. If Christ broke the fourth commandment, then why did He say, "I have kept my Father's commandments"? John 15:10.

2. The Sabbath objector says that "the law" and he insists that all laws both moral and ceremonial are comprehended in that term-was in force until the cross. Then if Christ broke the Sabbath commandment, was He not a sinner? There is only one answer. But we know that Christ did no sin; therefore there must be something wrong with the reasoning in the objection before us.

What proof is offered that Jesus "broke the fourth commandment"? An inspired declaration of Holy Writ? No, only the charge of the "strictest Sabbatarians of His day."

On a certain Sabbath day, while our Lord was in a synagogue, there came before Him a man with a withered hand. Divining that Christ might plan to heal the cripple, some "strict Sabbatharians" asked the Master: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days? That they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Matt. 12:10-12. Whereupon He immediately healed the cripple. "Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him." Verse 14.

Another instance of Christ's healing on the Sabbath is recorded in John 5:2-18. In verse 18 we read that the judgment of the Jews was that Christ "had broken the Sabbath."

Here we see the charge of the "strictest Sabbatharians" in its Scriptural setting. Yet the Sabbath objector evidently considers this charge to be sufficient ground for saying that Christ "broke the fourth commandment." Incredible!

We believe the incident of the healing of the crippled man proves the very opposite of what some people allege it does, as the following questions will reveal:

1. If Christ considered the fourth commandment simply ceremonial, was this not an excellent opportunity for Him to discourse upon the distinction between ceremonial and moral precepts? Present-day Sabbath opposers surely would have done so, for here they argue that very point, insisting that it was proper to break the fourth commandment, because it was ceremonial, but that it would have been sin to break any other of the ten, because they were moral. But Christ did not use any such reasoning.

2. Note the question asked of Christ: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days?" When the Samaritan woman at the well asked Christ where men should worship, a question that through the long past years had had genuine importance, He dismissed it summarily by informing her that the time was at hand when the question no longer had significance. If Christ was soon to abolish the Sabbath law on the cross, would we not expect Him to dismiss, in similar fashion, the question the "strictest Sabbatharians" had posed? Instead, He gave no hint of impending abolition, but replied, "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

There is no suggestion that He considered He was breaking the Sabbath. Instead, He was interpreting its true meaning. Nor is there anything in His interpretation, or His miraculous action that followed, that warrants the conclusion that the Sabbath rests on a ceremonial law. It is always lawful to "do well" in relation to moral laws.

But it is alleged that the Sabbath is ceremonial because Christ declared that the priests "profane the Sabbath, and are blameless." His reference to the priests was simply offered in illustration of His statement that "it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Christ's adversaries were contending that He and His disciples profaned the Sabbath by engaging in some form of work on the Sabbath. He reminded them that the priests also worked on the Sabbath, and were blameless. Even the "strictest Sabbatharians" would agree that what the priests did on the Sabbath, in harmony with "the law," was "lawful," even though the priests each Sabbath had to engage in the work of slaying and offering sacrifices.

Christ's use of the word "profane" must be understood in the context of the controversy. His reasoning appears to be this: If His and His disciples' deeds were profanation of the Sabbath, then by

the same token the deeds of the priests were profanation. To contend that Christ really meant that the priests, whose Sabbath deeds of sacrificing were done in harmony with the law, did, in truth, desecrate the Sabbath, would lead to an impossible conclusion. Christ would really be saying that God gave a holy law to guard the sacredness of the Sabbath and then gave to Moses another law that resulted weekly in the desecration of the Sabbath! Those who wish to, may hold this conclusion. We do not.

The Sabbath commandment, like the other commands in the Ten Commandments, is relatively brief. It sets down the principle that men should refrain from all their own labors on the seventh day. But the God who gave the law also revealed—for example, through other laws given to Moses, and through Christ's words—just how the Sabbath command should be understood and how it is related to other aspects of life. But that does not warrant the conclusion that the Sabbath command was therefore ceremonial. Commands that the Sabbath objector admits are moral, sometimes need interpretation to enable a person to know how to carry out the real intent of those commands under differing circumstances. For example, the fifth commandment makes the unqualified statement that children should honor their parents. And in Oriental lands that would be understood in a most far-reaching sense. But what if the parents were heathen, a situation that began to present itself when Christianity was preached to the Roman world? Paul, who quotes the opening words of the command, places it with this obvious interpretation: "Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right." Eph. 6:1. That permitted them to disobey the command of a heathen parent if that command was contrary to the standards of Christ.

The eighth commandment reads, "Thou shall not steal." Was ever a command more unquestionably moral! But is it possible that what man might consider a violation of that command, God might not? Evidently, for Moses was instructed to tell the people that a person going through someone else's field could satisfy his hunger by eating to the full, though he must not carry anything away. (See Deut. 23:24, 25) Did a hungry person by eating his neighbor's grapes thus flout, or profane, the law against stealing? No. Why? Because the God who gave the law declared that such eating was in harmony with the law, the "strictest" honesty advocates notwithstanding. The same is true of the Sabbath command. Neither Christ nor the priests violated or vitiated the Sabbath command, because the God who gave the command also declared that the work of the priests and the work of Christ were "lawful" on that day.

The Sabbath objector may take his choice: either assert that the fourth command is ceremonial, which logically calls for the eighth command to be considered ceremonial also; or admit that the eighth is moral, which logically calls for the fourth to be also. But he is already on record as affirming that all the commands of the Ten Commandments are moral, except the fourth. Consistency calls for him to include it also.

## Objection 28

**Though the Ten Commandments were abolished at the cross, nine of them were re-enacted in the New Testament, and thus are binding on Christians, but the fourth command was not; hence we are not obligated to keep it.**

Two fallacies underlie this reasoning:

1. People often speak of the Old Testament in the same breath with the old covenant, and of the New Testament in the same breath with the new covenant. The almost unconscious effect upon both speaker and hearer is a minimizing of the Old Testament to the point of considering it nonessential and quite superseded by the New. And if there is coupled with this the view that the Ten Commandments are the old covenant, the way is paved for the kind of reasoning set forth in the objection now before us. But we have already shown (Objection 5) that the Ten Commandments are not the old covenant, and that the New Testament in no way supersedes the Old (Objection 1). When we keep clearly in mind that both the Old and the New Testament are our inspired guides, much of the force of this objection disappears.

2. The claim is that the Ten Commandments were abolished at the cross, but as already noted (Objections 24, 25) those who make this claim admit that nine of the ten commands state eternal moral principles or laws. He therefore finds himself in the curious position of declaring that eternal things can be abolished. At least this is the point to which his reasoning leads him. Does he hesitate to admit this? Then we would ask him: How can you abolish the ten-commandment law unless you abolish the ten precepts that constitute it? There is only one answer to this question, as the objector himself evidently realizes, for he speaks of the re-enactment of nine of the ten. His dilemma is this: He must needs abolish the Ten Commandments in order to do away with the Sabbath command, which is in the heart of it. But abolishing the Ten Commandments creates moral chaos, so he must promptly re-enact nine of the precepts. It is this that necessitates the incredible conclusion that eternal moral principles, or laws were abolished, and then, equally incredible, re-enacted.

Now there are two things to remember about these eternal moral laws that constitute the nine commands:

1. They cover virtually the whole range of moral conduct.

2. Because they are eternal moral principles they are an expression of the very nature of God Himself, as Christian theologians have ever held, and govern all moral beings in the universe.

In the light of these undebatable facts the claim that the Ten Commandments was abolished at the cross takes on a monstrous, even sacrilegious, quality. When Christ (lied on the cross was the moral nature of God changed? It is sacrilege to ask the question. But so long as God is unchanged in nature the moral principles radiating from His nature remain unchanged. So long as God's nature abhors lying, stealing, killing, adultery, covetousness, false gods, etc., so long will the universe to its farthest corners be controlled by moral laws against these evil deeds. But we are told that the Ten Commandments was abolished at the cross, which, if words mean anything, means that the prohibitions of that holy code, the "Thou shall not's" have disappeared. Now, either these precepts were abolished, or they were not. There is no middle ground. For example, either the sixth command, which prohibits murder, was abolished, or it was not. And so with the other commands.

The objector hopes to avert the appalling conclusions that inevitably flow from the logic of his position by hurrying out for inspection his re-enactment theory. The casual onlooker may feel that probably all is well, for does not the re-enactment thus preserve the continuity of moral law in the universe? Yes, if we might think of the re-enactment as we would think of the changing of gears in an automobile traveling the highway. But to make this kind of comparison is to violate both language and history. The idea of gear shifting, with forward motion continuing, has nothing in common with the thought of abolition. Furthermore, the figure of gear shifting implies essentially no tiny interval in the transition. But it is this point of time interval that brings to light the most incredible feature of this whole re-enactment theory.

The apostles, from whose New Testament writings certain lines are quoted to prove the re-enactment of nine of the ten commands, did not pen their inspired manuscripts until twenty, thirty, forty, and more years after the cross! This simple historical fact leads to the fantastic conclusion that the whole world, if not the whole universe, was free from the great moral laws for this period of time. For example, when we inquire of the objector if he believes it proper to kill, steal, lie, et cetera, seeing that the Ten Commandments is abolished, he replies no, and informs us that the New Testament has re-enacted laws against these. Then he will probably quote Romans 13:9, where there is certainly found explicit prohibition of these crimes. But there is general agreement that Paul wrote Romans about the year AD. 58. What about the time in between that year and the year of the crucifixion?

But there is a further dilemma that confronts those who present the re-enactment theory. They seem hard pressed to find in the New Testament explicit restatements of all the nine commands. So they generally draw, in part, from Christ's words in the four Gospels. But those words were uttered before His crucifixion! We cannot speak of re-enacting a law before it is abolished. Nor can the objector consistently contend at one time that the cross marks the dividing point between the old and the new, with all things becoming new at the resurrection, and at another time offer Christ's words before His crucifixion as exhibits of the new, reenacted law.

Nor is this all the perplexity that confronts those who set forth this re-enactment theory. They are really not able to find in the New Testament a clear and sufficiently detailed restatement of the second commandment. We must turn to the words of the Ten Commandments if we, as Protestants, are to bring a wholly convincing indictment against Rome for the images in Catholic churches.

This is strange, indeed, if the re-enacted law should be wholly adequate for every situation in the Christian Era! Will the objector have the hardihood to affirm that the great God, in writing out the words of the second command, was needlessly detailed; or that, in inspiring New Testament writers, He failed to have them be as specific as is needed? Either conclusion would be sacrilegious. We need accept neither.

As earlier set forth in the discussion on the equal authority of the Old and the New Testament (Objection 1), the New Testament writers give no suggestion that they are enacting a new code, or giving us a new revelation in the sense of superseding a former revelation in any area of our spiritual life. They quote many passages from the Old Testament in illustration of what they are presenting, and sometimes those quotations are from the Ten Commandments. At times the quotations are brief; at other times, more extended. That explains why the precepts of the Ten Commandments are not generally found in exactly the same form or so detailed as in the Old Testament. Why should they need to repeat verbatim? They constantly referred their readers to the Scriptures, which at that time meant the Old Testament, and in the Old Testament could be found the more detailed and explicit statement of the precept to which the apostle made reference.

In the light of these facts there is no point to the contention that the fourth command is not re-enacted in the New Testament.

But to remove the last shadow of plausibility from the objection let it be said in conclusion that the New Testament is not silent regarding the fourth command. On the contrary the references to it are as plentiful as to any other command. Note the following:

1. Our Lord declared, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. Mark, in writing down these words of our Lord years after the cross, felt no necessity to qualify His words with the comment that the Sabbath was made for man only until the cross. In the absence of that comment what would Mark's readers naturally deduce from that statement by Christ? Obviously, that the words of our Lord still stand, and that the Sabbath remains. Yes, the writers of the New Testament were silent at times regarding the Sabbath, but not the kind of silence that the objector refers to.

2. Matthew records what Christ said as to certain things being lawful on the Sabbath day. (Matt. 12:12) Now if the Sabbath law were abolished at the cross, how important that Matthew should add immediately a comment to explain to the early Christians who might read his writings in some far corner of the world, that the whole discussion of the lawfulness of this or that on the Sabbath day is merely a bit of history, for the Sabbath law was abolished shortly after Christ made His statement! In the absence of that comment Matthew's readers would naturally conclude that they should be careful to see that they followed Christ's counsel on the matter of the Sabbath.

3. When Christ described to His disciples the destruction that was to come on Jerusalem, and told them that they were to flee when the Roman armies drew near, He added, "But pray you that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Matt. 24:20. The destruction occurred in AD. 70. For almost forty years they were to pray that they might be spared fleeing on the Sabbath. But if the Sabbath were abolished at the cross, what point would there be in this? The force of this question is so great that some have sought to weaken it by declaring that on the Sabbath the gates of Jerusalem would be shut. But Christ, who knew all the future, knew that in AD. 70 the Jews would go out to battle the Romans on the Sabbath. (See Josephus, Jewish Wars, book 2, chap. 19) Further, the command to flee is addressed to "them which be in Judea." (Matt. 24:16) Judea was not surrounded with walls and gates. Yet they in Judea were to pray that their flight should not be on the Sabbath day! Could evidence be clearer that Christ viewed the Sabbath day as different from other days?

When we read Christ's counsel to His disciples to pray regarding the Sabbath, and when we couple with that His words regarding certain things being lawful on the Sabbath, with both statements being recorded by Matthew decades after the Christian Era had begun, should we not conclude that the Sabbath law is binding for Christians? Matthew says nothing to stop us from drawing this logical conclusion.

It is hard to speak restrainedly of so fantastic a proposition as that the Ten Commandments was abolished at the cross, and then nine of its precepts were later re-enacted. Perhaps some reader, fully persuaded of the folly of such a view, may inquire in bewilderment: Is it really true that the great body of Protestant leaders through the years have believed and taught so incredible a doctrine? The answer is no. The classic position of Protestantism, as we have earlier stated, is that the Ten Commandments is the eternally binding rule of life for all men in all ages, and that only the ceremonial statutes were done away. (See page 493) Those who set forth the Decalogue abolition doctrine, with its re-enactment corollary, have forgotten for the moment the historic Protestant position regarding the Ten Commandments.

(For discussion of one New Testament to the Sabbath that might seem to support the claim that it was Abolished at the cross, see Objection 29)

## Objection 29

**Paul specifically declares, in Colossians 2:14-17, that the Sabbath is abolished.**

The passage reads as follows: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

Under objection 2 we learned that there are two laws, one moral, the other ceremonial, and that it was only the latter that was abolished by Christ. Under objection 11 we learned that Paul, in Colossians 2:14-17, is speaking of the ceremonial law. Under objection 26 we learned that the ceremonial law had certain annual Sabbaths. Hence we may properly conclude that Paul, in the passage before us, is not even referring to the seventh day Sabbath.

If Paul here was referring to the weekly Sabbath of the Ten Commandments, then the only conclusion to reach would be that in the Christian Era there is no weekly holy day of rest. And does Christendom, in general, believe that? No. The sternly enforced Sunday laws of the different Christian lands in all the generations past, provide militant, embarrassing, even shameful, proof that the general belief is that a weekly holy day is proper, right, and Scriptural. And in many instances Sunday advocates have employed as first proof in defense of that belief, the fact that the Ten Commandments commands a weekly holy day. The very fact that they have read "first day of the week" into the command only proves the more eloquently that they believe that the obligation to keep a weekly holy day must be found in the fourth command of the Ten Commandments.

Though Seventh day Adventists have consistently denounced Sunday laws as an infringement of conscience, they have gladly conceded that in general those who enacted these laws acted in good faith, and in harmony with what they thought the Bible commanded. But the Sabbath objector, unless he claims he has just discovered the true meaning of Paul's words that eluded all his Sunday keeping forebears, must charge those forebears with rank hypocrisy and of flying in the face of Scripture, Paul says, "Let no man therefore judge you . . . in respect of an holy day, . . . or of the Sabbath days." But Sunday laws judge men in respect of a holy day, a Sabbath day, and with a vengeance.

NO, Christendom in general has never believed that Paul's declaration wiped out every distinction in days and that in the Christian Era a person may, with complete spiritual immunity, refrain from considering any day holy. True, some theologians, as certain Bible commentaries reveal, have thought they found in Paul's words the justification for turning their back on the seventh day Sabbath, but they have always hastened to add that in the Christian Era we have a new Sabbath. But that is playing fast and loose with Paul's words. He does not even intimate that a new holy day is to be substituted. He speaks only of the abolition of certain holy days. Hence, honest reasoning demands that if we are obligated to keep a holy day in the Christian Era, that obligation must be found in a law that is above and beyond the range of Paul's declaration. And that law is the Ten Commandments, which Paul did not have under discussion in this passage in Colossians.

That Paul was not discussing the Sabbath of the Ten Commandments is freely admitted by some of the best of Bible commentators, and with their comments we close this discussion:

Says the Methodist, Adam Clarke, in comment on Colossians 2:16:

"There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity."

Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, in their comment on this text, note first that the annual Sabbaths "have come to an end with the Jewish services to which they belonged." Then they add immediately:

"The weekly Sabbath rests on a more permanent foundation, having been instituted in Paradise to commemorate the completion of creation in six days."

Albert Barnes, eminent Presbyterian Bible commentator, observes:

"There is no evidence from this passage [Col. 2:16] that he [Paul] would teach that there was no obligation to observe any holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. . . . He had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their

ceremonial and typical law, and not to the moral law, or the Ten Commandments. No part of the moral law-no one of the Ten Commandments could be spoken of as 'a shadow of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal application."

## Objection 30

"The word 'Sabbath' occurs some sixty times in the New Testament. In every case except one, the Adventists admit that the weekly Sabbath is meant. In the one case, however, where the word, in the Greek, is the same (Col. 2:16), they insist that it means something different. Why is this so? Is it not because they know that this one verse . . . completely shatters all their arguments for Sabbath keeping by Christians?"

The eminent Bible commentators quoted at the close of the preceding objection "admit that the weekly Sabbath is in some fifty-nine instances, as reference to their comments on those texts reveals, but they likewise declare that this sixtieth instance deals with the annual Sabbaths! Yet they have no interest in proving anything in behalf of the seventh day Sabbath. We quoted Sunday keeping commentators!

It is no secret that the Greek word translated in the New Testament means simply "rest" and in itself gives no indication as to what kind of rest or what day of rest. The Greek speaking Christians gave the right meaning to the word by the context in which they found it, even as we do with many words. To repeat an illustration earlier given: The word "day" requires a context to make certain the period of time meant. We may mean the light part of the twenty-four hours; we may mean the whole twenty-four hours; or we may mean an indefinite period, as "this is a great day and age we are living in." Now, simply because a writer uses the word "day" fifty-nine times to mean twenty-four hours, provides no proof in itself that his sixtieth use of the word must mean the same time period! Context must decide. If a writer, for example, said that "the day ended as the western horizon glowed red with the reflected light of a setting Sun." The context of red sky and setting sun would be sufficient to determine that he was not using the word "day" to mean twenty-four hours, but only the daylight part of it. The writer's fifty-nine or five hundred and fifty-nine previous uses of the word to mean twenty-four hours would not affect our conclusion that here was an instance where only the daylight part of the day was meant.

Actually the facts in the case before us call for the very opposite conclusion from that which the Sabbath opposer seeks to establish. He admits that some fifty-nine other references to "Sabbath- in the New Testament speak of the seventh day Sabbath. None of these references even suggest that the Sabbath had lost, was in process of losing, or was going to lose any of the sanctity that had thus far distinguished it. Hence, if the New Testament teaches Sabbath abolition, that teaching must be found in this lone sixtieth reference.

We do not recall at the moment that anyone has seriously attempted to find a reason for Sabbath abolition in any of the other fifty-nine references. Sabbath opposers confine themselves to this sixtieth reference to "Sabbath" in Colossians 2:16 and frankly rely on "this one verse" "completely" to shatter all the Adventist "arguments for Sabbath keeping by Christians."

That is a very great weight to place on one text, but it is enlightening to know that the discussion of the word "Sabbath" in the New Testament can be narrowed down to this. If this text does really thus teach Sabbath abolition, what a shock must have come to the Christian believers scattered over the Roman Empire as the Colossian letter slowly made its way, in the form of handwritten duplicates, to the different churches. We might imagine their saying something on this order: 'We have read the Scriptures from Moses to Malachi, and we find there a command to keep holy the seventh day Sabbath of the Ten Commandments. We have read numerous references to the Sabbath in the writings of the apostles, but they have given no hint that the Sabbath was abolished at the cross. Why have they failed to do this in all their fifty-nine references to it?"

But would those early Christians have found it necessary to raise such a question? No. They had read in the writings of the apostles that the ceremonial rites and services of the Jews were abolished by Christ, and they knew, as almost anyone in the Roman Empire knew, that those services included regulations of meats and drinks and various feasts, new moons, and annual Sabbaths.

Therefore, when they read in the Colossian letter that the ritual of meats and drinks, new moons, Sabbaths, et cetera, was abolished what would they naturally conclude, in view of the context, were the Sabbaths Paul meant? Honestly, now, what would be their conclusion? The same conclusion we would reach after we had read in a book fifty-nine references to "day" as meaning twenty four hours, and then read the sixtieth reference to "day" in the context of red sky and setting sun. They would conclude that a different time period was meant, that Paul was speaking of annual Sabbaths.

## Objection 31

**Many who were converted to Christianity in apostolic times came out of heathenism and lived in countries where Sabbath keeping was unknown. "It would have been necessary to enjoin them as to the particular day they should observe. But the New Testament is absolutely silent on the point." If the Sabbath is still in force, why was it not mentioned in Christ's reply to the rich young ruler (Matt. 19:17-27), or in the gospel commission (Matt. 28:19), or on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), or in the decision of the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15)?**

This is simply a variant form of a claim made in connection with a number of objections. The churchman who in false zeal opposes the Sabbath, also generally believes most ardently that the first day of the week holds a spiritually unique place in the week. He sees vast import in the fact that the New Testament writers nowhere reissue a command in behalf of the Sabbath. But he sees nothing impressive or damaging in the fact that both the Old and the New Testament writers are silent about a command in behalf of Sunday. The complete silence of all the Scriptures concerning a Sunday command sounds more impressive to him in behalf of Sunday than the awesome thunder of Sinai, echoing down through tile pages of Holy Writ, sounds in behalf of the Sabbath. One is almost tempted to believe that the objector's repeated insistence that the New Testament issues no new command for the Sabbath is for the purpose of drawing attention away from the fact that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is completely silent about a command for Sunday.

But what about those converts from heathenism who needed instruction as to a weekly holy day? Undoubtedly they did need instruction. Hence if Sunday were the day to keep holy, where is the record of apostolic instruction on it? Except for 1 Corinthians 16:1-3, which instructs the Corinthians to lay by some funds on the first day of the week for a future offering for the poor at Jerusalem, there is no suggestion as to anything of arty kind, secular or religious, that the apostles ever asked arty Christian church to do or not to do on the first day of the week. (See under Objection 42 for a discussion of 1 Corinthians 16:1-3) This is strange indeed. No command, no instruction. One searches the New Testament in vain, not simply for a Sunday command, but for any formula of service, any suggestion of holiness to the day, any counsel on the proper program of living for that day. The point bears repeating: The churches raised up among the heathen would never have stumbled onto the idea of Sunday sacredness in any form from reading what the apostles wrote.

But what of the seventh day Sabbath? They would have read fifty-nine references to it, and those references pictured it as the weekly day of worship, when Paul and others might most often have preached. They would have read Luke's description of it as "the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. Most of these fifty-nine references are almost casual; that is, they take for granted that their hearers are conversant with the Sabbath. But how would those Christian converts from heathenism have been conversant with the Sabbath unless they had been instructed concerning it?

Paul said near the close of his ministry that he had preached none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." Acts 26:22. In that he followed the course outlined by our resurrected Lord who, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets," expounded "in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke 24:27. The disciples who thus listened saw there the pattern for their preaching. The Scriptures they expounded, of course, were what we call the Old Testament.

Now, in order for Paul or the other apostles to teach the Old Testament, they would need to carry it with them. And as they won converts would they do less than exhort them to read those Scriptures? This conclusion is irresistible. Christianity has always been the religion of the Book, a revealed religion. We need hardly add that when those converts read the Scriptures they would certainly find the Sabbath right in the heart of the Ten Commandments. Therefore they would most certainly know of it and would understand the fifty-nine references to it in the New Testament. Why should the apostles need to reissue a Sabbath command? In the light of all this the argument based on the silence of the New Testament in the matter of a new command becomes pointless.

But in view of the fact that the converts from heathenism would naturally conclude from the Scriptures that the Sabbath should be kept holy, how strange is the silence of the apostles about the matter of the abolition of it, if as the Sabbath objector contends, they actually did preach its abolition.

Paul told the elders of the church of Ephesus that he had "kept back nothing that was profitable." Acts 20:20. But where in his letter to the Ephesians does he inform them that the seventh day Sabbath of the Ten Commandments is abolished? He does speak of the abolition of certain "commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. 2:15. But we have found that he was not speaking of the Ten Commandments. (See under Objection 11.) He "kept back nothing that was profitable" to any church he raised up. But in all the letters he wrote to those churches there is only one reference in one letter to the abolition of certain "Sabbath days," and we have found that he was there speaking of annual Sabbaths. (See under Objection 29)

We do find Paul's writings bristling with discussions of the ceremonial ritual that God gave to Israel at Sinai. The heart of the controversy between him and the Judaizing leaders was the rite of circumcision. He declared repeatedly that circumcision was not needful, that it was done away in the Christian Era. Because of this Jewish mobs tried to kill him.

Lay alongside this the fact that the Jews were perhaps even more fanatically attached to the Sabbath than they were to circumcision. They were ready to kill Christ simply because He healed a man on the Sabbath.

Hence, if Paul or the other apostles had gone about declaring that the Sabbath was abolished, even as they declared that circumcision was, would not a furor have been raised, and would not something of that furor have echoed through the pages of the New Testament, even as the circumcision controversy did? But we look in vain for it. Of the total of some sixty times that the word "Sabbath" is used in the New Testament, only one, we repeat, declares that certain "Sabbath days" are abolished. And the only instances where the word "Sabbath" is used in the setting of controversy are those in the Gospels, where Christ sought, not to show that the Sabbath was abolished, but to show what was "lawful" to do on that day. Again we see that the silence of the apostles, instead of being an argument against the Sabbath, is rather a powerful argument that the apostles never spoke against it.

In the light of these facts it is hardly necessary to examine in any detail the specific texts cited in the objection. We are supposed to conclude that because the Sabbath command is not mentioned in these texts, therefore it is not in force in the Christian Era. By the same logic we should therefore conclude that if any other of the Ten Commandments are not mentioned in these texts, they likewise are not in force. In Matthew 19:17-27 the commandment against idolatry, for example, is not mentioned. Shall we conclude that it is no longer binding? In the gospel commission, Matthew 28:19, none of the commandments are mentioned. On the day of Pentecost Peter preached a great sermon, Acts 2:14-40, but he mentions none of the commandments. At the Jerusalem council the apostles gave this order: "That you abstain from meats offered to idols and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if you keep yourselves, you shall do well. Fare you well." Acts 15:29. Not many commandments mentioned here either.

Now the Sabbath objector agrees that nine of the Ten Commandments are binding in the Christian Era, even though he cannot find those nine all listed in these texts. Why may not we be permitted to believe that the fourth is also binding, even though it is not mentioned in these texts?

## **Objection 32**

**If Paul were living, he would offer the same condemnation of Seventh day Adventists that he did of the Galatians. (See Gal. 4:9,10.)**

The passage in Galatians reads as follows: "But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto you desire again to be in bondage? You observe days, and months, and times, and years."

We have earlier found (under Objection 7) that the yoke of bondage was the endless series of ceremonial rites, particularly in view of the fact that those rites had been heavily encrusted with rabbinical refinements and additions. It is evident that Paul is not here speaking of the moral law, for it deals only with one day, the seventh day Sabbath. He must be speaking of the ceremonial law, for only there do we find commands on how to "observe days, and months, and times, and years."

How could Paul possibly say that the seventh day Sabbath was one of "the weak and beggarly elements," and that the keeping of it would bring men into "bondage"? Paul was the man who instructed Timothy that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3:16. Therefore Paul would be guided in his appraisal of the Sabbath by the prophets' appraisal of it. Isaiah, for example, declares that the Lord calls the Sabbath "my holy day," and then appeals to us to call it "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." Isa. 58:13.

Christ died on the cross to redeem men from sin and to sanctify them, to blot out from this world everything that relates to sin, and to restore this world to its original Edenic glory. But why would Christ seek to abolish the Sabbath, which came forth blessed and sanctified from God's hand in the sinless beauty of Eden, was held before God's people as the sign of His sanctifying power, was commended to the "soils of the stranger" (Isa. 56:6), as well as to the Jews, and will be kept in Eden restored? Sabbath objectors make no serious attempt to face squarely this question.

There is another question we would ask: If Paul would indict those who keep the Sabbath, why would he not also indict those who keep Sunday? Is there not as much the keeping of a day in the one case as in the other?

But let us take the matter a little further. Paul's indictment is against those who "observe" a variety of days and seasons, and so on. Seventh day Adventists are marked by the fact that they do not observe a variety of holy days or seasons, for example, Good Friday or Easter, though we attach vast significance to the death and resurrection of our Lord. We keep only one day holy. Plainly Paul would not indict us along with the Galatians.

We wonder, however, what he might say if he could speak today to the Sunday keeping world that is giving ever-increasing attention to a variety of religious days and seasons. One current Protestant paper, under the title "The Increasing Observing of Lent," remarks: "Lent has a most important place in the calendar of the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, the Episcopalian, and the Lutheran Churches," and then goes on to add that "in our churches there is an increasing acknowledgment of Lent." Another Protestant paper is not content simply to promote the observance of Sunday, Good Friday, Easter, Christmas, and Lent, but wishes to add another. It regrets that "Ascension Day has not bulked more largely in Christian thought and the calendar of the churches." The editorial states what it believes the observance of Christmas has done for men, and likewise the observance of Easter and other days, and goes on from this to argue that the observance of Ascension Day would further enrich the spiritual life of Christians.

This is the same kind of reasoning that governed the theologians of the Middle Ages when they were adding one holy day after another, and building the structure of the Catholic Church that is so sweepingly indicted by God's prophets. But we are not quoting from a medieval Catholic writer but from an editorial in a twentieth-century Protestant paper, the Christian Statesman. This is the official organ of the National Reform Association, which so earnestly strives to obtain rigid Sunday laws throughout the whole United States, and which declares that it speaks for a great percentage of the Protestant bodies of the country! If Paul's words have a present-day application, we leave the unbiased reader to judge as to which group would be indicted, Seventh day Adventists or the great Sunday keeping Protestant bodies? In view of the fact that Adventists are often considered defective in their Christianity because they do not observe Good Friday, Easter, the Lenten season, or any special days or seasons, we would ask: Why should Adventists be indicted for failing to observe a variety of days and seasons, and at the same time be indicted by Paul as being guilty of that very thing?

## **Objection 33**

**The Old Testament prophets foretold that the time was coming when the Sabbath would be done away. (See, for example, Hosea 2:11) In Amos 8:5 the question is asked, "When will the Sabbath be gone?" The prophet answers that this would take place when the sun went down at noon and the earth was darkened in a clear day. (Amos 8:9.) The earth was thus darkened when Jesus was crucified. Hence the Sabbath came to an end at the cross.**

To the credit of Sunday advocates it should be said at the outset that this objection is not frequently presented against the Sabbath. Hosea 2:11 reads as follows: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Place alongside this the

word of the Lord through Isaiah: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? Says the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When you come to appear before me, who bath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when you spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when you make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil. . . . If you be willing and obedient, you shall eat the good of the land." Isa. 1: 11- 19.

Here is a picture of back sliding Israel given over to idolatry and every evil, yet observing the forms of the ritual of days and seasons given to them at Sinai. Thus they made mockery of divinely ordained services. In return God declared that fearful judgments were to come upon them. No more would they engage in a round of services; no more would mirth or the sound of gladness be heard in the land. The very "trees" and "vines" were to be destroyed. (Hosea 2:12) God would shut His eyes from seeing them and His ears from hearing them.

And when were these fearful prophecies uttered? Well in advance of the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, with its capital in Samaria, and the taking into Babylonian captivity of the kingdom of Judah, with its capital at Jerusalem. In that fearful destruction and captivity Bible commentators find adequate fulfillment of these prophecies. But these judgments came on Judah and Israel several centuries before the cross. Thus the Sabbath objector would have the Sabbath ending more than half a millennium too soon to fit his theory that at the cross the Sabbath ended and Sunday took its place.

Not the abolition of the Sabbath, or of any religious service for that matter, is foretold by these texts, but rather the abolition of a rebellious nation.

Now, what of the question asked in Amos 8:5? The passage, including the immediately preceding verse, reads thus: "Hear this, O you that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? And the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit?"

Nothing was allowed to be sold on the Sabbath. Greedy, godless merchants desired to take up their traffic as soon as possible again. So they inquired as to when the Sabbath would be gone. To say that such a question is directed toward the prophet Amos or that the questioners desire to know when the Sabbath will be abolished, is to say something patently without foundation and contrary to the evident facts.

And what of the claim that Amos predicted the darkening of the sky at the crucifixion of Christ? Immediately after he has described the greed and iniquity of the Israelites, Amos tells of the judgments that are to come on them: 'And it shall come to pass in that day, says the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the dear day: and I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation.' Verses 9, 10.

Let Amos interpret his own words. Three chapters earlier he discusses these same judgments and says, "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? The day of the Lord is darkness, and not light. . . . Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? Even very dark, and no brightness in it? I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies." "Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, says the Lord, whose name is The God of hosts." Amos 5: 18-21, 27.

It is evident that this darkening of the sun was a synonym for the blackness of God's judgment, and the sun's going down at noon on a clear day, a figurative way of describing the suddenness and unexpectedness of that awful judgment. And this judgment, this sudden blackness, that was to envelop Israel was their being led "into captivity beyond Damascus." That judgment fell on the

kingdom of Israel about seven hundred years before the cross.

When Nehemiah, long afterward, gathered a remnant of the Israelites that had been taken captive into Babylon, and sought to restore Jerusalem, one of the things he endeavored most valiantly to do was to revive the true keeping of the Sabbath. (See Neh. 13:15-22)

## Objection 34

The psalmist prophesied that there would be a new day of worship. (See Ps. 118:22-24.) The "day" mentioned in Psalms 118:24 can refer only to Sunday, the day on which Christ became the headstone of the corner.

Psalms 118:22-24 reads as follows: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

The objector's line of reasoning is this: (1) Christ became "the head stone of the corner" by the act of rising from the grave. (2) He rose on Sunday. (3) The statement, "This is the day which the Lord bath made," applies to a twenty-four-hour day, and the day referred to is Sunday. (4) Therefore, "we will rejoice and be glad" on Sunday by keeping it as God's holy day.

But nowhere does the Bible say that Christ became the "head stone of the corner" by the act of rising from the dead. In the New Testament, Christ is frequently referred to as "the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2:20; 1 Peter 2:6) and as "the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1: 18). But these references do not narrow down to any one act of Christ's life, or to any moment of time, His acquiring of this title of headship. The context of Colossians 1:18 would indicate that if any one act is focused upon, it is the death of Christ, which occurred on the sixth day of the week.

It is true that the reference to Christ as "the head over all things to the church," in Ephesians 1:22, is found in a context that mentions the resurrection of Christ. But a reading of the context from verse 18 to verse 23 shows that Paul is discussing a whole series of important events in connection with Christ, events which are given in sequence, with no warrant for concluding that they are to be understood as having occurred on the same day. We read that God (a) "raised him from the dead," (b) "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places," (c) "put all things under his feet," and (d) "gave him to be the head over all things to the church."

An examination of Paul's further writings indicates clearly that Christ's sitting at God's "right hand" is in His capacity as our High Priest: "We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Heb. 8:1, 2. Certainly Christ did not enter on His work of ministry that Sunday morning He rose. He was with His disciples on earth for forty days after His resurrection..

Further, the phrase, "put all things under his feet," brings to our mind another passage of Paul's, in which he says of Christ: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. 10:12, 13.

Without taking the matter further, it is evident that Paul's statement in Ephesians 1:22, concerning Christ's headship of the church, does not warrant the conclusion that the acquiring of His headship took place on the Sunday of the resurrection. On the contrary, the related passages in Hebrews would rather indicate it involved a sequence of events over a period of time.

Sometimes another text is quoted by the advocates of this Sunday theory who seek to prove that Christ became the chief cornerstone precisely on the first day of the week, the resurrection Sunday. That text reads, "Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Rom. 1:3,4. That passage parallels the one in Ephesians that we have just analyzed, particularly Ephesians 1: 19,20. Hence it gives no further proof in support of the theory.

Any theory that depends for its strength on focusing everything on one act of Christ's life, to the exclusion of all other acts, may rightly be viewed with suspicion. Christ's great plan for the salvation of man depends on a whole series of momentous events. The incarnation was an event of vast significance; without it there would have been no plan of salvation. The crucifixion holds a similar position, for without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. The resurrection is likewise of vast importance; for if Christ is not raised, then we who die in Christ must perish. Finally, the Second Advent is imperative to the success of the plan of salvation; for it is then that Christ comes "without sin unto salvation" to fulfill His promise "that where I am, there you may be also." (Heb. 9:28; John 14:3) It is then that He becomes King of kings and Lord of lords and sees all His enemies put down under His feet.

Only the tremendous urge to load the first day of the week with sufficient sanctity to command reverence for it can explain the theological reasoning of those who seek to convey the impression that everything of significance for the salvation of man occurred on the resurrection morning. The Bible conveys no such impression. True, the Scriptures give profound meaning to the

opened tomb; but they also give similar meaning to Bethlehem's manger, Calvary's cross, and the rolling back of the heavens at the last day to reveal the face of our Lord.

So much for the part of the argument that would narrow down the fulfillment of Psalms 118:22 to a certain twenty-four-hour day, the resurrection day. Let us now inquire as to what the Psalmist meant when he said, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; We will rejoice and be glad in it."

An examination of the verses that immediately precede and allow the passage under consideration reveals that the psalmist is here concerned with the broad subject of salvation. Verse 21 reads thus, "I will praise thee: for thou has heard me, and art become my salvation." Verse 25 reads, "Save now, I beseech thee, O Lord: O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity."

Compare with this the New Testament comment by Peter: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other." Acts 4:11, 12.

The natural conclusion, therefore, concerning the statement, "This is the day which the Lord hath made," is that the psalmist is speaking of the day of salvation that would be ushered in most definitely by the Advent of our Lord as the Savior of men. The Bible frequently uses the word "day" to describe an indefinite period of time. For example, we read of the "day of the Lord, the "day of judgment." We know these cover very much more than a twenty-four-hour period. Likewise, the Bible speaks of the "day of salvation." In Isaiah's prophetic writings we read, "Thus says the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee." Isa. 49:8.

Note, now, Paul's comment on this prophetic declaration as he addresses the church at Corinth. After quoting a portion of Isaiah 49:8, the apostle affirms, "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." 2 Cor. 6:2. According to the apostle Paul, the "day of salvation," of which the prophets had written, was "now," when he was writing to the church at Corinth, many years after the day of the resurrection. It is evident that he understood the "day" to refer to the whole period of God's grace, which was to continue on until the close of man's probation.

In a discussion with the unbelieving Jews, Christ spoke of those who were the servants of sin, and of how they could be saved from sin: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." John 8:36. The Jews did not understand this divine plan of salvation, and scornfully declared that they were Abraham's children and were never in bondage to anyone. Then Christ replied, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." Verse 56. Abraham, with prophetic eye, looked forward to the very time when Christ would stand before men to offer salvation to them, and Abraham "rejoiced." Quite evidently the "day of salvation" began before the resurrection.

Now let us view together the statement by the psalmist and the statement concerning Abraham, remembering that the psalmist and our spiritual father Abraham both looked forward to the coming of the Messiah:

"This is the day which the Lord bath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Ps. 118:24.

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." John 8:56.

The parallel is perfect. We need not search further to discover the meaning of the psalmist's words.

As stated in the opening paragraph, some earnest Sunday advocates, hard pressed for a Bible command to keep holy the first day of the week, fasten on this passage in the Psalms, and declare that the Bible commands us to "rejoice and be glad" on Sunday. The Bible reveals that Abraham "rejoiced" and "was glad" in relation to the "day" of which the psalmist spoke. Is there any Sunday advocate so courageous as to affirm that Abraham kept Sunday? What more need be said?

## Objection 35

Noted astronomers have discovered that our world is twenty-four hours behind the rest of the universe in point of time. The Bible record of Joshua's long day-twenty-three hours and twenty minutes-and of the turning back of the sun forty minutes in Hezekiah's day, accounts for this twenty-four hours. Hence both Jews and Seventh day Adventists are wrong about the time of the Sabbath. Our blessed Lord brought the Sabbath and the first day of the week together, merging them into the glorious day on which He arose from the dead, the day we celebrate as the Sabbath.

Briefly, the answer to this remarkable objection is as follows:

1. It Proves too much, which is the most fatal weakness of any piece of reasoning. According to it the Sabbath and Sunday were merged long before the resurrection. They were virtually merged at the time of Joshua, with a forty-minute refinement at the time of Hezekiah. That is another way of saying that the Jews actually kept Sunday. And if that be so, then certainly most Christians today are not keeping either the Sabbath or Sunday, for they are keeping the day that follows immediately after the day held sacred by Jews.

2. Is it reasonable to believe that God would answer the prayer of His servant Joshua in such a manner as to confuse the reckoning of time so that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to give obedience to the Sabbath law? Sunday keepers today ring the changes on what they describe as the legalistic quality of the Jewish dispensation, declaring that everything was governed then by rigid law in contrast to our present period of grace. And they never fail to remind us that the Sabbath law was so exacting in those times that a man could be put to death for breaking that law. But now, behold, we are asked to conclude that Moses had scarcely gone to his rest before the Lord worked a miracle through Joshua that broke the cycle of time and certainly gave to the Sabbath an elasticity that has never revealed itself in the Christian Era. At least no one has ever claimed that the sun has been made to stand still in the Christian age.

We read of Nehemiah's holy jealousy for God's day that led him to close the gates of Jerusalem as it began to grow dark on the eve of the Sabbath. What a fine opportunity that would have been for his opponents to remind him that only a short while before, in the days of Hezekiah, there was a difference of forty minutes in the arrival of the Sabbath, and that therefore it was quite an elastic affair anyway, and no one should be exercised about the matter. But we find no record of anything like this occurring in the dispute between Nehemiah and those who were breaking the Sabbath. We do find references there and elsewhere throughout the Old Testament that discuss the divine obligation of the Sabbath and the penalties that would descend upon the disobedient. Neither Nehemiah nor any other of the inspired writers were aware of shifting time. Their messages all breathe the conviction that the Sabbath is a fixed day, the reckoning of which can be easily computed, so definite indeed that the guilty have no excuse, and should justly suffer dire punishment.

3. The closing verses of the twenty-third chapter of Luke and the opening verse of the twenty-fourth chapter forever settle the question of the relationship of a certain day to the Sabbath command. Christians generally are in agreement that Christ was crucified on Friday, and that He rose on Sunday. The day in between is described as "the Sabbath day according to the commandment." The language is simple and explicit. Anyone who reads the Sabbath commandment and wishes to free himself from all uncertainties of the theological discussion has only to read this passage in Luke.

We need not be astronomers, we need not have a knowledge of all past time, or be able to settle all the dark questions about chronology, in order to be clear concerning the Sabbath commandment. Luke, who along with the other Gospel writers gave us the inspired record of the Savior on which our Christian religion depends, informs us that there is a certain day which is "the Sabbath day according to the commandment." It is the day following this that Sunday keepers revere. Luke knew nothing about a merging of days because of Joshua and Hezekiah. The day that Christ lay in the grave is "the Sabbath day according to the commandment," and the next day is described simply as "the first day of the week."

4. However, someone may inquire at this point, "But what are you going to do about the Bible record concerning Joshua and Hezekiah?" We don't believe we need to do anything about the record. We are very willing to let it stand, and we believe it. We insist only that all the rest of the record in the Bible also be permitted to stand, such as the references that have been cited. The Bible is always its own best interpreter. If, despite amazing and baffling miracles, we still find God's prophets commanding obedience to a definite holy day, and Luke informing us that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath day according to the commandment, then we are in no darkness whatever as to how to give explicit obedience to God's command. The shadow on Hezekiah's sundial was never intended to

cast a shadow on the Sabbath, nor did God work a bright miracle to help an ancient warrior in fighting the battles of the Lord so that modern warriors might find weapons to aid them in their fight against God's Sabbath command. What an irony if the additional light given on that eventful day of battle long ago should throw darkness ever afterward on the Sabbath, indeed, should give us neither a definitely defined Sabbath day nor a clear-cut Sunday, but something that was forty minutes from being either until Hezekiah's day.

5. It is always a favorite strategy in debate to claim that eminent scientists are on your side. Perhaps some astronomer has worked out certain cycles back through the millenniums that lead him to conclude there is a difference of twenty-four hours in time between our world and the rest of the universe. We say "perhaps," for we have never heard of such a discovery. But what of it? We do not have to travel into interstellar space to find a difference in reckoning. We can cross the Pacific and find a difference of twenty-four hours. Yet no matter on what side of the Pacific a man lives, there seems to be no difficulty in keeping the accurate reckoning of time down through the centuries. In fact, Sunday keepers in Australia are just as certain that they are keeping the correct first day of the week in cycles of seven from the resurrection day as are those in the mother country, England. Indeed, in both countries the certainty is so great that Sunday laws have been enacted to enforce observance of the day. It is bad enough for Sabbath opponents to attempt to lose the seventh day Sabbath by traveling around the world, though they never lose Sunday, but what is to be said for the man who seeks to carry us into the uncharted reaches of interstellar space in order to lose God's holy day?

However, we would say right here that for anyone to make a sweeping claim as to the exact relationship in time of our solar system to all the rest of the universe is to make a claim that cannot be substantiated.

6. Finally, it should be remembered that the Bible way of reckoning days is from sunset to sunset. Therefore, the lengthening out of the day in some miraculous way in Joshua's time would not break the cycle of seven in counting days according to Bible reckoning. After all, we are dealing with a Bible institution and not with a question of chronometers or stop watches or even astronomers. We need not explore the mystery of the long day in Joshua's time in order to be sure that we keep the correct time in relation to God's holy Sabbath day.

## Objection 36

The Sabbath day is abolished, because Paul says that it is all right to consider every day alike in the Christian Era. (See Rom. 14:5.)

Let us give, first, the passage mentioned, in its context: "Him that is weak in the faith receive you, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believes that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eats herbs. Let not him that eats despise him that eats not; and let not him which eats not judge him that eats: for God has received him. Who art thou that judges another man's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. Yet, he shall be held up: for God is able to make him stand. One man esteems one day above another: another esteems every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regards the day, regards it unto the Lord; and he that regards not the day, to the Lord he does not regard it. He that eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; and he that eats not, to the Lord he eats not, and gives God thanks." Rom. 14:1-6.

Further in the chapter Paul refers to the matter of drink as well as food. (See verses 17, 21)

Here is a discussion of meats and drinks and various holy days, and Paul's counsel is that no believer should "judge" any other believer in such matters. How strikingly similar is all this to Paul's counsel to the Colossians: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Col. 2:16. But we found (objection 29) that Paul was speaking to the Colossians about the ceremonial law, which dealt with meats and drinks and a variety of holy days, and not at all with the moral law and its seventh day Sabbath.

But let us look a little more closely at the passage in Romans: "Him that is weak in the faith." What faith? The faith of the gospel of Christ, which teaches that we receive pardon from all our sins and acceptance by our Lord without the works of the law. Some coming in from Jewry, who had long been immersed in the ritual of the ceremonial law, seemed not to have a faith quite strong enough at the outset to grasp fully the truth that we are saved wholly by the grace of God, without any good deed on our part. Others who had stronger faith, or who were Gentiles, and thus never devotees of the ceremonial law, were tempted to judge critically those whose faith was weak and who thus continued to make certain ceremonial distinctions in meats and drinks and holy days. Paul counseled against this critical attitude.

The crux of the passage, of course, is this statement: "One man esteems one day above another: another esteems every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And the key phrase is, "every day alike." The reasoning of the Sabbath objector might be summarized thus: Does not "every day" mean all seven days in the week? And if a believer considers all days "alike," does not that mean he attaches no special sacredness to any day? And does not Paul rebuke those who would pass critical judgment on the believers who thus viewed -every day alike"?

The reader has doubtless noted that some words in the Bible are italicized. The word "alike" is one such word. Now, the italicizing of a word indicates that it is not a translation of a word written by the Bible writer, but a word supplied by the translator in his endeavor best to express what he thinks is the meaning of the original writing. This is done in all translations and is inevitable. The scrupulously conscientious Bible translators indicated the instances when they thus supplied a word to round out what they considered was the thought in a text. We have no way of knowing whether Paul, if he were alive and could speak to us in English, would use the word "alike" to round out his sentence. Hence, the very fact that no argument can rightly be built on the single word "alike" reduces at once a great part of the plausibility of the objector's series of questions.

But he will probably still inquire confidently: Does not "every day" mean all seven days in the week? And he may add for good measure: Do not the Scriptures mean just what they say? What he forgets is that though the Bible writers were inspired, they used human language to convey their heavenly instruction. And human language is a very inexact and constantly changing medium for expressing thoughts. We must remember also that all languages have idioms, those singular combinations of words that often defy translation. For example, we may say in colloquial English that certain facts "center around this point." But how can they both "center" and yet be "around"? We understand perfectly what is meant, but we also admit that strictly speaking we cannot make sense out of the phrase if we look at each word separately.

Christ told His disciples that He would "be killed, and after three days rise again." Mark 8:31. The Sabbath objector might plausibly ask: Does not "after three days" mean just that? In other words, does it not mean at least the fourth day, or perhaps later? But wait The Bible also informs us that Christ told His disciples that He must "be killed, and be raised again the third day." Matt. 16:21. Why should not the Sabbath objector now ask: Does not the third day" mean just that? Only as we concede that the phrase after three days" was an ancient Jewish idiom that meant to them the equivalent of "third day"

can we harmonize the two passages.

Now to borrow our English idiom, the question before us centers around this point of the proper understanding of a Bible phrase. If we carefully compare scripture with scripture, both as to constructions of phrases and as to doctrines taught, we shall have no more trouble over the Bible's literary forms than over those in any other book.

To the Sabbath objector who insists that "every day" in Romans means all the days of the week, we would direct this question: Does the phrase "every day" in Exodus mean all the days of the week? In Exodus 16 is the record of the giving of the manna. The Lord through Moses instructed the Israelites to "go

out and gather a certain rate every day." Verse 4. But when the sixth day came they were told to gather a double portion, because on the seventh day they would find none in the field. (Verses 22-26) But some forgot, or were unmindful, and went out to gather on the seventh day. For this God rebuked them, "How long refuse you to keep my commandments and my laws?" Verses 27, 28. There is no record that any Israelite replied, "Every day" means every day in the week, and therefore I thought it proper to consider the seventh day just like every other day. Evidently they had not heard of the modern "every day" argument against the Sabbath!

Exodus 16:14 clearly reveals that the word "every" may be understood to have a qualified meaning at times in the Bible. We must read the context and compare scripture with scripture to discover whether there are possible qualifications. The same is true of the word "all." Paul said, "All things are lawful unto me." 1 Cor. 6:12. A libertine, who isolated that statement from all other scripture, might possibly seek to prove thereby that his wastrel life and scandalous deeds were altogether "lawful." But we protest that Paul's statement shall be kept in the context of all scripture. And when we do so we have no trouble with the passage. We understand it to-mean that Paul considered that all things within the scope of God's holy law, and the Christian practices of life growing out of it, were lawful to him. It was needful for him to make the all-embracing statement in order to give greatest force to the qualifying words that immediately followed: "But all things are not expedient."

If we view Paul's words in Romans in terms of these simple rules of Bible study, we shall see their true meaning. "Every day" meant every one of the days that were regarded as holy under the ceremonial law, which is the law obviously under discussion here. Why should Paul need to interject that he did not mean to include the seventh day, when the seventh day Sabbath was not part of the controversy before him. Nowhere in all Paul's writings is the seventh day Sabbath the subject of controversy!

We close with a comment on Romans 14:5 by two commentators. First from the Methodist commentator Adam Clarke:

"Perhaps the word hemera, day, is here taken for time, festival, and such like, in which sense it is frequently used. Reference is made here to the Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals; such as the Passover, Pentecost, feast of tabernacles, new moons, jubilee, ec. . . . The converted Gentile esteems every day-considering that all time is the Lord's, and that each day should be devoted to the glory of God; and that those festivals are not binding on him.

"We [the translators] add here alike, and make the text say what I am sure was never intended, viz. that there is no distinction of days not even of the Sabbath. And that every Christian is at liberty to consider even this day to be holy or not holy, as he happens to be persuaded in his own mind."

Second, from the commentary by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown so highly regarded in Fundamentalist circles:

'From this passage about the observance of days, ALFORD unhappily infers that such language could not have been used if the Sabbath law, had been in force under the Gospel in any form. Certainly it could not, if the Sabbath were merely one of the Jewish festival days: But it will not do to take this for granted merely because it was observed under the Mosaic economy. And certainly if the Sabbath was more ancient than Judaism; if, even under Judaism, it was enshrined amongst the eternal sanctities of the Ten Commandments, uttered, as no other parts of Judaism were, amidst the terrors of Sinai. And if the Lawgiver Himself said of it when on earth, 'The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day' (see Mark 2:28). It will be hard to show that the apostle must have meant it to be ranked by his readers amongst those vanished Jewish festival days, which only 'weakness' could imagine to be still in force, a weakness which those who had more light ought, out of love, merely to bear with.'

If the Sabbath objector still demurs at the thought of letting words and phrases be understood in certain

contexts and according to current usage, we would ask him this question in closing. Do you understand the phrase, "every day clothes" to mean clothes worn every day in the week, that is, all seven days of the week? If not, why seek to build an anti-Sabbath argument out of "every day" in Romans 14:5?

## Objection 37

The days of creation were not literal, twenty-four-hour days, but long indefinite periods, millions of years in length. Therefore Seventh day Adventists are not warranted in using the creation story of Genesis 1 as an argument for the holiness of the literal seventh day of the weekly cycle.

If the person setting forth this view is an evolutionist, and thus does not believe that Genesis gives a dependable historical record, there is no point in our trying to provide here an answer. We would need, first, to compass the wide question of the truth of evolution and the dependability of the Bible, and that would carry us far beyond the compass of this book. But such reasoning is sometimes presented by Christian people who believe the Bible. To such, we direct our answer.

The way the matter is stated one might think that Adventists, late in earth's history, thought they discovered a valid connection between creation week and the specific seventh day Sabbath. The facts are that we found that connection by reading the straightforward narrative in Genesis and the simple declaration of the fourth commandment. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20: 11.

Certainly when God spoke those words to Israel they understood Him to mean that the seventh day of the weekly cycle had been blessed, for it was that particular day in the cycle they were called upon to honor. Indeed, there would have been no point to the command that they should work six days and keep the seventh day of the week, in memory of creation, if creation had not taken place on that same pattern-six days God labored and the seventh day He rested. To make the days of creation long periods is to spoil the parallel that God, not the Adventists, set up between the creation incidents and the weekly cycle of human activity and rest.

This Sabbath objection goes too far. No matter how hard most Sunday advocates seek to prove that the Sabbath is not binding in the Christian Era, they quite uniformly agree that it was binding in the days before Christ. But the objection before us, if true, could have been used by all the good men before the first advent, and hence there would have been no seventh day Sabbath in all earth's history!

How anyone who accepts the Bible record as true history could think of the creation days as long, indefinite periods, millions of years in length, we cannot understand. Adam was created on the sixth day. He lived only 930 years. Long before those years were totaled he had been driven from the Garden of Eden, and in his sinful state had reared a family. According to the objection, Adam must have lived his whole life within the span of that sixth day, for 930 is but a small segment of a period that is measured in millions of years. But when God had rested the seventh day and looked back over the week, He blessed that day as a climax to a perfect work. Therefore, no sin had yet entered to mar the earth. How, then, could Adam, who lived sinlessly at least beyond the end of creation week, have lived a grand total of only 930 years, when he had to live through a fraction of the sixth and all of the seventh day of creation, and yet those days were millions of years long?

The whole creation account is written as a simple narrative. There is nothing in the record to suggest that words should not be understood in their ordinary meanings. To each day of that first week there is "the evening and the morning." Indeed, that is how each day is marked off. But "evening" and "morning" belong to twenty-four-hour days, not to long, indefinite periods i' of millions of years.

On the third day grass, herbs, trees, and other vegetation were brought forth. Now these all require sunlight if they are to thrive. According to the creation narrative the sun appeared the next day. Does that mean millions of years later? If so, then we are confronted with a more amazing miracle than Genesis has been thought to contain-the plant kingdom flourishing for ages without sunlight!

Of the fourth day we read, "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night." Gen. 1:16. Here, obviously, the words "day" and "night" are being used as we use them today. From the beginning of the fourth day the day and night were thus ruled. But according to the record, the length of that fourth day, and of succeeding days, is the same as that for each of the first three days: "The evening and the morning were the fourth day." Verse 19. Hence the question that the objector should answer is this: If on the fourth day and onward "the evening and the morning" mean an ordinary day measured by sun and moon, why should the identical phrase used earlier in the narrative regarding the first three days mean something entirely different? Was part of creation week a long, indefinite period, and the remainder ordinary days?

But why carry the discussion further? For the man who believes that Genesis is history, there can be no doubt that the creation days are literal days. And the "seventh day" is as literal as the others. Some who do not wish to keep that day holy would soon lose it amid the billowing mists of indefinite geological ages. We prefer to believe the straightforward historical narrative, so eloquently

summarized by God Himself in the fourth commandment: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day."

## Objection 38

The phrase, "the seventh day," in the fourth commandment, means simply one day in seven. Therefore I am keeping the spirit of the Sabbath law so long as I keep one day in seven. And is not Sunday one day in seven?

There are some very real reasons why "the seventh day" means a specific day, not simply one day in seven:

1. Those who believe the Bible speak of creation week and view the series of events that then occurred as setting in motion the unique time cycle, the seven-day week. Was the Sabbath simply one day in seven in that first week? No, it was the specific seventh day of that week. Why would it become less specific in succeeding weeks and years and centuries?

2. The Sabbath memorializes a certain historical event, the completion of the creation of this world. Memorial days, if they are to have significance, must be anchored to definite points of time. They are intended to recall a particular day or a particular moment of past history. For example, to Americans "the Fourth" means, not the fourth of any month, but the Fourth of July. And why? Because on a certain fourth of July long ago a certain event took place. By law that particular day is set apart in memory of the Declaration of Independence. Now, what would we think of the man who reasoned that "the Fourth" means simply the fourth day of any month, that he can therefore choose some other "fourth" on which to remember some other historical event, and still be keeping the law that sets apart "the Fourth" as a special day for the nation?

But there are Sunday advocates, devout and sincere men, who contend that they are obedient to the fourth commandment, which calls for the keeping of the seventh day of the week in honor of the creation, when they keep the first day of the week in honor of the resurrection!

It is true that the fourth commandment does not say "the seventh day of the week" was blessed and sanctified by God as the Sabbath, but simply that "the seventh day" was. Sabbath objectors seek to make capital of this, declaring that the phrase "the seventh day" may therefore justifiably be construed to mean simply one day in seven. But that God intended the phrase, "the seventh day," in the commandment to mean the seventh day of the week will be increasingly evident as we proceed.

3. The Sabbath command refers back to the creation week, and it is in the historical setting of that week that the phrase "the seventh day" of the commandment must therefore be understood. God did not simply rest one day in seven in the creation week. He rested on the seventh day of that week.

4. No day was so solemnly set before Israel by the prophets of God as the weekly Sabbath day. When certain Israelites went out to gather manna on "the seventh day" they were rebuked. When one of them gathered sticks on the Sabbath day he was stoned. When certain of those who had returned from the Babylonian captivity tried to carry on commerce on the Sabbath they were denounced. Neither Sunday advocate nor Sabbath keeper today has any doubt in his mind that those Old Testament instances of Sabbath breaking had to do with a specific day, the seventh day of the week. But the prophets could point only to the fourth commandment to support their fervent admonition to keep holy this certain specific seventh day of the week. Therefore we must conclude that these inspired men of God understood "the seventh day" in the commandment to mean the specific seventh day of the week. And would anyone wish to challenge the ability of the prophets rightly to interpret the meaning of God's commands? Indeed, is it not part of the holy work of God's prophets to make absolutely clear to our finite minds the meaning of His holy commands?

5. Christendom in general believes that our Lord lay in the tomb on the seventh day of the week. And how does Luke describe that day? "The Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. That one inspired statement is sufficient in itself to settle the question as to what the commandment means when it says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." It means the seventh day of the week.

6. As already noted, no one has any doubt but that those who lived before Christ were required by God's holy commandment to keep the seventh day of the week. In other words, "the seventh day" in the command unquestionably meant the specific seventh day of the week. Then, what rational ground can be found for claiming that when Christ came, the plain and specific meaning of the commandment suddenly became vague and nonspecific, and now means merely one day in seven? No one at the time of Christ or for almost sixteen hundred years afterward ever thought of making so astounding a claim. Until the year AD. 1595, Christians, as certainly as the Jews, understood "the seventh day" in the commandment to mean the seventh day of the week. (See page 545 for historical proof.) So far from having any foundation in Scripture, this one-day-in-seven theory was not even heard of until fifteen hundred years after the last of the apostles had gone to his grave.

7. The very phrase "the seventh day" makes evident that a particular day, not merely one day

in seven, is meant. If we told a friend that we lived in the seventh house in a certain block what would we think if he began at the first house on the block and knocked at each door until he came to the seventh, explaining at each front door that he was trying to find an old friend who had told him he lived in the seventh house in the block, and that that meant, of course, that he lived in any one of the seven houses? What would we think? Yes, and what would our neighbors think of the sort of friends we had?

8. Through the long generations ardent Sunday advocates have succeeded in having placed on the law books of most Christian lands a statute requiring at least nominal observance of Sunday. Often the prime argument in favor of such a law has been that God commands the keeping of a weekly day of rest. The only command to which they could point was, of course, the fourth command of the Ten Commandments. If they were reminded that the fourth command calls for honoring the seventh day, not the first, they could escape embarrassment only by replying that the fourth commandment simply means one day in seven. It never occurred to them that if the Bible commands merely that one day in seven be kept holy, they were presumptuous, to say nothing of being inconsistent, in seeking to require all men to rest on a certain specific day. But church history, even down to our very time, grimly records that such Sunday advocates, though they have been willing to let "the seventh day" in God's law mean any day in the week, have been ready to imprison the man who should thus interpret "the first day" in their Sunday law!

Now a word regarding the matter of keeping the spirit of the law. The Bible has much to say about the letter and the spirit, and some have obtained the mistaken idea that the spirit of a law means less than the letter of it, at least as regards divine law, and very particularly as regards God's Sabbath law. It is difficult to understand how such an idea could obtain credence. Perhaps it is due to the fact that the word "spirit" conveys to some minds the thought of vague apparitions, airy, elusive, and shadowy, and that therefore the keeping of the spirit of a law means obeying something that is only a vague and shadowy resemblance of that law.

Nothing could be further from the truth in the matter. When we speak of keeping the "spirit of the law" and the phrase is not uncommon in our everyday language-we mean keeping that law in its fullest and deepest sense. For example, take the eight-hour labor law found in many States today. An employer may keep the letter of that law, and yet slave-drive his employees so as to get from them in eight hours as much work as he formerly got in nine or ten. We say he has failed to keep the spirit of the law.

Do we mean that if such an employer had kept the spirit of that law, he would have been freed from the letter of it, which definitely declares that eight hours is the maximum that an employee can be required to work in one day? Why, no, of course not. In other words, the keeping of the spirit of a law requires much more of a man than the mere keeping of the letter of it.

The Bible provides us with some choice illustrations of how this principle applies to the law of God. In the sermon on the mount Christ explained that the command "Thou shall not kill" involved much more than refraining from committing actual violence against some person. The man who hates his brother is a murderer. In other words, the spirit of that divine law against killing demands that he shall not hate any man. But there is no one so irrational as to say that in keeping the spirit of this law we are thereby released from obeying the letter of it. What a horrible thought!

How evident that those who keep the spirit of a law go far beyond the letter of it, not by disregarding the letter, but by seeing in the letter a far greater depth of meaning.

## Objection 39

Seventh day Adventists insist that a particular seventh day, coming down through from creation in cycles of seven, is the day God blessed and therefore the day that all should keep as the Sabbath. But no one now knows what that day is. Besides, calendar changes have confused the reckoning.

Before we take seriously this objection we would like to ask the objector a question: Why do you keep Sunday? If you answer as Sunday keepers have routinely answered through the centuries, you will say, Because Christ rose on the first day of the week. Indeed, we have never heard any other answer ever given. Then we would ask, Are you sure that you and your spiritual ancestors have been keeping the particular first day of the week that has come down in cycles of seven from the resurrection Sunday? You can hardly answer no, for that would be a dreadful indictment of all your Sunday keeping forebears who generally succeeded in having men sent to jail if they failed to give due reverence to Sunday. If you answer yes, then what becomes of your contention that time has been lost? Did the first day of the week come down safely through the centuries, but not the seventh day?

Strictly speaking we need not take the discussion further. It should be time enough for us to examine seriously this question of lost or scrambled time when Sunday advocates are ready to admit that they are not sure they are really keeping the first day of the week. But so generally is the lost-time theory brought forth, when all other arguments against the Sabbath are lost, that we should probably give some attention to it.

What proof is offered that time has been lost? None whatever. We are simply supposed to believe that in the long ago everybody woke up one morning and decided that Monday was Tuesday, or something like that. Or perhaps that when the calendar was changed the days of the week became confused.

Of course we do not have a history that tells us all that has happened since creation. But we do know that when we come down to the time of Christ's crucifixion "the Sabbath day according to the commandment" was definitely known, and that that day was the day between crucifixion Friday and resurrection Sunday, the seventh day of the weekly cycle. That makes unnecessary our peering into the vistas of time before Christ.

And what of the centuries since Christ? Have calendar changes confused our reckoning of weeks? Fortunately we need be in no doubt. Here are the facts: There has been one change in the calendar since New Testament times, from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar, under which we live today. The change to the new calendar was first made in Spain, Portugal, and Italy in AD. 1582, under an edict of Pope Gregory XIII. It is for this reason that our present calendar is known as the Gregorian calendar. The correction of the calendar in changing from the old to the new called for the dropping out of ten days from the month of October. The result was that October, 1582, in such countries as made the change at that time, appeared as shown below:

AD. 1582		OCTOBER					AD. 1582	
SUN.	MON.	TUE.	WED.	THU.	FRI.	SAT.		
		1	2	3	4	15	16	
17	18	19	20	21	22	23		
24	25	26	27	28	29	30		
31								

Thursday, the fourth of October, was followed immediately by Friday, the fifteenth. The result was that although certain days were removed from the month, the order of the days of the week was not interfered with. And it is the cycle of the week that measures off the Sabbath day for us. As the years passed by, the other nations gradually changed to the Gregorian from the Julian calendar, as the former one was called. And every nation, in making the change, employed the same rule of dropping out days from the month without touching the order of the days of the week.

But the case is even stronger than this. Not only was the week not tampered with in the revision of the calendar, but even the idea of breaking the weekly cycle in any way was not thought of. Speaking of the variety of plans suggested for the correction of the calendar, the Catholic Encyclopedia says, "Every imaginable proposition was made; only one idea was never mentioned, viz., the abandonment of the seven-day week." - Volume 9, p. 251.

Why should time be lost? Who would want to lose it? Civilization and commerce have existed all down through the centuries, and can we not believe that those who lived before us were quite as able to keep count of the days as we? Surely all wisdom and knowledge is not confined to the present century. Furthermore, the accurate keeping of time records is a vital necessity in religious worship,

both for Christians and for Jews. Christianity and Judaism have come down through all the centuries since Bible times. They are probably the most definite links binding us to ancient times.

Would it be conceivable that all Christian peoples and Jews would lose the reckoning of the weeks, which would involve confusion for all their holy days? And if such a thought be conceivable, could we possibly bring ourselves to believe that all the Christians in every part of the world and all the Jews in every part of the world would lose exactly the same amount of time? To such incredible lengths must one go in order to maintain the idea that time has been lost!

Look at the question from still another angle. Ask the astronomer whether time has been lost, or whether the weekly cycle has been tampered with. He will tell you simply no.

There is no uncertainty whatever in tracing back the weeks to Bible times; and when we reach there we read that the "Sabbath was past when the "first day of the week" - the resurrection morning arrived. (Mark 16:1, 2) If you wait until Sunday to rest and worship, you have missed the Sabbath, for the Word of God declares it is "past." (See page 553 for a further treatment of this question.)

## Objection 40

Seventh day Adventists declare that the Sabbath was intended for all men in all lands. But it is evident that it was intended only for the Jews in the little land of Palestine. How could anyone keep the definite seventh day Sabbath up in the Arctic circle, where there is six months day then six months night? Or how would a person keep track of the order of the days of the week in traveling around the world, for you lose a day if you travel in one direction and gain a day if you travel in the other direction?

Arctic explorers keep a reckoning of the days and weeks and report in their diaries what they did on certain specific days. They tell us that in that strange and almost uninhabited part of the earth it is possible to tell the passing of the days, during the months that the sun is above the horizon, by the changing positions of the sun, and during the months that the sun is below the horizon, by the twilight at noon.

If a Sabbath keeper should find himself up in that weird world of ice and had any fear that he had lost his reckoning of the weeks, he need only go to a mission conducted for the Eskimos by some Sunday keeping church and compare his reckoning with theirs! They would keep a reckoning, of course, in order to know when the first day of the week arrived!

And what of the problem of traveling around the world in relation to keeping a correct reckoning of the weeks? Do we really lose or gain a day? Here are the simple facts:

The so-called dropping or adding of a day in circling the earth is only an apparent and not a real loss or gain. Otherwise the most astounding things could happen. For example, twins could cease being twins by the simple expedient of traveling in opposite directions around the world. One gaining a day and the other losing a day! And if one gained and the other lost a day, that would mean that one of the twins was really two days older than the other and all as the result of one trip around in opposite directions. But what if they were both sea captains, and the route of their respective boats caused them to keep going around the world in opposite directions! Would it not be only a matter of time until one of them would be so many days older than the other that he would be really old enough to be the father rather than the brother?

"How preposterous! You say. We agree. But that is exactly what would happen if it were true that a person could really lose or gain a day by traveling eastward or westward around the world.

The objector will probably now say: "Well, even if you don't really lose or gain days in traveling, the facts are that the people in one part of the world cannot keep the Sabbath at the same moment of time as the people in other parts of the world, because, for example, the people in Europe begin their day several hours earlier than we in America. What are you going to do about that?"

We don't intend to do anything about it. There is no need. The Sabbath commandment says nothing about keeping the Sabbath at the same moment of time everywhere over the earth. It simply commands us to keep "the seventh day." And does not the seventh day arrive everywhere over the earth? It does.

Furthermore, we showed in our examination of the lost-time theory that no time has been lost; that, on the contrary, the cycles of the weeks have come down to us in unbroken succession through the centuries, so that we can be certain as to which is the seventh day of the week. And of course that means we can be as certain in Hong Kong or Cairo as in Washington or London, for the cycles have come down just as faithfully in one place as another.

When we reach any country in our travels we find all the people there-scientists and laymen, Jews, Christians, and infidels -in perfect agreement as to the days of the week. Indeed, this is probably one of the few facts of everyday life in which such a mixed group are in agreement. Ask them separately or collectively, and they will all give the same answer as to when the seventh day of the week arrives.

Then how simple is God's command to keep "the seventh day"!

## Objection 41

The Sabbath was changed from Saturday to Sunday at the time of Christ's resurrection. One of the strong proofs of this is the fact that Christ, after His resurrection, always met with His disciples on that day. A further proof is the fact that the Holy Spirit was poured upon the disciples on Sunday.

Who changed the day? We are asked to believe that Christ did so. But on so important a matter as a weekly holy day we cannot be content simply to presume. We do not have to presume as to the holiness of the seventh day of the week. We have a clear command, often repeated through the writings of the prophets, so that no one might be in doubt, and those who are inclined to forgetfulness might ever be reminded. That is the picture up to the time of Christ. But we look in vain for a command for Sunday keeping in the New Testament. What warrant have we for believing that suddenly after the time of Christ men would no longer need to be given a clear command as regards the keeping of a holy day, or to be reminded of that command from time to time? What warrant is there for thinking that the followers of God in the Christian Era would just naturally conclude from a combination of circumstances that two most important events had taken place. (1) The explicit command of God to keep the seventh day had been revoked; and (2) a new command, for the keeping of the first day, was now in force?

Only one text in the New Testament speaks of the abolition of Sabbath days (Col. 2:16), but we have found that this text is not speaking of the weekly Sabbath, as eminent Sunday keeping Bible commentators admit. (See under Objection 29.) And, as just stated, no text in the New Testament contains a command for Sunday. Yet despite all this, we are asked to believe that the seventh day Sabbath was abolished at the cross and that Sunday took its place as the weekly holy day!

We shall find, in examining this objection, and the ones immediately following that the case for Sunday sacredness in the New Testament is built on surmises, deductions from shaky premises, and wishful thinking. Let the facts speak for themselves.

We are asked to believe (1) that after the resurrection Christ always met with His disciples on Sunday, and (2) that that provides unanswerable proof that Christ changed the weekly holy day from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Only six texts in the New Testament mention the first day of the week in connection with Christ's life: Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2,9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1,19. (John 20:26 is often thought to refer to Sunday, and will be discussed a little later on.)

These four Gospel writers penned their narratives anywhere from twenty or thirty years up to nearly seventy years after the ascension of Christ. These and other New Testament writers all speak of the seventh day as "the Sabbath," with no suggestion that this weekly holy day had been abolished or was in process of being abolished. Now, we shall discover that when they speak of the first day of the week they fail to suggest, even, that it had acquired, or was in process of acquiring, any sanctity. Strange, indeed, if as Sunday advocates so confidently declare, Sunday began to be regarded as the Christian holy day immediately after the resurrection.

From a study of the six texts before us the following facts come to light:

1. Each time Sunday is called simply "the first day of the week." No title of holiness or a title that even suggests holiness is employed.

2. There is no statement by Christ in connection with His meetings with the disciples, either in these texts or in the context that even suggests that special significance should henceforth be attached to the first day of the week.

3. The reason why the disciples were all in one place on the resurrection day was not because they were holding a religious service to institute Sunday worship, but because they were in "fear of the Jews." (John 20:19.)

4. Three of the four Gospel writers plainly state that the Sabbath had ended when the first day of the week began.

5. Evidently, then, the true significance that attaches to the mention of the first day of the week in the resurrection record is the evident desire of the Gospel writers to give an accurate history of the events surrounding the crucifixion and to show that Christ's declaration that He would be raised on the third day was fulfilled.

In addition to His meetings with the disciples and certain women on the resurrection day, as mentioned in the six "first day" texts, what other visits, which state the time of His visit, are recorded? There are two:

1. The day of the ascension, which occurred "forty days" after the resurrection. (See Acts 1:3,9.) Obviously, if resurrection day is Sunday, Ascension Day must be Thursday. Those churches that honor Ascension Day do so on a Thursday.

2. A meeting held a week after the resurrection day. The time is thus given: 'And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, "Peace be unto you." John 20:26. Learned theologians generally hold that "after eight days" is a Jewish idiom for a week. Thus this is a meeting of Christ with His disciples on the second Sunday after His resurrection.

Accepting this view, we find evidence, then, of Christ's meeting with His disciples on only two Sundays. The first Sunday meeting obviously proves nothing-why should He wait beyond the resurrection to meet His disciples. Hence all the evidence for Christ's changing the day of worship that is to be drawn from His meetings with the disciples must be drawn from this second appearance. Perhaps Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, in their Bible commentary, present the case for Sunday as favorably as possible:

"They [the disciples] probably met every day during the preceding week, but their Lord designedly reserved His second appearance amongst them till the recurrence of His resurrection-day, that He might thus inaugurate the delightful sanctities Of THE LORD'S DAY." -Comment on John 20:26.

Here is an admission that the disciples were not singling out Sunday for a meeting. That is a most important admission. In fact, the record gives no suggestion of any meeting. If this twenty sixth verse is compared with the nineteenth verse, we most naturally would conclude that the disciples were continuing together behind closed doors simply for protection. They feared to be out on the streets. But the text gives no hint that Jesus specially "reserved His second appearance amongst them" until Sunday, and that He did so to "inaugurate" the Lord's day. What phrase or words in the text even suggests such an idea? None whatever.

But the text does hint, at least, as to the reason why He appeared at this particular time, but that reason has nothing to do with Sunday sacredness. We read, "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them." John specifically mentions Thomas' absence from the upper room on the resurrection Sunday, and his consequent incredulity. (John 20:24-26) He may even have been absent for a number of days after the resurrection. But this day he was "with them" in the upper room so far as John's record discloses, the purpose of Christ's visit "after eight days was to talk to Thomas. Naturally He chose a time when Thomas was "with them." Beyond that, nothing can be reasonably deduced from the record. Thus the Sunday-inaugurating significance of this meeting "after eight days" disappears.

Of course it is true that He did meet with them at other times, but these were undated. Perhaps the Sabbath objector will wish to affirm-though without possible proof-that such meetings were on Sunday. If so, then let us examine the account of "the third time" that Christ met His disciples after His resurrection. (See John 21:1-14) The disciples were fishing! Evidently they considered fishing proper on that day, whatever it was. Nor does the record even suggest that Christ rebuked them for it. Instead, He instructed them how to catch fish! We do not recall that Sunday advocates discuss this "third time" that Jesus showed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." They focus, instead, on His first appearance to the disciples, which proves to be explainable in terms of His desire immediately to reassure them of His resurrection; and on His second appearance, which is explainable as a visit made because Thomas was present. They focus on no other appearances, for there are none other that can possibly be fixed as on Sunday, or that can be strained to support in any way the theory that Christ inaugurated Sunday worship.

What of the proof for Sunday sacredness that is supposed to reside in the fact that the Holy Spirit was poured upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost? We will pass by the fact that some Sunday keeping theologians are not even certain that Pentecost fell on Sunday that year, though that fact is obviously weakening to the Sunday argument. We think Pentecost did come on Sunday that year, but we would never discover that fact from the Biblical record of the outpouring of the Spirit. No mention is even made as to which day of the week is involved. The record informs us only that "when the day of Pentecost was fully come" the outpouring of the Divine Spirit took place. (Acts 2:1.) Surely, if the apostolic writer saw in this outpouring any significance for Sunday keeping, he would have at least disclosed the fact that the event took place on the first day of the week, even if he did not take time to comment on the sacredness of Sunday that is supposed to follow from the divine outpouring.

But the objector may reply: Everyone reading the book of Acts knew that Pentecost was on Sunday that year, and could thus draw his own conclusions as to the relationship between the divine outpouring and the first day of the week. If this reply means anything, it means that so far from Acts 2:1 being an inspired reference to Sunday sacredness, or even a mention of the day of the week involved, the reader must rely on his own knowledge of the facts and draw therefrom his own

deductions. That is surely a long way from a "Thus says the Lord" for Sunday.

But would every reader of the book of Acts know that Pentecost came on Sunday that year? Luke wrote Acts about AD. 63, or some thirty years after the Pentecostal event. The annual Jewish festivals, of which Pentecost was one, came on different days of the week each year, even as, for example, our Armistice Day does. But does everyone today, a generation after World War I, who reads of the Armistice, November 11, 1918, know what day of the week it came on? No. Even so with the day of Pentecost in the year our Lord ascended. The reader of Acts, which was written a generation after Christ, would no more be aware of the day of the week involved in that great Pentecost than we would be aware of the day of the week on which the 1918 Armistice came.

The very words of Luke reveal that he desires the reader to note the fact, not that the Holy Spirit was poured out on a certain day of the week, but that it was poured out "when the day of Pentecost was fully come." Do we not find an evident explanation for the timing of the incident in the fact that certain events in connection with Christ's first advent were the fulfillment of certain typical services of the Jews. "Christ our Passover" (1 Cor. 5:7) fulfilled the typical Passover service and was sacrificed on the very day that the Passover lamb was slain, the fourteenth day of the first month (Ex. 12:1-6). The offering of the first fruits on the sixteenth day of the first month met its fulfillment in Christ's resurrection on that day, the first fruits of them that sleep. (Lev. 23:5-11; 1 Cor. 15:20-23) Then "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," a further typical service evidently met its fulfillment. (Lev. 23:15-21.) If we are to deduce anything from the timing of the Holy Spirit's outpouring, it is this: Luke is seeking to show that Christ is the great antitype of the Jewish services. At least, no further deduction seems at all warranted by the text of the narrative.

## Objection 42

From earliest apostolic days Christians kept Sunday in honor of Christ's resurrection. This is clearly revealed in two scriptures, Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 16:2.

We have already learned (Objection 41) that there is no Scriptural foundation for the statement that "from earliest apostolic days Christians kept Sunday," because there is no proof that Christ instituted Sunday worship on the resurrection day. Or during any time that He appeared to His disciples in the forty days before His ascension. Nor is there anything in the Scriptures to show that during that forty-day period the apostles gave any kind of veneration to Sunday.

Therefore, if there is Biblical proof that the apostles kept Sunday, it must be found some decades later in the two texts cited in this objection, and in one further text to be considered in the next objection. Strange, is it not, that a practice so revolutionary as the keeping of a new weekly holy day, by Jewish Christians as well as Gentile, and thus the abandonment of the seventh day Sabbath, should not have been the subject of extended and repeated discussion in the writings of the apostles? When they said that circumcision was no longer necessary, a hurricane was let loose, and the wind of that controversy blows strongly through the pages of the New Testament. But we are asked to believe that they told the Christian converts that the Sabbath need no longer be kept, and yet no tempest ensued, at least nothing important enough to find mention in the New Testament! Yet the Jews were fanatically zealous about the Sabbath! Here is a most singular situation.

In the light of these facts we have a right to be suspicious of the Sunday claim that is based on the two texts cited. And remember, they are the only two in the Bible that mention the first day of the week subsequent to the resurrection day. The first one reads thus:

"Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart [from Troas] on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:7. This text is part of a running narrative describing various incidents of Paul's homeward trip to Jerusalem at the close of his third missionary journey. The whole story requires two chapters. Let us examine first the statement about breaking bread. In Acts 2:46 we read that the disciples continued "daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." If a communion service is implied by "break bread," in Acts 20:7, it proves nothing distinctive for this particular day in Acts, because the disciples broke bread, "daily."

Notice that no holy title is used for this day. It is simply called "the first day of the week." Therefore, on what are we to base an argument for Sunday sacredness? Apparently simply on the fact that a religious meeting was held that day. In other words, the logic is as follows:

1. The holding of a meeting on a certain day is proof that that day is holy.
2. Paul held a meeting on the first day of the week.
3. Therefore Sunday is a holy day.

Thus stripped of all surplus language, the argument for Sunday that is supposed to reside in Acts 20:7 stands revealed in its true weakness. When we read the whole story of the journey we find that Paul preached in various places along the way as he traveled to Jerusalem. Were all these sermons timed to come on Sunday?

Look at the last half of the twentieth chapter, which gives a summary of what was probably one of the most important sermons Paul preached on this trip—at least, it is the only one that is described in detail. An examination of the context, especially verse 15, would indicate that it was probably preached on a Wednesday, certainly not on a Sunday. Therefore shall we conclude that Wednesday is a holy day? That would be the conclusion we could reach from the logic set forth in behalf of Sunday sacredness in this chapter. Really, the logic would force us to conclude that Paul made almost every day of the week holy by this one journey, so many were the services he conducted along the way. No, it takes more than the preaching of a sermon to make a day holy, or to reverse the divine command that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

When the exact time of the Troas meeting is noted, this passage in Acts 20 becomes even less convincing as a proof for Sunday, if that could be possible. The service was held at night, for "there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together." Verse 8. The record declares also that Paul "continued his speech until midnight," the reason being that he had to "depart on the morrow." Verse 7. His speech continued past midnight, "even till break of day," and "so he departed." Verse 11. The accompanying narrative reveals that Paul had to make a trip across a peninsula from Troas, where he had left his boat, to Assos, where he would embark again.

It is a well-known fact that the Bible reckons days from sunset to sunset, not from midnight to midnight, as we do today. (See Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; Ley. 23:32) Therefore the dark part of that

"first day of the week" was what we would describe as Saturday night. Conybeare and Howson, in their authoritative work, Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul, write as follows concerning the time of the meeting:

"It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath. On the Sunday morning the vessel was about to sail." - Page 520 (One Volume Edition).

Thus we see that Paul held a Saturday night meeting, and started off on his long journey Sunday morning. We do not see Sunday keepers today attaching any sacredness to Saturday night, yet they wish to rely upon this record of a Saturday night meeting as a proof of Sunday sacredness. It was only because Paul preached a very long sermon that this meeting even stretched over into what Sunday keepers regard as their holy day.

Paul abode at Troas "seven days." Verse 6. Then on Saturday night, the beginning of "the first day of the week," he "preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." There is no good reason to believe that Paul refrained from preaching during the "seven days," and then because "the first day of the week" had come, held a service. The account of his journeys reveals that he preached constantly. In this case we are specifically told why he preached: Because he was "ready to depart on the morrow." In other words, he took advantage of a last opportunity to speak to them, "when the disciples came together to break bread," even to preaching "till break of day." Verse 11. If the record proves anything, it proves that this first-day meeting was held, not because of a usual religious custom, but because of an unusual travel situation.

In the light of the whole narrative of Paul's journey the mention of "the first day of the week" is most simply explained as one of several mentions of time to give the reader a general picture of the time involved in that journey. Note these references:

1. "Abode [in Greece] three months." Acts 20:3.
2. "Sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread." Verse 6.
3. Came "to Troas in five days." Verse 6.
4. "Where we Abode seven days." Verse 6.
5. "And upon the first day of the week." Verse 7.
6. "Ready to depart on the morrow." Verse 7.
7. "The next day over against Chios." Verse 15.
8. "The next day we arrived at Samos." Verse 15.
9. "The next day we came to Miletus." Verse 15.
10. "Hasted . . . to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost." Verse 16.
11. "The day following unto Rhodes." Acts 21A.
12. Tarried at Tyre "seven days." Verse 4.
13. "And when we had accomplished those days." Verse 5.
14. "Abode with them [at Ptolemais] one day." Verse 7.
15. "The next day we . . . departed, and came to Caesarea." Verse 8.
16. "Tarried there many days." Verse 10.
17. "After those days we . . . went up to Jerusalem." Verse 15.

Dr. Augustus Neander, one of the most eminent of church historians, and a Sunday keeper, remarks thus concerning the proof for Sunday sacredness that is supposed to be found in Acts 20:7.

"The passage is not entirely convincing, because the impending departure of the apostle may have united the little Church in a brotherly parting-meal, on occasion of which the apostle delivered his last address, although there was no particular celebration of a Sunday in the case." - The History of the Christian Religion and Church, translated by Henry John Rose (1831), Vol. 1, Page 337.

If this "passage is not entirely convincing" to a Sunday keeping church historian, it should hardly be expected to prove convincing to a Sabbath keeper who rests his belief on the overwhelmingly convincing command of God: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

For a Sunday advocate to declare that he looks to Acts 20:7 for proof of Sunday sacredness is only to reveal how weak is the case for Sunday in the Scriptures.

The second of the two "first day" texts before us reads thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do you. 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." 1 Cor. 16:1,2. We are supposed to find here a picture of a religious service when a company is gathered together, and the offering is being taken up. The reasoning, of course, is that if a

service was held on Sunday, that proves Sunday is sacred, and, by inference, that the Sabbath of the Ten Commandments has been -abolished.

This is a very great deal to attempt to find in one text, especially when the text will not permit of the deductions drawn from it. Instead of describing a church offering, where the communicants pass over their gifts to a deacon, the record says that each one was to "lay by him in store." The most recent and most widely accepted version of the Scriptures translates the text thus: "On the first day of every week, each of you is to put something aside and save, as he may prosper, so that contributions need not be made when I come." R.S.V. In other words, when the first day of the week had come, each one was to decide from the last week's earnings how much he wanted to set aside for the special collection that Paul was going to take to the poor at Jerusalem. And lay it by in a special place apart from the other money of the house. This was an act of bookkeeping rather than an act of worship.

That this is the correct understanding of this passage is admitted by scholarly Sunday keeping theologians, whose desire to translate the Scriptures accurately exceeds their desire to find proofs for Sunday. Take, for example, the typical comment that is found in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, a commentary on the Scriptures, published by the Cambridge University Press, and edited by Church of England clergymen. Speaking of this text, the commentator declares that, as to the practice of Christians to meet on the first day of the week, "we cannot infer it from this passage." Then follows his comment on the phrase "lay by him"-

"i.e., at home, not in the assembly, as is generally supposed. . . . He [Paul] speaks of a custom in his time of placing a small box by the bedside into which an offering was to be put whenever prayer was made."-The First Epistle to the Corinthians, edited by J. J. Lias, p. 164.

Certainly it requires much more than the fact that the disciples were gathered together in fear in their abode on the first day of the week, or that Paul preached one sermon on that day. Or that he commanded the Corinthians to set aside some money in their homes the first of each week--much more than this, we say, to give any believer in the Bible a reason for violating one of the precepts of the eternal Ten Commandments, which declares that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

## Objection 43

The apostle John calls Sunday the "Lord's day," [Revelation 1:10] and declares that he was in the Spirit on that day. This proves that Sunday is the sacred weekly rest day of the Christian church and that the Sabbath has been abolished.

The claim is based on Revelation 1:10: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet."

Significantly, those who make this claim feel it necessary to abolish the Sabbath in order to find a place for Sunday worship. Naturally so, for the Bible provides for only one weekly holy day, and Sunday advocates have rather uniformly sought to provide some kind of Bible foundation for Sunday. But even if John meant "Sunday" by "Lord's day," that would provide no proof that the fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments had been abolished or even changed. Let that fact be clear at the outset.

Now, how do Sabbath opposers attempt to prove that this text refers to Sunday? In this fashion: They declare that the phrase "Lord's day," as a synonym for Sunday, began to be used by church fathers in their writings very soon after John's death, and that therefore he used the phrase in the same sense.

What are the facts? Briefly these: There have come down to us today certain writings attributed to various martyrs and other church fathers who lived in the generations immediately following that of the apostles. Church historians declare that many of these writings are spurious, and of those that are genuine, most have been so garbled or so added to by later writers that it is almost impossible to know what portion was written by the original author. And the very fact that an author's words were often garbled, coupled with the fact that some of these earliest fathers employed unusual, if not incoherent, literary constructions, has caused learned translators to be in great uncertainty as to the true meaning of many passages in those writings. The church historian Augustus Neander thus sums up the problem of their value:

"The writings of the so-called apostolic Fathers have unhappily, for the most part, come down to us in a condition very little worthy of confidence. Partly because under the name of these men, so highly venerated in the church, writings were early forged for the purpose of giving authority to particular opinions or principles. And partly because their own writings which were extant, became interpolated in subservience to a Jewish hierarchical interest, which aimed to crush the free spirit of the gospel." - General History of the Christian Religion and Church (1854), vol. 1, Appendix, sec. 4, p. 657.

In view of these facts the reader can immediately see how undependable is any argument based on what the apostolic fathers are supposed to have said or when they are supposed to have said it. Only if we shut our eyes to the spurious element, with the uncertainty as to date that grows out of it. And only if we are ready to add a little wishful thinking to our translation of certain garbled and incoherent passages, can we unquestioningly accept the claim that the phrase "Lord's day" began to be used by the church fathers shortly after John's death. We believe that there is no clear, irrefutable use of that phrase in any writings of the fathers until near the end of the second century. (See page 773 for historical proof of this statement.) And if that be true, the argument for Sunday based on John's use of the phrase stretches out so thin-for it must stretch out over nearly a century-that it cannot carry the weight of argument suspended on it.

But so plausible can even a garbled, doubtful passage sound to those who need the support it provides that, despite the damaging evidence here presented, there will still remain in many minds at least a halfway feeling that the phrase was actually used by church fathers to describe Sunday within a generation or so of John's day. Furthermore, so intriguing is the fact that John uses a phrase that is later used to describe Sunday that those same minds will naturally lean toward the conclusion that probably, after all, John likewise used the phrase to describe Sunday. Besides the emotional weakness that afflicts that kind of conclusion, there is a glaring fallacy that invalidates it, the fallacy of concluding that because a word has a certain meaning at one time it has identically the same meaning at an earlier time. This is one of the worst fallacies into which a person can fall in reading writings of a former day. Because in the writings of a second-century father the phrase "Lord's day" meant Sunday, it does not therefore follow that in the writings of John the phrase meant Sunday. Words change and even reverse their meanings, and sometimes in an amazingly short period.

Until the seventeenth century the word "Sabbath" had rather uniformly been used by Christian speakers and writers to describe the seventh day of the week. But in the British Isles, in that century,

there was a great Puritan revival of religion, which focused on an endeavor to secure better observance of Sunday. Sunday was declared to be commanded in the Ten Commandments, with simply a change from the seventh to the first day of the week. (See page 545 for historical proof.) In order to make their language consistent with this view the Puritanical reformers began to call Sunday "Sabbath." In almost one generation the change was made. So far as a large segment of the population was concerned, and the term "Sabbath- for "Sunday" has come down to our day.

Take the word "Sabbatarian." For long years, even to the opening of the twentieth century, the term was used to describe a Sunday advocate who believed that Sunday should be rigorously kept, generally with the aid of civil legislation. Today "Sabbatarian" is used to describe a Seventh day Adventist, who keeps a different day and who is opposed to civil laws for Sabbath keeping. Here again is a complete reversal of meaning, and in a rather short space of time.

Or take another change in word values, more startling as to difference in meaning and as to speed of change. As late as the 1840's in America the word "spiritualist" meant a person who spiritualized away the literal meaning of Scripture, or one who had very spiritual views. But in less than ten years the word began to be used to describe those who had taken up with the Hydesville rappings of 1848, which started the modern cult of spiritism.

All one needs to do is to examine an unabridged dictionary to find an endless list of such changes in meanings of words. And after such an examination he will be hopelessly suspicious of any argument that would seek to read back into the words of a man who wrote at one time the meaning given to those words by men who wrote at a later time. Why conclude, on the reading of a "spiritualist" in a theological journal in 1840, that a believer in departed spirits is there described? Or why conclude on reading in a newspaper of the 1890's that a group of "Sabbatarians" field a meeting that therefore a company of Seventh day Adventists were in session? Or why conclude from reading John's statement on the "Lord's day," written about AD. 90, that he was "in the Spirit" on Sunday?

We may properly understand a writer's words in the light of the meaning that those words have had up to the time he wrote. But we cannot safely read back into his words a meaning acquired by those words in later years.

Now, as noted, John wrote the Revelation about the year AD. 90. Up to that time had the Bible writers ever used the term "Lord's day" to describe Sunday? No. They uniformly described Sunday simply as "the first day of the week." Even more striking is the fact that John himself, in his Gospel, which it is generally agreed, was written some years after the Revelation, still calls Sunday by the same colorless phrase as the other Bible writers used, "the first day of the week."

There is only one day described in the Bible that could lay claim to being the "Lord's day," and that is the Sabbath. The Ten Commandments describes it as "the Sabbath of the Lord." Ex. 20:10. Isaiah tells us to call this day "the holy of the Lord." Isa. 58:13. Christ described Himself as "Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. John had heard the Savior utter these words. He knew also the words of the Ten Commandments and the words of Isaiah. How reasonable, then, to conclude that he meant the Sabbath when he said "Lord's day."

Of course someone may contend that if John used "Lord's day" for Sabbath in the Revelation, he would naturally use it also in his Gospel. But instead he there uses the customary term "Sabbath." We grant that we do not know just why he used "Lord's day" this one time. Evidence has been presented to show only (1) that the Sabbath objector's interpretation of "Lord's day" in Revelation 1:10 will not stand scrutiny, and (2) that the only reasonable interpretation of his words is that he meant "Sabbath."

However, the history of John's day offers an interesting suggestion as to why he used "Lord's day" for Sabbath in the book of Revelation. Christianity was coming into ever greater and greater conflict with pagan Rome. The Caesars were often deified, and Christians were sometimes called on to offer incense to them, or forfeit their lives. There were emperor days, such as the emperor's birthday, which took on a religious quality because of the blending of state and church. The day when a Caesar visited a certain city was ever afterward a holiday in that city and known, by translation, as a worshipful day, a day worthy of worship. The emperor Domitian was "accustomed to call himself and to be called 'Lord and God.'" -PHILIP SCHAFF, History of the Christian Church (8th ed., 1903), vol. 2, p. 44.

Now, John, who had been banished to Patmos almost certainly during Domitian's reign, was specially favored with revelations of Christ's coming kingdom and glory, as Patmos lighted up for him with the glory of his Lord. This Lord he described as "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And how meaningful that title was for the persecuted Christians who, at the cost of their lives, refused to acknowledge Caesar as "Lord and God." In Revelation 1:10 John introduces his first revelation of Christ's glory. In view of the Christian conflicts with Rome, how natural for him, if that first vision was on the Sabbath, to declare that he "was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," the day of the true Lord, whose

proof of Lordship is His Creator ship, which the Sabbath memorializes. (See Rev. 4: 11; 10: 6; 14:7.)

## Objection 44

Pages of authentic statements, selected from the writings of primitive Christian authors, could be quoted in proof of the fact that the first day of the week . . . was continuously observed as a day of Divine worship from the Savior's resurrection on through the succeeding early centuries of the present dispensation." But despite this evidence "Seventh day Adventists teach (supposedly by 'inspiration') that the change came in with Constantine, the first so-called 'Christian emperor' of Rome, 'in the early part of the fourth century.' (See *The Great Controversy*, p. 53.) And by the same authority, they, contradicting themselves, also teach that 'the Pope changed [the Sabbath] from the seventh to the first day of the week.' (See *Early Writings of Mrs. White*, p. 33, edition of 1916.)"

We have already discovered that no passage of Scripture can be found to support the claim that Christians kept Sunday. The primitive Christian authors, beyond the apostles, provide no undebatable proof of veneration for Sunday earlier than the second century. (See page 773 for historical proof.) It is generally held that virtually all the apostles had gone to martyrs' graves by AD. 70. But we must wait at least forty or fifty years beyond this date before we find written evidence worthy of any serious consideration that Christians were giving any special regard to Sunday. And even some of the evidence would be seriously challenged by church historians as highly doubtful in regard to authorship and date and possible exact meaning.

What the average reader does not know, and the Sabbath objector is glad to forget, is that in the years immediately after the death of the apostles many pagan ideas and customs began to infiltrate the church. Speaking to the elders of the church at Ephesus, about the year AD. 60, Paul warned: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, Riot sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:28-30.

A few years earlier he had written to the Thessalonian church of a 'falling away' from the faith that was to come and that would result in the exaltation of the "man of sin." This "mystery of iniquity," he added, "cloth already work." (2 Thess. 2:3-7.)

Most Protestant theologians through the centuries have regarded this as a prophecy of the growth of the Papacy, the great Roman Catholic power.

In his general comments on this whole prophetic passage in 2 Thessalonians, the Bible commentator Adam Clarke, though uncertain in his own mind on various points, adds immediately:

The general run of Protestant writers understand the whole as referring to the popes and Church of Rome, or the whole system of the papacy."

Then he summarizes at length the comments of Bishop Newton, one of the most eminent of Anglican writers on prophecy, remarking that "the principal part of modern commentators follow his steps. He applies the whole to the Roman Church." And here is what Newton, as quoted by Clarke, says in part:

"The mystery of iniquity was already working [in Paul's day]; the seeds of corruption were sown, but they were not grown tip to maturity."

"The foundations of popery were laid in the apostle's days."

Protestant historians are generally agreed that the roots of Roman Catholicism run down at least to the second century. The eminent church historian Philip Schaff, declares:

"The first example of the exercise of a sort of papal authority is found towards the close of the first century in the letter of the Roman bishop Clement (d. 102) to the bereaved and distracted church of Corinth.". - *History of the Christian Church* (8th ed., 1903), vol. 2, p. 157.

"He [Clement] speaks in a tone of authority to a sister church of apostolic foundation, and thus reveals the easy and as yet innocent beginning of the papacy." -*Ibid.*, p. 646.

Paul died a martyr at Rome about AD. 68. Clement, bishop of Rome, was a disciple of Paul and died AD. 102. Schaff describes "the interval between Clement and Paul" as a "transition from the apostolic to the apocryphal, from faith to superstition." - *Ibid.*

The Sabbath objector speaks warmly of "primitive Christian authors," who are alleged to have provided such good proof for Sunday keeping in the early church. But what is here revealed of the

early beginnings of the Papacy casts a heavy shadow of suspicion over these "authors." Clement, bishop of Rome, was one of the earliest, though he did not write on the question of Sunday! Of the so-called fathers of the church who lived in the two centuries immediately following the apostles Schaff says:

"We seek in vain among them for the evangelical doctrines of the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, justification by faith alone, the universal priesthood of the laity. And we find instead as early as the second century a high estimate of ecclesiastical traditions, meritorious and even over meritorious works, and strong sacerdotal, sacraments, ritualistic, and ascetic tendencies, which gradually matured in the Greek and Roman types of catholicity."-Ibid., p. 628.

We have learned (under Objection 43) that we cannot even be sure, when we read the so-called apostolic fathers-those "primitive Christian authors"-that we are actually reading what they said rather than what some later forger introduced into their writings.

Schaff quotes a "distinguished writer" as declaring that when we move from the inspired writings of the New Testament to the uninspired writings of the fathers, it is like passing, " 'by a single step,' " from the verdant confines of " 'an Eastern city in the desert' " out " 'into a barren waste.' " (Ibid., p. 636)

Into this "barren waste" the Sabbath objector would lead us for proof of Sunday keeping! Even if we can be sure of what the fathers said on the matter, what value is their testimony that the church, so far as their limited knowledge of a little part of it was concerned, was already following the practice of Sunday keeping? The church historians just cited disclose that the roots of various false teachings, even of all Roman Catholicism, run back to the days of those earliest fathers.

Now, because these various false teachings and practices, when crystallized by custom and the centuries, finally culminated in the Papacy, it is natural to speak of these different errors as having been brought into the Christian church by Rome, which is equivalent to saying that they were brought in by the popes. We have found that Sunday keeping is not apostolic, not Scriptural; therefore it is one of those un-Scriptural teachings that came in later, which teachings finally constituted the Roman Catholic system of doctrine. Hence Mrs. E. G. White, speaking for Seventh day Adventists, made no historical mistake in saying that the Pope changed the day of worship. Nor is there any conflict between that statement and her other statement, that Constantine "issued a decree making Sunday a public festival throughout the Roman empire." - The Great Controversy, p. 53. Mrs. White does not say that "the change" from the Sabbath to Sunday "came in with Constantine," as the Sabbath objector declares, but simply that he issued a certain Sunday law, which is a statement of historical fact.

It is true that the church historians we have quoted-all of them Sunday keepers believe that Sunday had the sanction of apostolic custom, even if not of apostolic command. And the only real argument they offer, in the complete absence of Scriptural command or proof of an apostolic Sunday keeping custom, is this: Surely we would not find Sunday veneration so widespread in the second century unless it had had apostolic sanction. What these historians forget for the moment is this: They have just told us of endless false doctrines and practices rampant in the second century, and supported by the writings of the fathers. Did all these evil things have apostolic sanction? They further forget for the moment that the same plausible argument they use to prove apostolic beginnings for Sunday worship, Rome uses to prove apostolic authority for numerous of her un-Biblical teachings and practices. The argument is as good in one instance as in the other. And, need we add, it is worthless in either instance. Not in "the barren wastes" of post-Biblical times and writers can we find safe places for our feet. If we would walk in the path of truth, we must keep on the highway of the Scriptures, hand in hand with our Lord and His holy apostles.

If it still seems incredible to any reader that so great an apostasy could set in within the brief compass of, say, half a century from the last part of the first century through the early part of the second century-let him note a modern parallel. In the latter part of the nineteenth century most of the Christian ministry could be described as Fundamentalist in belief, though subtle evolution teachings were quietly beginning to receive a sympathetic hearing from some. But by the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century a revolutionary change in religious belief, known as Modernism, had occurred in the major branches of Christendom. Such basic terms as the deity of Christ, the atonement of Christ, the inspiration of Scripture, had vastly changed in meaning.

How unwarranted a future church historian would be in reasoning that because early in the twentieth century church leaders in general held certain Modernist beliefs, therefore those views must likewise have been held in the nineteenth century. That indeed the great church leaders of the nineteenth century must have thus taught their pupils! The evidence before us regarding the first and second centuries leads us to conclude that historians are equally unwarranted in reasoning that because

certain beliefs were held in the second century, therefore they must have been held in the first, indeed, promoted by the apostles. Why blacken the reputation of those holy men?

## Objection 45

The resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity; therefore we keep Sunday. Sabbath keepers are not Christians, because they do not commemorate the great event of Christ's rising from the dead.

Even if we agree that the resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity, it does not therefore follow that the Sabbath of the Ten Commandments should be abolished and Sunday worship be substituted in its place. But who are we frail mortals that we should make our own decision as to which is the greatest event in the history of God's dealings with His people? The Bible has never made a pronouncement on this question. Furthermore, who are we to say how a holy event in Christ's life shall be commemorated? If human beings must decide which is the greatest event and how it should be kept in mind, then Sunday sacredness, which grows out of that decision, rests upon a human foundation.

All that would be needed in order to change the day of worship would be for Christians to agree that some other event is the greatest in Christianity's history. And might not a very good case be made out for the crucifixion as being the most notable event, for then the world witnessed the supreme example of unselfish love-the Son of God giving His life for a rebellious world? Or might not a plausible case be built up for the notable event of Christ's birth, when the universe witnessed the amazing scene of God made manifest in the flesh?

Christianity without the crucifixion of Christ would be meaningless. The same is true of the miraculous birth. How, then, can we say dogmatically which is the greatest event in the history of Christianity?

How could we prove wrong the man who declared the crucifixion, for example, to be the greatest event? And if, in harmony with that declaration, he proceeded to keep Friday, how could we say he was not as consistent as the Sunday keeper, who attempts to build his holy day on his own private view as to which is the most important event in the history of Christianity?

The logic of all this brings us to the conclusion that a man might keep any one of several days, depending altogether upon his appraisal of notable events, and still be a good Christian. Apparently the only day a Christian must not keep holy is the seventh day of the week. The Sabbath keeper is to have leveled against him the charge that he is not a Christian, because he does not honor the event that the Sunday keeper has decided should be honored, or rather because he does not honor it in the way the Sunday keeper has decided it should be honored.

But Sabbath keepers do remember the fact of our Lord's resurrection and its meaning to the Christian, for we carry out faithfully the ordinance of baptism, which is intended of God to keep bright in our minds both the death and the resurrection of Christ. (See Rom. 6:3-5) And we baptize by immersion, which enables us scripturally and most vividly to remember that Christ was buried and rose again.

The Sunday keeper, by instituting a certain day in remembrance of the resurrection, makes quite pointless, if not wholly meaningless, the institution of baptism, which God intended should recall that event. Perhaps that is why most churches have reduced the rite of baptism to the sprinkling of a few drops of water, a procedure that conveys no idea whatever of "baptism into death," or of rising again to walk in newness of life.

## Objection 46

Seventh day Adventists make a great point out of the fact that the Sabbath memorializes creation. But we are not so much concerned with creation as with redemption, which is greater. Therefore we keep Sunday, the great memorial of our redemption.

This objection has much in common with the immediately preceding one, and all that is said there in reply is pertinent here. But the reasoning is here carried a little further; in fact, a great deal further, as will immediately be evident.

Not only is the Bible an inspired book; it is a historical book. Indeed, much of the inspired counsel in that book is presented in a historical framework. Or to use a figure of speech, the Bible is a tall, imposing edifice. The foundation rests in the Garden of Eden, the glittering pinnacle points to Eden restored. The various stories, or levels, of the building represent the different centuries in which God's revelations have been given to men. A great dividing point between foundation and pinnacle is that level where God was revealed in His Son to save men on the cross.

All rests on the foundation; destroy that and the whole structure of revelation loses symmetry and beauty and is ready to fall.

To speak literally, all the Bible writers build their images on the assumption, implied or expressed, that, as recorded in Genesis, man was created and placed in Eden and then fell from his holy estate into sin, which fall is the explanation of all the tragedy of the world. The burden of the prophets in the Old Testament is to present a heavenly plan of salvation whereby man may be lifted up again, redeemed and restored to Eden. The burden of the apostles in the New Testament is to announce that what the prophets forecast regarding a Savior had been fulfilled and that men should believe on His name. The last book of the Bible pictures us returned to the blissful abode of Eden.

But what if the Genesis record of man's beginning is a fable? Can that which rests on a fable have more substance or value than the fable? No. The whole Bible loses its rugged historical character, loses much of its meaning and literally, if the Genesis record of creation is a fable. Obviously, a person's belief as to the origin of man and of this world is tremendously important. That is why the evolution theory, so largely accepted today in place of the Genesis creation account, has such a religious significance.

When the evolution theory was first gaining acceptance, Joseph Le Conte, a university professor, wrote a book entitled Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought, in which he set forth the relation of this new theory to religious belief:

"Its truth or falseness, its acceptance or rejection, is no trifling matter, affecting only one small corner of the thought-realm. On the contrary, it affects profoundly the foundations of philosophy, and therefore the whole domain of thought. It determines the whole attitude of the mind toward Nature and God." -Pages 3, 4.

Just how the evolution theory affects the "attitude of the mind toward Nature and God is tersely set forth by a spokesman for Bible-deriding skeptics who, significantly, were among the first to accept the theory:

"But-no Adam, no fall; no fall, no atonement; no atonement, no Savior. Accepting evolution, how can we believe in a fall? When did man fall; was it before he ceased to be a monkey, or after? . . . And if there never was a fall, why should there be any atonement?" -ROBERT BLATCHFORD, God and My Neighbor, p. 159.

The relation of belief in the first chapter of Genesis to belief in all the rest of the Bible was vividly brought out by a writer early in the twentieth century:

"When we found that . . . Adam was not made directly from dust, and Eve from his rib, and that the tower of Babel was not the occasion of the diversification of languages, we had gone too far to stop. The process of criticism had to go on from Genesis to Revelation, with no fear of the curse at the end of the last chapter. It could not stop with Moses and Isaiah; it bad to include Matthew and John and Paul. Every one of them had to be sifted; they had already ceased to be taken as unquestioned, final authorities, for plenary inspiration had followed verbal inspiration just as soon as the first chapter of Genesis had ceased to be taken as true history." - New York Independent, June 24, 1909.

How evident, then, that the Genesis creation account is the foundation of the whole edifice of the Bible revelation. And how evident that when men forget, or deny, creation they open their minds to endless untruthful, unholy theories as to their origin and destiny. The awful account of the descent of

men into the pit of pagan idolatry and immorality, as given in Romans 1, would never have had to be written if they had kept ever before their minds the holy record of their origin at the hands of the one and only true God, who is of too pure eyes to behold iniquity. The evolution theory of our day could never have gained acceptance if men had believed in and kept bright in their minds the creation account of Genesis. In other words, there never would have been a departure from the true God, and the whole plan of salvation portrayed in the Bible would ever have had maximum meaning for men if they had not forgotten, and ultimately disbelieved, the heavenly account of their beginnings in Eden.

How important, then, above all else that we should remember creation! How strange if God should not have made careful provision for the keeping of it in mind! But He did make provision, He created a memorial to that opening event of our history. He set that memorial at the very beginning of man's journey. (Gen. 2:2, 3), and when He delivered His one audible, brief address to His people salvaged out of Egyptian idolatry and vice, He called upon them to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." They were to remember each week that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

Remembering creation, they would remember the God of creation. And remembering the God of creation as holy, and who created their first parents holy, they would constantly see in the Sabbath a sign and a pledge that the God whom they served could sanctify them, make them holy, by creating in them new hearts and right spirits. (See Ex. 31:13; Ps. 51:10.)

Remembering creation, with its beauty and purity and perfection, they would be led to look forward with earnest and contrite eagerness to the coming of Christ, who, by His death and resurrection, would make possible their release from sin and death and their restoration to Eden.

The Sabbath command is part of that great code of laws that is the foundation of morality, and memorializes an event that is the foundation of the whole historical revelation of God's ways toward man. Without the creation truth memorialized by the Sabbath the cross has no foundation and the resurrection no meaning. That is evident.

It is by keeping creation in mind that we give maximum meaning to the cross and the resurrection. And that is but another way of saying that by keeping the Sabbath, the memorial of creation, we place under the cross and the resurrection a sure and solid foundation and give to them their true force and meaning. We keep the Sabbath because we wish to give greatest glory to God the Father and to His Son, through whom He created all things. We keep the Sabbath because we wish to give greatest glory to the Book of God, which rests upon the foundation of Genesis. We keep the Sabbath because we wish to witness before all men that we are on the side of God against the great apostasy that has developed in the Christian church because of evolution.

In the light of these facts how pointless, yes, how foolish, seem the major indictments brought against our Sabbath keeping! In keeping the Sabbath we are not Jews, we are not legalists, we are creationists! And, as already made clear, a creationist is one who stands solidly for the Scriptures against all apostasy.

With religious bodies on every side of us split asunder by the evolution theory, if not wholly committed to it, Seventh day Adventists stand solidly for the Genesis account of creation and for the inspiration of the whole Book of God. How could we ever believe in evolution when each week we take a whole day solemnly to "remember" God's awesome act of creation-to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"?

## Objection 47

The phrase "the first day of the week" in Matthew 28:1 should be translated "the first of the Sabbaths," or "one of the Sabbath." This proper translation indicates that the apostle spoke of the resurrection Sunday as the first of a new order of Sabbaths.

The basic premise of the contention regarding the translation in question is that the Greek word sabbaton translated "week" in Matthew 28:1 and parallel passages should never be thus translated, that instead it should always be rendered "Sabbath." Sabbaton occurs in the New Testament sixty-eight times, and is translated "Sabbath" fifty-nine times, and "week" nine times. These nine references are Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 18:12; 24:1; John 20:1,19; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2.

To the English reader it may come as a surprise that both week and Sabbath should be translated from the same word in the Greek. It is this fact that gives plausibility to the Sabbath objector's claim. But that two different time periods should be described by the same term is not peculiar to the Greek. In English, as earlier noted, we describe the twelve-hour period, the twenty-four-hour period, and even a vague, indefinite period by the same word, day. The context determines the time limit of the word day; so also with sabbaton.

Happily, this matter of the two meanings for sabbaton is not in dispute. All Greek scholars, Jewish and Christian, are in agreement as to the correctness of translating sabbaton by "week." The following authoritative statements are typical:

### Authorities Agree as to Double Value of Sabbathon

"WEEK (Hebrew 'shabua', plural 'shabu'im, 'shabu'ot'; ... New Testament Greek, sabbaton, sabbata): A division of time comprising seven days, thus explaining the Hebrew name." -The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, p. 48 1., art. "Week."

"The expression hebdomas [a Greek word for "week"] is not found in the New Testament, but rather sabbaton (e.g., Luke 18:12) or sabbata (e.g., Matt. 28:1), used, however, in the sense of it." - Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (ed. 1891), vol. 4, 13. 2484, art. "Week."

"Of the two Hebrew names for 'week' one is derived from the number seven, and the other is identical with 'Sabbath,' the day which completes the Jewish week. The New Testament takes over the latter word, and makes a Greek noun of it." - Hastings' Bible Dictionary (ed. 1924), p. 936, art. "Time."

"The Hebrew shabhu'a, used in the Old Testament for 'week,' is derived from shebha', the word for 'seven.' As the seventh day was a day of rest, or Sabbath (Hebrew, shabbath), this word came to be used for 'week,' as appears in the New Testament (shabbaton, -ta), indicating the period from Sabbath to Sabbath (Matt. 28: 1). The same usage is implied in the Old Testament (Lev. 23:15; 25:8)." - The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (ed. 1915), vol. 5, p. 2982, art. "Time."

"The plural sabbata . . . means a week as well as a Sabbath or Sabbaths (comp. Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20A, 19; and Matt. 28:1). . . . Sabbata in the second clause [of Matt. 28:1] certainly means 'week' and not the Sabbath day." -JOHN PETER LANCE, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, translated by Philip Schaff, Comments on Matthew 28:1.

Luke 18:12, which is one of the nine texts in which sabbaton is translated "week," is a choice illustration of where sabbaton must be translated "week" in order to make sense. The Pharisee declared in his prayer, "I fast twice in the week [sabbatou]." It would have been pointless for him to say that he fasted twice in the Sabbath. There would be no mark of distinction in refraining from eating between breakfast and dinner and between dinner and supper. Doubtless even the publican did that. Only when sabbatou in this text is translated "week" does it make sense.

The Sabbath objector tries diligently to break the force of this passage by declaring that Luke 18:12 should read, "I fast two Sabbaths," that is, two of the fixed Sabbaths in the year. But the Greek will not permit this. The word dis, translated "twice," is an adverb, and cannot properly be translated "two." The word sabbatou, translated "week," is in the singular number, which is never translated by the plural form "Sabbaths" in our English Bible.

The second part of the objector's contention is based oil the fact that in the Greek the word day is not found in the phrase "first day of the week." This phrase in Matthe 28:1, is in the original, mian sabbaton. Concerning its proper translation, eminent theologians and Greek scholars of Sunday keeping

denominations have written. As far back as the year 1899 the claim for Sunday that was built upon this revised translation of mian sabbaton was exploded by a scholarly Sunday keeper, as the following quotation reveals:

"This widely heralded Klondike discovery as to mian sabbaton turns out to be only the glitter of fool's gold. It rests upon the profoundest ignoring or ignorance of a law of syntax fundamental to inflected speech, and especially of the usage and influence of the Aramaic tongue, which was the vernacular of Jesus and His apostles. Must syntax die that the Sabbath [Sunday] may live?

"Let these affirmations [of the theory] be traversed: '4. No Greek word for "day" occurs in any of the passages [that is, in Matthew 28:1 and parallel passages].' Made for simple readers of English, that statement lacks candor. Said word is there, latent, to a much greater degree than it is in our phrase, 'The twenty-fifth of the month.' Upon being asked, 'The twenty-fifth what?' The veriest child instantly replies, 'Day.' But stronger yet is the case in hand. The adjectival word miart is in the feminine gender, and an immutable law requires adjective modifiers to agree with their nouns in gender. Sabbaffin is of the neuter gender, and out of the question. What feminine Greek word is latent in this phrase, and yet so patent as to reflect upon this adjectival numeral its feminine hue? Plainly the feminine word hemera, 'day,' as analogously it is found in Mark 14:12, prote hemera ton azumon, 'the first day of unleavened bread.' Boldly to aver that 'no Greek word for "day" occurs in any of the passages,' is to blind the simple English reader to the fact that an inflected language, by its numerous genders and cases, can indicate the presence and force of latent words to an extent undreamed of in English. . . .

"As a vital or corroboratory part of any argument for the sanctifying of the Lord's day, this travestied exegesis, instead of being a monumental discovery, is but a monumental blunder. Thereby our foes will have us in derision.

"Tell it not in Gath,  
Publish it not in the streets of Battle Creek,\*  
Lest the daughters of the Sabbatharians rejoice,  
Lest the daughters of the Saturdarians triumph."

-DR. WILBUR FLETCHER STEFLE, "Must Syntax Die That the Sabbath May Live?" in the Methodist Review (New York), May-June, 1899.

\* At the time this was written the Seventh-day Adventist headquarters were in Battle Creek, Michigan.

In 1931 this question of mian sabbaffin was raised by an inquirer in The Expositor, a widely circulated preachers' journal. At that time The Expositor ran a question-and-answer feature entitled "Expositions," by Prof. A. T. Robertson, D.D., one of the most eminent of modern Greek scholars, and the author of a number of works on Biblical Greek, including an exhaustive grammar. For years Professor Robertson held the chair of New Testament interpretation at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. The question and answer are as follows:

"DEAR DR. ROBERTSON: Can it be proven, beyond doubt, that 'the first day of the week' is the proper rendition of 'mia sabbaffin' (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1,19; Acts 20:7; and 1 Cor. 16:2), instead of 'one of the Sabbaths,' as Mr. Knoch's Concordant Version reads? The Concordant Version reads 'first Sabbath' (Mark 16:9) instead of the first day of the week.'

"J. D. PHILLIPS,  
"Editor of The Truth,  
"Littlefield, Texas"

After offering certain caustic comments on the Concordant Version, Dr. Robertson proceeds with his answer:

"Now about the case of sabbaffin in the New Testament. It is the singular, the transliteration of the Hebrew word Shabbath, which was used for the seventh day of the week, as in John 5:9. The plural, sabbata, is a transliteration of the Aramaic shabbatha. Curiously enough, the Jews used the plural form in two ways. One way was for a single Sabbath, like the singular sabbaton. So in Josephus. (We have ten hebdomen Sabbath calournen. We call the seventh day Sabbath.) Precisely this usage occurs in the New Testament, as in Luke 4:16, 'on the Sabbath day,' en te hemera ton Sabbathn. So also Acts 13:14; 16:13, just like Exodus 20:8; 35:3, etc. So also in Matthew 12: 1; 5:10-12, tois sabbasin, on the Sabbath, though plural, Mark 1:21; Luke 4:31, etc. But the word sabbaton, in the singular, was used

also for the week which began [*bended*\*] with the Sabbath. So in Mark 16:9 we have proi proti sabbatou, early on the first day of the week. Here proi is an adverb, but prote is a feminine adjective, locative, singular, agreeing with hemera (day) understood, while sabbatou is neuter gender, genitive, singular, so that it is impossible to render this, early on the first Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> See also Luke 18:12. But the plural sabbata is also used for the week, as in Luke 24: 1. In the preceding verse the singular occurs, to sabbaton, 'they spent the Sabbath.' The very next words in verse 1 are, ti de mia ton sabbaton, 'on the first day of the week.' There we have mia used as an ordinal like proti, as is common in the Koine. The same use of both mia for 'first' and the plural sabbaton for 'week,' we find in Matthew 28: 1; Mark 16:2; John 20:1,19; Acts 20:7." - The Expositor, August, 1931.

\* 'Began should read "ended." See correction of this typographiral error by Dr. Robertson in *The Expositor*, October, 1931.

Since Sunday keeping theologians so thoroughly expose the false-translation argument for Sunday, it is hardly necessary to add anything more.

NOTE-Right on this point of dealing with arguments against the truth which opponents construct out of a claim that certain passages in the Scriptures should be rendered differently from what they are, a brief word might not be amiss. With our lay members becoming more and more active in presenting the truth to the world, this type of objection has to be met by them increasingly. They may not have had the privilege of studying the original languages, or may not have available the standard commentaries which, in most cases, reveal the unreasonableness of quibbles built on the claim that some different translation should be given than that found in the well-known versions.

What, then, is the layman to do when he is confronted with such an argument? Become confused and withdraw from the field? Not at all. Instead, he should reply briefly that the translations of the Bible into the English language, the King James Version, and later the Revised, are the product of the united endeavors of a large group of the most learned Greek scholars ever gathered together. And that he sees no reason for making a drastic change in their translation simply because some lone man of the present day, who has no linguistic standing, declares that there ought to be a change.

That is about all the answer that is needed. It is a sound and substantial one, and will appeal to the reason of any unprejudiced person who bears it. Of course, this does not mean that a clearer understanding of a Bible passage cannot sometimes be obtained by reference to the original language, as is well illustrated in the matter of the original terms for soul and spirit. But calling attention to the original words and the possible alternate translation allowed by the lexicons is an altogether different thing from manufacturing translations that violate the primary rules of the original languages.

## Objection 48

Seventh day Adventists say that everyone who keeps Sunday has the mark of the beast. Such a teaching places under God's condemnation all other Christian people and dooms forever all Sunday keeping Christians who died before Seventh day Adventists began to preach. By teaching that a person cannot be saved unless he keeps the Sabbath, Seventh day Adventists make Sabbath keeping the means of salvation instead of Christ.

Seventh day Adventists do not say that everyone who keeps Sunday has the mark of the beast. Hence we do not place anyone, dead or alive, under condemnation. Note this authoritative statement from the writings of the best recognized of Adventist writers, Ellen G. White:

"Christians of past generations observed the Sunday, supposing that in so doing they were keeping the Bible Sabbath: and there are now true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic Communion, who honestly believe that Sunday is the Sabbath of divine appointment. God accepts their sincerity of purpose and their integrity before Him. But when Sunday observance shall be enforced by law, and the world shall be enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath, then whoever shall transgress the command of God, to obey a precept which has no higher authority than that of Rome, will thereby honor popery above God. He is paying homage to Rome, and to the power which enforces the institution ordained by Rome. He is worshiping the beast and his image. As men then reject the institution which God has declared to be the sign of His authority, and honor in its stead that which Rome has shown as the token of her supremacy, they will thereby accept the sign of allegiance to Rome 'the mark of the beast.' And it is not until the issue is thus plainly set before the people, and they are brought to choose between the commandments of God and the commandments of men, that those who continue in transgression will receive 'the mark of the beast.' -The Great Controversy, p. 449.

Take this further word from the pen of Mrs. White:

"No one has yet received the mark of the beast. The testing time has not yet come. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. None are condemned until they have had the light and have seen the obligation of the fourth commandment. But when the decree shall go forth enforcing the counterfeit Sabbath, and the loud cry of the third angel shall warn men against the worship of the beast and his image, the line will be clearly drawn between the false and the true. Then those who still continue in transgression will receive the mark of the beast." - Evangelism, pp. 234, 235.

Paul said to the ancient, idolatrous Athenians, "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men every where to repent." Acts 17:30. It is not what we do ignorantly that brings God's condemnation, but what we do willfully after we have a clear knowledge of the truth. "Therefore to him that knows to do good, and does it not, to him it is sin." James 4:17. God sent the Advent movement into the world, not to condemn the world, but to preach the truth. We have no desire to judge any man. judgment belongs to God.

In view of this fact it is not an accurate statement of our position to say that we hold that a person cannot be saved unless he keeps the seventh day Sabbath. Here is our position: Only those will be saved who, having been redeemed by the grace of Christ, walk in obedience to all the light that God sheds on their way. Surely no Christian will question that position. The Bible says that "the path of the just is as the shining light, that shines more and more unto the perfect day." Prov. 4:18. Peter calls on Christian believers to "add to your faith" a long list of Christian graces. (See 2 Peter 1:54) So long as we continue to walk in the light and add graces and Christian practices as they are revealed by that light, we grow in grace, and continue on the road to heaven.

When we willfully refuse to go forward in the path because some requirement God reveals to us seems hard to obey, we reject Heaven's light. When we do this do we not immediately jeopardize our hope of salvation, and must we not change from rejection to acceptance of that further light before it can be said of us again that we are truly saved? Of the Jews who refused to accept the light that Christ brought, He declared, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak [margin, "excuse"] for their sin." John 15:22.

In far lands missionaries of the various churches preach Christ crucified, presenting the love of God and the atoning sacrifice of Christ. They preach to savage races of men who have brazenly and perhaps without a twinge of conscience been violating the whole range of the Ten Commandments. As

the natives are touched by God's Spirit and express their sincere desire to accept Christ's proffered salvation, what do the missionaries do? They explain to the natives that Christ offers them salvation as a free gift, but that if they desire to be true children of God, they will give evidence of this by walking in the path that God has revealed. In other words, the missionaries will say to them, as Paul said to the Ephesians: "Let him that stole steal no more." Eph. 4:28. They will speak of turning not only from stealing but from the other violations of the Ten Commandments-murder, adultery, lying, idolatry, etc. They will probably add that no liar or thief or murderer or idolater will ever enter the kingdom of God.

This, in substance, is what missionaries of all faiths say day after day as they bring men to God. But we have never heard anyone charge that they are thus substituting obedience to the Ten Commandments for the grace of God. Then, why should Adventists be accused of substituting Sabbath keeping for the grace of God simply because our appeal to men to walk by grace in the way of truth includes a presentation of all the Ten Commandments, for the Sabbath command is one of the ten? We do not say, for we do not believe, that keeping the Sabbath command, or any other of the Ten Commandments, gives a man entrance to heaven. Entrance will ever be only through the grace of God received by faith. But we do say that the man who willfully breaks any of God's commandments, which includes the fourth, shuts the doors of heaven against himself. No willful sinner will enter its portals.

## **Objection 49**

I don't believe that a God of love would keep men out of heaven just because of a day. I think Seventh day Adventists put too much emphasis on a certain day that should be kept holy.

The answer to this is largely found in the answer to the immediately preceding objection. We wish to ask the objector this question: Do you think God is particular? To reply that you do not think that God is particular, is to free yourself not only from obedience to the fourth command but from obedience to every other command as well. By what process of reasoning should we conclude that God is particular about nine of the commands but not about the fourth?

God gave the command that men should keep "the seventh day." Did He really mean that, or may we just keep any day we choose, or none at all if that pleases us more? In language more terse and blunt: Does God really mean what He says?

In the early days of Jewish history God instructed the priests that when they ministered in the sanctuary they should not use 'strange fire,' that is, common fire, but that they should always draw from the holy flame that burned continually on the altar. It may be very plausibly argued that all fire is alike, even as one might argue that all days are alike, and conclude that God would really not care if His command concerning the particular kind of fire was not obeyed. Evidently two priests--Nadab and Abihu acted on this theory for they employed strange fire in offering incense before the Lord. And what was the result? "There went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." Lev. 10:2.

The context shows that this judgment came upon them because they had failed to obey the command to put a "difference between holy and unholy." Verse 10.

How remarkable is the parallel. The Sabbath commandment is intended to put a difference between the holy and the unholy in days. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." Is God less particular about His holy day than He was about the holy fire that He gave to the Israelites?

Take another illustration: The children of Israel were forbidden to touch the ark of God or "any holy thing." (See Num. 4:15, 20) The command was very simply worded, so that all could understand. But once when the ark was being moved over rough ground, a man by the name of Uzzah "put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it; for the oxen shook it." 2 Sam. 6:6. Uzzah doubtless reasoned that the command against touching the ark did not apply in such a circumstance. But what are the facts? "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him there." Verse 7. Was the Lord particular? Did He mean just what He said? And shall we say that God is less particular today than in former years? Is He not the same yesterday, today, and forever? Indeed, were not these experiences of the ancient Israelites written for our admonition, that we might profit by their mistakes? If God punished a man for laying his hand upon the holy ark, will He condone the man who lays violent hands upon the Sabbath day, moving it about to suit his own convenience?

The Israelites, so the record leads us to conclude, thought that the Lord was surely not so particular as to bring a judgment upon them if they failed in such a small matter as keeping a particular day holy. But the Good Book informs us that the destruction of Solomon's Temple and the carrying away captive of the people from the land of Canaan was a direct judgment on them for their desecration of the Sabbath. (See Jer. 17:21-27; 2 Chron. 36:17-21; Neh. 13:17, 18; Eze. 22:26) Now if God drove His chosen people out of the literal land of Canaan for their disregard of the day He had commanded them to keep holy, how unreasonable to think He will admit men to the heavenly Canaan if they willfully disregard that holy day.

## Objection 50

### The Sabbath cannot save anyone. Why not preach Christ instead?

The answers to the two objections immediately preceding are largely the answer to the one before us. The weakness of this one becomes clearly evident by simply expanding it to its logical limits. The statement is made that the Sabbath cannot save anyone; in other words, that Sabbath keeping can never win for man a place in heaven. But it is also true that the mere keeping of any other commandment of the Ten Commandments will not purchase entrance into heaven. Shall we therefore conclude that it is unnecessary for a minister to preach on the third commandment, for example, or the fifth, with their stern declarations concerning the reverencing of God's name and the honoring of one's father and mother? No, you say, by all means preach out boldly on these, for profanity is heard on every side, and honor to parents has been too much forgotten by the youth today.

Well then, if it is not only proper but highly important to preach about the third and the fifth commandment, how can you say that we should not preach the fourth commandment? And when we think of the wholesale violation of that fourth commandment-as widespread surely as the violation of the third or the fifth-the candid reader will immediately realize that the preaching of the Sabbath commandment is not only proper but highly important. It is for this reason that we raise our voice so clearly regarding the Sabbath.

We have stated that no one can purchase entry into heaven by Sabbath keeping, and have shown that such a statement proves nothing against the Sabbath. But we would take the matter a little further. Simply because it is true that the keeping of any or all of the commandments cannot ensure our entrance into heaven, is it therefore true that the failure to keep the commandments will not prevent us from entering that blessed abode? No, you say, the person who willfully violates the commandments cannot enter heaven. Abstaining from murder will not ensure our entrance, but the violation of that command will certainly keep us out. Refraining from stealing or from adultery will not assure us entrance, but certainly the breaking of those commandments clearly debars us.

Well then, does not the most obvious analogy cause us to conclude that although Sabbath keeping cannot secure us admission into heaven, Sabbath breaking will certainly prevent our entrance? And if it is possible for a man so to relate himself to the Sabbath, or to any other commandment in the Ten Commandments, that his entrance to heaven is impossible, is it not very important that the minister of the gospel preach on those commandments, the Sabbath commandment included?

But let us go still further. The inference we are supposed to draw is that the preaching of Christ is something wholly different from preaching the obligations of God's holy law-that the two have nothing in common. Some have gone so far as to declare that the very idea of law is in opposition to the gospel of Christ. But such views cannot stand a moment's investigation, as we have already discovered. Two texts of Scripture are sufficient to reveal the close relationship between the law and the gospel. Christ said to His disciples, "If you love me, keep my commandments." John 14:15. Thus if we would preach the doctrine of love to Christ, we must include an exhortation to obey the commandments. Obedience is the fruit of love. Or, take this other text in the book of Revelation: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. This is a description of the true children of God in the closing days of earth's history. How closely related is their faith in Christ and their obedience to God's commandments!

The reason why some men do not want to hear the Sabbath preached is that it troubles their consciences, and they feel condemned before God as violators of His law. It is not the preaching that is wrong, but their lives.

## Objection 51

I have the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit has given me to understand that I do not have to keep the Sabbath.

This statement reflects the teaching of a certain religious organization that believes it possesses the gift of the Holy Spirit in a way different from all other Christians. The members believe themselves guided very directly by this Spirit in matters of doctrine. Now, it is true that the Bible says much about the presence of the Spirit in the lives of Christians, but the Good Book also warns against the presence of another kind of spirit that will lead men away from truth. The mere fact that one is possessed by a supernatural power does not prove that that power is the Holy Spirit of God.

The Bible instructs us to "try the spirits." (1 John 4: 1.) It does not say we should try a Bible doctrine by the spirits, but that we should try the spirits by the Bible doctrine. Otherwise how could we tell what sort of spirit was possessing us? The prophet Isaiah warns against being under the influence of certain "spirits," and provides a means whereby we may know whether a spirit is of God. His words are plain, and easily understood: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. Then, if a spirit does not speak in harmony with the law, that spirit does not belong to the kingdom of light but to the kingdom of darkness.

This one inspired statement ought to be sufficient. When a spirit declares that the Sabbath, which is part of the law--indeed, is found right in the heart of the law--need not be kept, what are we to conclude? Is not the answer evident? Such a spirit speaks not in accordance with the teachings of God's Word; on the contrary, it speaks against them.

The book of Revelation pronounces a dire woe against anyone who should add to or take from the words of the prophecy in the book. (See Rev. 22:18, 19) One statement in that book describes the people of God as "they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. A spirit that informs a man he need not keep the Sabbath commandment is really attempting to change the inspired description of God's children to read, "Here are they that keep nine of the commandments of God, but do not have to keep the fourth commandment."

By such an act this spirit comes under the last fearful woe found in God's Book. (See Rev. 22:18,19) And what kind of spirits are they that stand under the condemnation of God? Certainly not heavenly spirits. A spirit sent from God does not diverge from God's Word. Said Christ to His disciples, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come." John 16:13. The Spirit of God brings to the believer only that which has been heard in the courts of heaven. And violation of any of God's commandments is never advocated in heaven, that is, not since the day that Satan and his evil spirits were cast out.

We read that one of the duties of the Spirit of God is to reprove the world of sin." Verse 8. And what is sin? Transgression of the law. (See 1 John 3:4) But the spirit we are here investigating would not be reproving sin, but condoning it, by telling men that they may transgress one of the commandments -the fourth.

Therefore when a spirit declares that the Sabbath need not be kept, we may properly conclude that we should immediately free ourselves, not from the Sabbath, but from that spirit. The Sabbath has stood the test of the ages; its credentials are signed by God Himself. No, the Sabbath is not on trial. Try the spirits!

## Objection 52

We should keep all days holy in the Christian dispensation. But inasmuch as the law of the land has marked out a certain day Sunday as the particular day of rest, we should obey the law of the land, and keep Sunday.

This Sabbath objection grows out of a predicament. Different groups in the Sunday keeping ranks of Christendom have different ways of trying to avoid the straight command of God to keep holy "the seventh day." One group, frank enough to admit that the New Testament contains no command to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday, has attempted to escape the Sabbath obligation by declaring that in the Christian dispensation all days are alike holy, and because of this there need not be given to the Sabbath day any particular veneration over any other day.

Those who claimed merely that all days were holy thought that they were solving the difficulty in simple fashion. But in actual practice their solution did not work so well. If all days are holy, then one day is no better than another, and why should we do special honor to any day by centering our religious services on that day? Thus men could reason. In other words, the whole idea of the Sabbath would vanish out of the minds of men because it had lost its definiteness.

But how was definiteness to be introduced without surrendering the whole argument? Why, by the simple expedient of invoking the scripture that declares we should be subject to civil government, and then calling attention to the fact that there is a civil statute requiring rest from labor on a certain day in the week, Sunday. Thus by a wide detour this group of Sunday keepers reach their desired day without apparently laying themselves open to the troublesome necessity of trying to prove that the day was changed to Sunday by the New Testament writers theological feat that they have observed other Sunday keepers unable to accomplish.

It is hard to know just where to begin in answering such a fallacy as this, for every main statement of it is incorrect. Take the claim that all days are alike holy. Is it not asking a little too much of the Sabbath defender to expect him to meet the Sunday challenger from two opposite sides at the same time? Must we be expected to demolish with one stroke the claim that the Sabbath was transferred to the first day of the week and the contention that it was transferred to all the seven days of the week? Might we not be pardoned for demanding that Sunday keepers first agree among themselves as to just what claim they will make for Sunday before asking a Sabbath keeper to answer them?

But let us examine the claim that we should keep a certain day because the government so decrees. True, the Bible says we should be subject to the civil power. But where do we read that we should guide our religious lives by the statutes of civil government? (Rather, we read the contrary. Acts 5:29) If we ought so to guide ourselves, then our religion would change whenever we moved to a new land, and one so unfortunate as to live in a pagan land would find himself keeping holy certain days set apart for pagan gods. Into what desperate situations does false logic bring us!

But let us take the matter a little further. How do we happen to have Sunday laws on the statute books of various so-called Christian governments? Because certain militant Sunday keepers who believed the Sabbath had been definitely changed to the first day of the week persuaded legislatures to enact a law setting aside that particular day. And now, incredible though it be, those who declare that all days are alike holy come urging Sunday sacredness because of a civil statute that was passed at the behest of those who declare that the Sabbath was transferred to the first day of the week.

Could paradox be greater? Is it really possible to tell just what such people believe?

## Objection 53

If Saturday is the right Sabbath, why do not more leading men believe it? If what you preach about the Sabbath is true, why wasn't it discovered before?

Is it not common knowledge that when Christianity began in the world the people of that day, both Jews and Greeks, had much to say about its being a new doctrine? When Christ rebuked an evil spirit, commanding it to come out of a man, the people "were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? What new doctrine is this?" Mark 1:27. When Paul came to Athens and began to preach Christianity, the people inquired, "May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou spoke, is?" Acts 17:19. Various other passages might be given, showing that the teachings of Christianity were considered new and strange.

Come down to the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Who does not know that the most common argument against the Reformers was that their teachings were new? The argument was about in the form of the objection we are considering: If what you Reformers say is true, how is it that these doctrines were not discovered before?

But did such charges against Christ and the apostles and the Reformers prove that their teachings were not of God? No. Doctrines must be judged by a different standard from that.

But what of this charge of newness made against Christianity and the Reformation? When Christ or His disciples were confronted with the charge, they always denied it, declaring that they did not preach new, strange doctrines, but that, on the contrary, as Paul affirmed, they preached "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." Acts 26:22. When the charge was made against the Reformers, they proceeded to show from the Bible that the doctrines they preached were not new but very ancient. And, further, they could show that all down through the centuries there had been a few faithful children of God who had known and preached those doctrines.

As we read history we still marvel at the charges made against Christ and the Reformers, and wonder why men should have been so slow to discern truths that now seem so evident. But the fact that they were so slow is an indictment of them and not of the doctrines they failed to see.

The relation of these facts to the question before us is clear. With Christ and the disciples and the Reformers we would say that the Sabbath doctrine is not new; it is as old as creation, and has been known and kept by godly men through all the centuries. Granted that this Sabbath truth was almost completely suppressed for centuries, and did not burst forth again until relatively modern times, is it not a fact that the truth of righteousness by faith was almost wholly lost for more than a thousand years, and did not burst forth again until the sixteenth century?

Now a word as to why more leading men" do not believe this Sabbath truth. What of the leading men" in the days of Christ, and of the Reformation? Who does not know that it was "the common people" who heard Christ gladly; that His disciples were ordinary people, such as fishermen? And who does not know that the "big men" of Christ's time endeavored to argue people out of accepting Christ by inquiring, "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" John 7:48. What was it that Paul declared to the early believers? "You see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." 1 Cor. 1:26. And in Luther's day what about all the leading men"? All the church dignitaries were spending their time trying to catch him to burn him.

True, we believe that God has among the so-called "big men" many honest hearts, and that from their ranks will finally be drawn strong believers in the Sabbath. But though none such should accept, the seventh day would still be the Sabbath of the Lord, for no man is big enough to change God's commandments.

## Objection 54

If I should keep the Sabbath, all my friends and neighbors would ridicule me.

What if they do ridicule you? Surely you do not govern all your acts by what your neighbors may think or say about you. Ridicule is generally the price men have had to pay for holding any sort of idea different from the majority. We would not have many of our great inventions today if men like Bell and Edison and others had refused to adopt some new mechanical idea simply because people would ridicule them. For this very reason it often takes courage to be an inventor. But you say that it is worth the price. Very true. And is it not worth the price of ridicule to be a Christian and to be assured of the rewards promised to those who obey God? That is the real question involved.

The Bible does not attempt to hide the fact that those who obey God will often suffer reproach and be falsely accused, and that divisions will come even between members of a family, to say nothing of neighbors. Said Christ: "Suppose you that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law." Luke 12:51-53.

If you are haunted by the fear that people will ridicule you if you do what God commands, read the lives of God's loyal men of the past, who suffered much more than ridicule for the cause of right. You will receive a new idea of values, all will begin to realize that the ridicule of men means little. Read what that mighty man Paul wrote from his dungeon cell to Timothy: "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God." 2 Tim. 1:8.

And why did Paul feel no shame, no humiliation, over his imprisonment and over his being subjected to the taunts of the Roman soldiers? "I am not ashamed," he said; "for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." Verse 12. "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. 4:7, 8.

That was the secret of Paul's disdain of ridicule, shame, and reproach. He looked beyond the brief present to the eternal future, with its rewards. And to those who fix their eyes on that better land of the future the Good Book declares, "They desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11: 16.

There should be coupled with this the solemn words of Christ: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation. Of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark 8:38.

Would you rather be on good terms with your neighbors than with God? Would you rather do what they think is right, or what God says is right? Would you not rather have your neighbors ashamed of you in this day than to have Christ ashamed of you in the last great day? What is your answer to solemn questions like these?