

# Answers to Objections

An Examination of the Major Objections  
Raised Against the Teachings of  
Seventh-day Adventists

---

By FRANCIS D. NICHOL

---

Published by the  
**REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.**  
TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

SOUTH BEND, IND.

PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

Copyright, 1932  
by the  
Review and Herald Publishing Association

BX  
G155.4  
.N512  
c.2  
WHITE



# CONTENTS

Preface .....	10
---------------	----

## PART I

### Decalogue Objections

1. Seventh-day Adventists teach that a man must keep the commandments in order to be saved .....	13
2. The ten commandments did not exist before the time of Moses .....	14
3. The law was abolished at the cross. Proof: Eph. 2:14, 15; Col. 2:14 .....	16
4. We are living under the new covenant, and therefore have nothing to do with the law .....	19
5. We are not under the law, but under grace. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ .....	22
6. Why preach the law, when no one can be saved by obeying it? Furthermore, man is morally unable to keep the commandments .....	24
7. The only command that we need to keep now is Christ's new commandment to love one another; for He declared that we should keep His commandments even as He had kept His Father's commandments. And does not the Bible say that love is the fulfilling of the law?.....	26
8. The law was not made for a righteous man .....	28
9. By preaching the law you endeavor to deprive us of the glorious liberty of the gospel .....	29

### Sabbath Objections

1. The Sabbath was not given until the Israelites came out of Egypt; and the Bible is silent regarding any one's keeping it before then .....	33
2. The Sabbath was given only for the Jews .....	35
3. The Sabbath was simply a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and therefore has no meaning to us Gentile Christians .....	37

4. The Old Testament tells of how 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 .... 39
5. The Sabbath was one of the Jewish feasts that Christ abolished at the cross ..... 41
6. Christ changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday at the resurrection; and after the resurrection He always met with His disciples on Sunday ..... 45
7. It was the custom of the early Christians to meet on Sunday. Paul held communion on that day ..... 47
8. John the revelator was in the Spirit on "the Lord's day," which is Sunday ..... 51
9. The resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity, and therefore we keep Sunday. Sabbath keepers are not Christians because they do not keep Sunday ..... 53
10. The book of Genesis, which says that God rested on the seventh day and blessed it, was not written until the time of the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, 2,500 years after creation. Therefore the statement that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it," really refers to God's announcement of the Sabbath command at Sinai, and not to any act of blessing the seventh day at creation..... 55
11. The Sabbath is nowhere commanded in the New Testament, whereas all the other nine commandments are reaffirmed there ..... 57
12. All we need to do is to keep the spirit of the Sabbath commandment; and the spirit of it calls simply for our keeping one day in seven ..... 60
13. Time has been lost. Because of calendar changes, we cannot really tell which is the seventh day ..... 62
14. The Sabbath cannot be kept on a round world, because in traveling around the earth a person either loses or gains a day ..... 65
15. Do you think God will keep men out of heaven because of a day? ..... 67
16. 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 rest..... 69

17. The Sabbath cannot save any one. Why not preach Christ instead? .....	71
18. 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 .....	73
19. 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?.....	75
20. If I should keep the Sabbath, all my friends and neighbors would ridicule me .....	77
21. If I keep the seventh-day Sabbath, I won't be able to make a living .....	79

## Second Advent Objections

1. Why become stirred up over the second advent? No one can tell if Christ will come tomorrow or a thousand years from now. Christians through all the centuries have vainly expected Christ's coming. The apostles thought He would come in their day. But they were all mistaken .....	81
2. Seventh-day Adventists are always setting a time for the second coming of Christ .....	84
3. Christ's second coming is not literal, but spiritual. He comes to the Christian at conversion or at death .....	85
4. It is revolting to the Christian idea of love to believe that Christ will come as a destroyer and wreak vengeance on the world .....	87
5. We should spend more time helping people to make this a better world, rather than stirring them up about another world, as is the case when the second advent doctrine is preached. To stir them up in this way leads only to fanaticism .....	89

## Mortal Man Objections

1. Man is made in the image of God; God is immortal; therefore man is immortal .....	91
2. Ecclesiastes 12:7 proves that there is a conscious, immortal entity that leaves the body at death .....	93
3. The Bible describes the death of Rachel by saying that "her soul was in departing." Gen. 35:18. (See also 1 Kings 17:21, 22) .....	95
4. Revelation 6:9, 10, proves that the souls of the righteous dead are in heaven .....	98

5. Did not Paul declare that when he died he would go immediately to be with Christ? (See Phil. 1:21-23) .....	100
6. Paul said that he was "willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Cor. 5:8	104
7. Christ, during the time between His crucifixion and His resurrection, went and preached to the spirits in prison. 1 Peter 3:18-20 .....	107
8. Christ told the thief on the cross that he would be with Him that day in Paradise. (See Luke 23:43) .....	110
9. How do you harmonize with your belief in the unconsciousness of man in death, the Bible account of the witch of Endor, who brought forth Samuel to talk with King Saul? (See 1 Sam. 28:7-19) .....	112
10. Christ's story of the rich man and Lazarus proves the immortality of the soul. (See Luke 16:19-31) .....	114
11. The Bible speaks of "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46) for the wicked, and of "everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:41) in which they will burn, and of their being "tormented day and night forever and ever" (Rev. 20:10). This proves the immortality of the soul .....	117
12. The Bible repeatedly speaks of hell and hell-fire, and of the wicked going down into hell when they die. This proves the conscious state of the dead .....	121
13. The Bible says that hell-fire will not be quenched and that "their worm dieth not." (See Mark 9:43-48 and Isa. 66:24.) This proves the immortality of the soul .....	126
14. The doctrine that a Christian at death goes down into the grave, there to lie unconscious until the resurrection day, is a gloomy belief .....	128

### Sanctuary and Atonement Objections

1. Seventh-day Adventists reject the atonement of Christ. They make of no effect the death of the Saviour, because they believe that His atonement for sin was not completed on Calvary .....	131
2. Seventh-day Adventists make Satan their savior, sin bearer, and vicarious substitute .....	133

### General Objections

1. Seventh-day Adventists, in their opposition to Sunday laws, show themselves to be in league with the disreputable elements of the country .....	135
2. Seventh-day Adventists teach that only they will be saved, and that all Sunday keepers have the mark of the beast..	136

3. Seventh-day Adventists are calamity howlers .....	138
4. Seventh-day Adventists are proselyters .....	139
5. Seventh-day Adventists hold fanatical views on health reform and vegetarianism, and by such teachings restrict the liberty that belongs to Christians.....	140
6. Seventh-day Adventism is a new "ism," and holds new and unscriptural doctrines .....	142
7. Seventh-day Adventists have a prophet like many other of the modern "isms," and they make of her writings a second Bible .....	144

## PART II

Protestantism and the Law of God .....	149
Sunday Sacredness in the Reformation Movement .....	168
Were the Annual Sabbaths Decalogue Sabbaths? The Gamble Theory Examined .....	177
Should "First Day of the Week" Read "First of the Sabbaths," in Matthew 28:1? .....	206
Evidence of the Antiquity and the Unbroken Sequence of the Weekly Cycle .....	213
An Explanation of the Original Words From Which "Soul" and "Spirit" Are Translated .....	223
The Scapegoat and the Atonement .....	229
Scriptural Index .....	251

## PREFACE

ANY movement, especially a religious one, that is active in promoting its beliefs, must expect to be confronted with a variety of objections, or even indictments, from numerous sources. In fact, opposition may be considered excellent proof that a movement is making a definite impression on the world. Men do not oppose something that is dead or dying.

The Seventh-day Adventist movement has been no exception to the rule. As it has grown, it has stirred up discussion in every corner of the earth, and the years have seen a variety of tracts, pamphlets, and books fervently brought forth and circulated in opposition. The sincerity of these opponents may be granted. It is not the sincerity of these men, but the soundness of their objections, that the author calls in question.

The list of objections considered is not exhaustive. That would be impossible, for their name is legion. However, there are certain major ones that are quite regularly raised against Seventh-day Adventist teachings. It might not be amiss to state that the decision as to which are the major ones was reached after obtaining from our leading evangelists in North America a list of the objections they most frequently meet.

The author has endeavored to avoid the barren procedure of dealing merely with the negative, by setting forth the positive Bible truth on the question in dispute. He has striven also to avoid the use of the unfortunate type of language that so often characterizes religious discussion. Seventh-day Adventists can afford to leave to those whose case lacks Bible support, the questionable expedient of substituting scathing adjectives for Scriptural evidence. We can well afford to rest our case wholly on the word of God.

Not with any wish to create needless dispute, but with the earnest desire to provide further aid in the defense of the faith once delivered unto the saints, this book is sent on its way.

THE AUTHOR.

# Part I





## DECALOGUE OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

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

To the rich young man who inquired of Christ, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Jesus replied, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19:16, 17. The verses that follow show clearly that Christ referred specifically to the ten commandments.

It is surely unfortunate that so many Christians remember only one portion of the statements of Christ. They preach much about the passive side of Christianity—of accepting Jesus Christ as a Saviour. But there is an active side as well; for Christianity embraces much more than the saving of a man from his *past* sins. It has to do with his living a sinless life. There is for the Christian a *doing* of God's will, a *keeping* of God's commandments, and a certain *working out* of his own salvation. (See Matt. 7:21; Rev. 14:12; Phil. 2:12.)

While we do *not* teach that a man keeps the commandments in order to be saved, we do emphatically teach that a man who *is* saved gives evidence of that salvation by keeping the commandments of God. It has been well remarked that although there is no salvation in keeping the law, there is awful condemnation in not keeping it.

Christianity does not free man from the claims of God's law, which he as a sinner has not been able to fulfill. If it did thus free him, Christianity would be but an opiate to his soul, leaving him in the same unfortunate state as before. No; Christianity is God's plan whereby man can obtain power to keep the laws of heaven. It is the divine scheme by which Christ lives and works within us. (See Gal. 2:20.)

We believe the words of Christ, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," but we also believe that the

*keeping* power is a gift from God. We confess that we of our own selves can do nothing, but we believe that we can do *all things* through Jesus Christ who strengthens us. (See John 15:5; Phil. 4:13.) While we say with Paul, "Work out your own salvation," we immediately add, as does the apostle, "It is *God* which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure."

## OBJECTION II

**The ten commandments did not exist before the time of Moses.**

Here is a subtle objection, the real point of which may not be immediately evident. The average reader will probably remark that inasmuch as we live *since* the time of Moses, the law applies to us, and we are therefore not concerned as to just when the law was given. Very true, and we might dismiss the matter right here were it not for the fact that the objector is endeavoring to build a subtle bit of argument on this objection. If we grant that the world moved along safely for centuries before Moses without the ten commandments, then we have halfway prepared ourselves to believe the next objection, namely, that the law was abolished at the cross. Surely if godly men like Enoch and Abraham needed not the ten commandments, why should Christians?

Therefore, because of the arguments reared upon it, we must give some attention to this claim that the ten commandments did not exist before Moses.

Right on the face of it, this is an unbelievable claim. The decalogue commands men not to make idols, for example, not to take God's name in vain, nor to kill, steal, or commit adultery. Could we possibly bring ourselves to believe that such a code of laws was not in force before Moses? There are some things too incredible to warrant belief, and this is one of them.

Nor, indeed, do any of the leading denominations thus believe. There is no point on which the great branches of the Christian church agree more cordially than that the ten commandments were in force from the beginning of the world. But this belief of the various denominations does not rest

simply on the conviction that it would be irrational to entertain any other view. It rests also on the clear statements of the Bible.

The Bible says that "sin is the transgression of the law," and that "where no law is, there is no transgression," "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." 1 John 3:4; Rom. 4:15; 3:20. We are left in no possible doubt as to what law is intended, for Paul declares: "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. What law is it that says, "Thou shalt not covet"? Why, the ten commandment law.

Our problem, therefore, is reduced to the simple question: Did sin exist before Moses? To ask this question is to answer it. We read that Satan was "a murderer from the beginning," and also "a liar." John 8:44. There must therefore have been "from the beginning" a divine law against murder and lying.

Who does not know of Sodom and Gomorrah, those sinful cities that were destroyed long before Moses lived? Either the men of those cities were transgressors of God's law, or else the judgment of God upon them was unjust; "for where no law is, there is no transgression." But why pursue further such an obvious line of reasoning as this? The Bible declares that "the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly." Gen. 13:13. Again, if the law was not in existence before Moses, why should Joseph, when tempted, exclaim: "How then can I do this great wickedness, and *sin* against God?" Gen. 39:9. Furthermore, the Bible explicitly states concerning Abraham, who lived before the days of Moses, "Abraham obeyed My voice, and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws." Gen. 26:5.

But says the objector finally: "If the decalogue was in existence before Moses, how is it that it was first proclaimed and first written down at Sinai?" Such a question reveals a forgetfulness of history, if not worse. We might as appropriately question whether the moral instruction of the Holy Bible is really binding on us, seeing that none of it was written before Moses. The simple facts are that by the time of Moses and the children of Israel the knowledge of God and His laws

had become so blurred in men's minds that it became necessary that a written revelation be given to the world. Coming directly out of Egyptian darkness, the Israelites were in special need of clear-cut declarations on the great moral precepts. For this reason God with His own finger carved in the everlasting stone the ten commandments. No one need then be in doubt. The changing moral conceptions of those Israelites could ever be corrected by the unchanging words graven in the stone.

### OBJECTION III

**The law was abolished at the cross. Proof: Eph. 2:14, 15; Col. 2:14.**

The reader is prepared in advance to look askance at this objection because of what we discovered in examining the claim that the law did not exist before Moses. We found that when there is no law there is no sin, and that specifically the law that makes sin known to us is the one containing the command against coveting—the decalogue. The simple proof that there was sin long before Moses' time, established for us the fact that the law must have been in existence before then.

It is evident that by the very same process of reasoning we can quickly discover whether the law existed after Christ's time. Did sin exist after the cross? Most certainly. The apostles went out to preach to sinners after Christ's return to heaven. The New Testament has as much to say about sin and sinners as has the Old. "But sin is not imputed when there is no law," says Paul. Rom. 5:13.

Thus it is as clear as a spring morning that the decalogue is as surely in existence *after* Christ as it was *before* Moses. No man in his Christian senses would admit that in the centuries before Christ men lived by a higher moral standard than we, for certainly there could not be a more exalted code than the ten commandments. How could we longer contend that in the Christian dispensation men were brought up to a higher moral plane, if we say at the same time that in this dispensation men are freed from the highest conceivable code, the ten commandments?

We are therefore prepared to believe, even before we examine the texts quoted by the objector, that they cannot possibly teach what he claims. The texts declare: "He [Christ] is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the *law of commandments contained in ordinances*; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Eph. 2:14, 15. "Blotting out the handwriting of *ordinances* that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross." Col. 2:14.

What do we mean by *ordinances* when we speak religiously? The Standard Dictionary thus defines the word: "A religious rite or ceremony as ordained or established by divine or by ecclesiastical authority; as, the ordinance of the Lord's supper." Did the Jewish Church before Christ have certain ordinances, even as we since Christ's time have ordinances, such as the Lord's supper and baptism? Yes, many more. They had special rites and ceremonies, like the Passover and various holy days and meat offerings and drink offerings, etc. We read, for example, "This is the ordinance of the Passover." Ex. 12:43. When these are referred to in the New Testament, the same language is used, for example: "Meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Heb. 9:10.

There were various laws and commandments stating just how these ordinances should be carried out. These were all written down by Moses in a book, and are generally described by Bible writers as the law of Moses. (See Deut. 31:9, 24; Dan. 9:11.) This "book of the law" was placed, not inside the ark, but "in the side of the ark," or rather "by the side of the ark," as many versions render verse 26 of Deuteronomy 31. (See A. R. V., Jewish translation of 1917, etc.)

How different is this from the ten commandment law, which deals only with great eternal moral principles, and which was written by God Himself on tables of stone! (See Ex. 31:18.) This ten commandment law is quite generally spoken of as the "law of God." (See Rom. 7:7, 22.) And the tables of stone containing this law were placed, not "by the side of," but "in



the ark." Deut. 10:5. These and numerous other distinctions that might be given, reveal clearly that the Bible presents two laws, and that these laws are vitally different one from the other. The law dealing with sacrifices, etc., is generally known as the *ceremonial* law, and the ten commandment code as the *moral* law.

The book of Hebrews contains the best explanation of the relation of the ancient Jewish ceremonies to the work of Christ. Incidentally, this book is generally regarded as having been written by Paul, the author of the two texts we are considering in the objection before us. In it we read of "the law having a shadow of good things to come." Heb. 10:1. Plainly the writer means the *ceremonial* law, first, because the *moral* law could not be described as a "shadow" of something "to come," for it deals with eternal principles; secondly, the writer says "the law" there spoken of deals with "burnt offerings and offerings for sin," etc. Heb. 10:8.

All the offerings under the Jewish service were intended to shadow forth the good things of the gospel, when Christ, the great sacrifice, should be offered up. When that one great, perfect sacrifice for sins was made, there was no longer need of the shadow of imperfect ones. Christ "offered one sacrifice for sins forever." Heb. 10:12. The laws and ordinances commanding the offerings of sacrifices, of meat and drink offerings, of annual holy days, like the Passover, were all abolished at the cross. Shadow met reality.

In view of this, we have no difficulty in understanding what Paul refers to when he speaks of the "law of commandments contained in ordinances," and the "handwriting of ordinances," in the two texts we are examining. He means simply the *ceremonial* law. He makes this doubly clear by saying in the succeeding verses that because these "ordinances" are abolished we are no longer under obligation as to offerings of meat or drink, etc., and the holy days, which "are a shadow of things to come." The comparison with the language of the book of Hebrews is exact. So far from these texts' teaching that the ten commandment law was abolished, they do not even *mention* it. (See page 41 for a further discussion of these texts as they relate to the Sabbath.)

**OBJECTION IV**

**We are living under the new covenant, and therefore have nothing to do with the law.**

Those who make such an objection quote various texts that show how the law is definitely related to the old covenant. Then they quote texts which declare that the old covenant has been done away. Combining these texts, they jump to the conclusion that the law was abolished also. They remind us, too, that the Bible says, "Christ is the end of the law." Rom. 10:4. They also quote another New Testament statement concerning the "ministration of death, written and engraven in stones,"—the old covenant relationship,—and declare that this was done away, and therefore the law written on stones was done away. 2 Cor. 3:7.

We agree that the old covenant was based on the law, and that the old covenant was done away. But, as we shall discover, this does not warrant the conclusion that the law also was done away.

We read: "He [Christ] is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." Heb. 8:6-9.

When they reached Mt. Sinai, the Lord said to them: "If ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people: for all the earth is Mine." Ex. 19:5. They replied: "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Verse 8. Later on, Moses read to the people the laws God had given him. When he had finished reading all the words, the people declared again: "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Ex. 24:7.

Moses then took the blood of a sacrificial animal, and sprinkled it over the people in token of the ratification of their promise to keep God's laws in return for God's special blessing. Moses then declared: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you *concerning* all these words." Verse 8. There was a covenant made "concerning all these words." The law was not the covenant, but simply that *concerning* which the Lord and the Israelites covenanted together. The New Testament specifically refers to this compact at Sinai, and describes it as the first covenant (or "testament," as some versions render it).

The faultiness of this covenant lay not in the law, for "the law of the Lord is perfect." The fault lay in the people, who had promised in their own strength to keep God's law. Further, the covenant was ratified with nothing more effective than the blood of animals. All through their history the Jews were under the mistaken impression that they could *obtain* righteousness by keeping the law—as if it were possible for a weak human being, unaided by the power of Christ, to obey God's holy law. The law thus used could mean only death for men, because the penalty for violation is death. And those living under a ministration that treated the law as something apart from the individual—as simply a code on tables of stone—truly lived under a ministration of death.

Let us examine the new covenant. We read: "This is the the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people." Heb. 8:10. Instead of abolishing the law, the new covenant makes it more real than ever in the life of the Christian, by writing it in the hearts of God's children. We read that the new covenant is "established upon better promises" than the old. Verse 6. The old was no stronger than the poor promises of the *people* to obey the law in their own strength. The new covenant is established upon the promise of *God* to give us a new heart, upon which He will write the divine law, and a new spirit that will enable us to obey this law. (See Eze. 36:26, 27.) The new covenant is



ratified, not by the blood of an animal, but by the precious blood of Christ on Calvary.

The man who accepts Christ, and thus comes under the new covenant, no longer strives to *obtain* righteousness by keeping the law. Upon his acceptance of Christ, the Saviour's righteousness is imputed to him. Says Paul: "Now the righteousness of God without [or, *apart from*] the law is manifested, being *witnessed* by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. 3:21, 22.

Because "the righteousness of God" can be obtained *apart* from the law, Paul can well declare: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. To every one who *believes* on Him, Christ brings to an absolute end the *use* of the law as a means of *obtaining* righteousness. Or, again, we may understand that word "end" as meaning the objective or purpose. Christ was the objective the law had in view; for the purpose of the law is to cause men so to realize their sinfulness, their unrighteousness, that they will go to Christ for His righteousness, which is not only imputed in justification, but is actually imparted in the daily living, as is clearly taught in Galatians 2:20. This use of the word "end" is found in James 5:11 and 1 Timothy 1:5.

The law of itself cannot make men holy. Nor can poor, weak man attain that desired state by his own attempts at law keeping. But when he accepts Christ, a divine power comes into his life that carries out the law perfectly; "for what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: *that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4. Thus we are freed from the "ministration of death," and come under the "ministration of the Spirit." 2 Cor. 3:7, 8.

The person who says he has nothing to do with God's holy law because he lives under the new covenant, reveals instead that he has nothing to do with the new covenant. For the new covenant believer has the law engraved on his heart.

**OBJECTION V**

**We are not under the law, but under grace. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.**

It is strange how individuals at times attempt to make conflicts in Bible statements where none exist. There is no conflict between law and grace, or between law and gospel. A simple definition or two will help us out in this matter. By "law" we mean God's standard of right and wrong—the yardstick by which we can tell whether we have fallen short of God's requirements. The word "gospel" means good news—good news of salvation from sin. (See Matt. 1:21.) And the Bible defines sin as any violation of the divine law. (See 1 John 3:4.) So, then, the gospel is the good news of God's plan to save us from breaking His holy law. Thus instead of law and gospel being in opposition, they are in close fellowship. And the very existence of the gospel proves that the law is still in force; for what would be the point in preaching the good news of salvation from breaking the law if the law were no longer in force? A man cannot break that which does not exist.

Let us now read, in its setting, the key text in this discussion: "Sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Rom. 6:14, 15. We discover immediately that whatever else Paul wishes us to understand by this passage, he does not want us to think that the reign of grace frees us from the law. "What then?" says he; "shall we sin," that is, break the law, "because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid."

The very next verse makes clear that to be "under the law" means to be under its condemnation, and that to be "under grace" means to be living under the plan that God has offered of salvation from the bondage of sin. For Paul follows right on to say: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. 6:16, 18.

The contrast is between servants "of sin" and servants "of obedience unto righteousness." What is it that gives strength to sin? It is the law, says Paul. (See 1 Cor. 15:56.) The fact that the law exists and pronounces a death penalty for evil doing and evil living, is what gives to sin its power over those who indulge in unlawful acts. The law does not lay its strong hand on the man who does not violate it. Its strength is felt only by the lawbreaker.

Paul says sin is no longer to hold us in its grip, because we are living under, or have accepted, God's plan of grace, which gives us a power that breaks the grip of sin. Thus instead of being servants of sin, we become servants of "obedience unto righteousness." And what is righteousness? It is right doing, right living—a state of heart the very opposite of sinfulness or lawlessness. Paul in a later chapter tells how the grace of the gospel of Jesus Christ brings righteousness to us, and how this righteousness is directly related to the law. We read: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the *righteousness of the law* might be fulfilled in *us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

Paul deals with the same problem in Galatians 3:24, 25: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster."

The law can show us our sinfulness, and bring to us such conviction of sin that we shall be driven to Christ, who can free us from our sins. When we receive Christ, we are no longer under the domination—the condemnation—of the law. But we are not freed from obedience to God's law, for in accepting Christ we receive divine power for obedience to that law, as is explained in the passage just quoted from Romans 8. Thus Galatians 3:24, 25, gives no support to the claim that the law is abolished.

How plain and simple it is, then, that when we accept God's Son and the grace He offers, we do not turn our back on the law! Rather, we find that the "righteousness of the law" is

"fulfilled in us." Instead of being sinners, breakers of God's law, we find that we are obedient to it.

In the light of these facts there is no difficulty in the text: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17. While Moses served a very great purpose in the plan of God,—for through him God gave to the world the written form of the moral code,—yet through Christ came divine grace, without which the law cannot truly be kept.

Both law and grace came from heaven. How happy are we as Christians that we are not called upon to reject one in order to have the other! By the power of God's grace we no longer dwell under the condemnation of the law, but are in Him raised up to the lofty plane of complete obedience to this divine code.

#### OBJECTION VI

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

We do not quite understand why this objection is raised, for we have never claimed that any one could be saved by keeping the law. We are further puzzled to understand why such an argument as this should be used to prove that the law was abolished at the cross. The statements made in this objection apply just as well before Christ as after. Certainly men were no more morally able to keep God's holy law in the centuries before Christ than they are in the years after Christ. Nor could they in those earlier centuries hope to obtain salvation through the law, for God has had only one way of saving men from the days of Adam down, and that is through the sacrifice of Christ.

So, then, if this objection really proves anything against the law *today*, it proves it against the law for *every* century. In other words, there would be no useful place for God's law at all in the whole history of the world. To such lengths are those driven who follow a wrong road of reasoning to its logical end. We agree with the objector that no one can be saved by

keeping the law, and that man is morally unable to keep it. But we do not agree with the conclusion he would have us draw from these facts. What would we say to the man who should argue that mirrors ought to be abolished as worthless because no one can obtain beauty by looking into them? Why, we would say that it is not the business of a mirror to make people beautiful, that no one ever made any such claims for mirrors. The function of the mirror is to provide us with a means of knowing whether we look as we ought. And when we have discovered how we look, we can take appropriate means for remedying the imperfections.

Even so with the law. The law was never intended to make man holy or pure or beautiful. Its task is not that of saving man from his sins and imperfections, but of providing him with a means of discovering just what his condition is. When he gazes at the law, with mind quickened by the convicting Spirit of God, he sees immediately where this moral defect, or that, mars the beauty of his soul, even as he discovers from gazing into a mirror just where this physical defect, or that, mars the beauty of his body.

And when men see their spiritual defects, when they become conscious of their uncleanness, then they are in a frame of mind to listen to a message that offers cleansing from their defilement. In other words, only when a man realizes that he is a sinner is he ready to listen to the gospel, which is the good news of salvation *from* sin. It is by the law that we have the knowledge of sin. (See Rom. 3:20.) Therefore it is evident that only as the law is made known to men can they be brought into a frame of mind that will cause them to wish to hear and accept what the gospel offers them.

But let us consider further the second statement, that man is morally unable to keep the commandments. We would ask the objector this question: If sinful man is morally *unable* to keep the law, and when he becomes a Christian he *need not* keep it, pray tell why was the law of God ever given? Shall we make a farce of God's law, and charge Heaven with proclaiming a code that was for thousands of years impossible of being kept, and for the last two thousand years need not be kept? The



fact is, that instead of the law's being abolished for the Christian, there is really *no* true keeping of the law *except* by Christians. The divine code would be a dead letter in this world were it not for the Christians who obey it. By faith Christ comes into our hearts, and lives out in us the precepts of heaven. (See Eph. 3:20; Gal. 2:20; 1 Cor. 1:23, 24.) Thus, instead of God's law being wholly ignored and flouted in this rebellious world, there are found men and women upholding and establishing it in the only way a law can be upheld,—by living in obedience to its claims. That is why Paul says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31. Our faith in Christ has not abolished but established the law.

#### OBJECTION VII

**The only command that we need to keep now is Christ's new commandment to love one another; for He declared that we should keep His commandments even as He had kept His Father's commandments. And does not the Bible say that love is the fulfilling of the law?**

It is quite true that Christ said, "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." John 13:34. Would the objector want to reason from this that all other commandments are abolished? The text does not allow such a conclusion. Christ did not say that we should keep His commandments in the *place* of His Father's commandments. It would be rebellion for the Son to free us from the Father's laws, and set up new ones in their place. Christ's purpose was not to destroy the great moral teachings and laws that had been given in former centuries. In His sermon on the mount He declared: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18.

And when we read farther in that wonderful sermon, we find Christ telling His hearers that they were viewing various commandments of the decalogue in too narrow a sense. Instead

of abolishing or even restricting His Father's commandments, Christ *magnified* them.

Thus in His commandment to the disciples concerning love, Christ wanted them to view love in a more magnified, a more holy sense than formerly. He wanted them to love one another, not as the world interprets love—selfishly or even merely sentimentally. By His life Christ had set before them an example of what true, unselfish love really is, such love as had never before been witnessed on the earth. Thus His commandment was truly new. It charged them, not simply “that ye love one another,” but “that ye love one another, *as I have loved you.*” John 15:12.

But what of the statement that love is the fulfilling of the law? The objector often expands this by saying that Christ declared that all we are to do is to love God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves. Let us read exactly what the Bible does say on this matter:

“Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked Him a question, tempting Him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” Matt. 22:35-40.

Christ was here setting forth no new doctrine. On the contrary, He was answering the specific question, “Which is the great commandment *in the law?*” His words are almost an exact quotation from the Old Testament. (See Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18.) In other words, the two great commandments to love God and to love our neighbor belong definitely to Old Testament times. Now then, if these two commandments take the place of the ten commandments, why were the ten commandments ever given? But the very Israelites who listened to the exhortation to love God and their neighbor also listened to the clear-cut command to obey the ten precepts of the decalogue.

No, these two commandments on love do not take the place of any other law. Instead, Christ declared that “*on* these two

commandments *hang all* the law and the prophets." The trouble with the objector is that he would have these two commandments hang *by themselves*, and have everything else cut off. But this is contrary to the teaching of Christ Himself.

According to the Bible, you cannot separate love from law. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:2, 3. Thus reads the Good Book. If we truly love our fellow man, we will not steal his goods or lie about him or kill him. Indeed, we will not do any of the things prohibited by God's commandments. And if we truly love God, we will not bow down to false gods, or take God's name in vain, or use for our own purpose His holy Sabbath day. In other words, if we love God and our fellow men, we will not willfully break any of the ten commandments. Thus is love the fulfilling of the law. Instead of love's being a substitute for law, it is the one power that brings forth true obedience to God's commandments. The Bible warns us against those who say they know and love God, but refuse to keep His commandments. (See 1 John 2:4.) Such love is counterfeit.

### OBJECTION VIII

#### **The law was not made for a righteous man.**

Let us read the whole passage in which this brief phrase is found: "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." 1 Tim. 1:9, 10.

The first fact that stands out from this Bible statement is that it says nothing about the law's being abolished in the Christian dispensation. Instead, we find that the law serves as definite a purpose in the Christian era as in the centuries before



Christ. The class of people against whom the law is directed—murderers, liars, etc.—are found in every period of the world's history. Really there is no text in the Bible that proves more conclusively than does this one that the law was not done away at the cross.

But does the objector contend that murderers and liars, for example, should obey the law, while Christians are free from it? To this strange conclusion would we be brought by following out the objector's logic.

There is really nothing hard to understand about this text. It is a simple statement concerning the purpose of law that every judge or legislator or layman would agree to today in matters civil as well as religious. For whom are our criminal laws laid down? For the law-abiding citizen? No, for the lawless, you say. That is right. But is the law-abiding citizen therefore freed from the requirements of the statute books? No.

The same is true concerning God's law. It is directed against the lawless, not against the righteous, who are law-abiding citizens of the kingdom of God. But are the citizens of the heavenly kingdom therefore freed from the requirements of that divine code? No.

Furthermore, good citizens in any government are not the ones who complain about the law. They have little occasion to complain. Their lives are in harmony with it. Even so in the spiritual realm. The man whose heart is right with God finds no occasion to fight the divine law, or to tell others that it ought to be abolished. Instead, he says with the psalmist, "O how love I Thy law! it is my meditation all the day." Ps. 119:97.

#### OBJECTION IX

**By preaching the law you endeavor to deprive us of the glorious liberty of the gospel.**

Christ declared: "Every one that committeth sin is the bond-servant of sin." John 8:34, A. R. V. And what is sin? The Bible says: "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Therefore it is the man whose life is *not* in obedience to the

law of God who is deprived of liberty. The righteous man willingly obeys God's law, and finds happiness in such obedience.

Law and liberty are not opposite words. You need not surrender one in order to have the other. True, there are men who stand up at street corners and declare that the only way to have real liberty is to abolish all laws. But as good citizens we do not take such talk very seriously. Instead, we know that laws wisely made and well kept provide the only sure foundation for liberty in any country. In fact, some one has aptly remarked, "Obedience to law is liberty." And this phrase is often found inscribed on public buildings in this liberty-loving land of ours.

In any country the ones who find in law a curtailing of their liberty are those whose habits of life are in opposition to the law. The man who is accustomed to steal or to murder finds that the law checks the freedom of his actions very greatly.

Of course, it is sometimes true that an unjust law is passed, which does strike at the liberty of good citizens. But that simply proves that the lawmakers in that particular instance have passed a bad law, and not that laws in general are all bad, and should be abolished by a liberty-loving people.

If as citizens of this world we find liberty in obedience to law, why, as citizens of the heavenly world, do we need the law abolished in order to have liberty? Is it because the laws of heaven are unjust and deprive us of the freedom that ought rightfully to be ours? It were blasphemy to utter the thought.

The law of God prohibits making or worshiping idols. No man who calls himself a Christian can feel deprived of liberty by such a prohibition. The law also commands us not to take God's name in vain or to desecrate His holy Sabbath day. Does the child of God want to be freed from these prohibitions? Likewise the law commands respect for parents, and prohibits killing, adultery, stealing, lying, and coveting. Certainly no follower of Christ will feel that these precepts deprive him of liberty.

Indeed, the Bible definitely speaks of God's holy law as "the law of liberty." (See James 2:10-12.) True, if the law is preached to men apart from the gospel,—the saving power

of God,—the result will be only a feeling of condemnation on the part of the hearers. They will simply be brought to a realization of how guilty they are. But when the high code of heaven is presented in terms of God's promise to give us of His Divine Spirit to carry out the law's holy requirements, then the hearers can find happiness and liberty in such preaching; for "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." 2 Cor. 3:17.

No one would ever have thought of bringing against Seventh-day Adventists the charge of depriving men of Christian liberty if it were not that we preach the law exactly as it reads in the Bible. Protestant denominations believe in the law (see page 149 for references to creeds), and declare that obedience to it is necessary. They have believed so strongly that the ten commandments, as they interpret them, should be obeyed by all, that they have persuaded legislatures in most of the so-called Christian countries to enact statutes for the observance of the fourth commandment, the Sabbath command.

Just why we who invoke only the grace of God to enable man to obey the command to keep holy the seventh day, should be charged as legalists, while the hosts of Sunday keepers who invoke the strong arm of the law in order to compel men to rest on the first day of the week, should claim to be the exponents of grace, is surely one of the strange contradictions in modern religion. Seventh-day Adventists have ever been vigorous opponents of the principle of approaching Sabbath rest from the legal standpoint, while Sunday-keeping preachers are the ones who have lobbied almost every legislative body in Christian lands into passing strong laws to protect Sunday!

Just what is there about preaching first-day sacredness from the fourth commandment—as Protestant denominations, in general, do—that allows them to bask in the warmth of grace; while the preaching of seventh-day sacredness from the same fourth commandment, consigns such preachers to the chill limbo of legalism? The explanation cannot possibly be found in the theory that we who preach seventh-day sacredness do so more sternly and rigorously than first-day preachers. Even a cursory acquaintance with Protestant history reveals that Sun-

day sacredness has quite generally been proclaimed with a severity that frightened into conformity the majority, and thrust into jail the remainder. If today there is a certain relaxation of this severity, it surely does not reflect any fundamental difference of view toward the first day by *religious leaders*, for they bemoan the laxity that has crept in.

When we declare that a certain definite day has been set apart as holy, we are frequently met with the argument that there is no difference in days in the Christian era, that it is unreasonable to maintain that a special sacredness or significance attaches to a particular day in the cycle of the week. But evidently by the actions and statements of Sunday keepers themselves there is a vast difference in days, so vast a difference that the keeping of one particular day means that you are shackled by legalism, while the keeping of another particular day means that you roam freely over the wide expanses of grace. Seventh-day Adventists never taught a sharper contrast in days than this.

Therefore the point at issue is not whether the ten commandments should be obeyed or not; all Protestantism believes that. Nor is it a question of whether there is a wide difference in days. Protestants in general believe there is so mighty a difference as to justify civil laws and penalties to maintain the difference. The real question is this: Seeing that the decalogue is in force, and seeing that there is a difference in days, which day is the right one, the seventh or the first? In the series of Sabbath objections in the following pages a partial answer, at least, will be found.

## SABBATH OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

**The Sabbath was not given until the Israelites came out of Egypt; and the Bible is silent regarding any one's keeping it before then.**

Even if it were true that the Sabbath was not given until the exodus, why should that affect our keeping of the day? We live on this side of that notable event. The unreasonableness of the Sabbath objection based on this argument is clearly revealed when it is set forth in the following form:

1. That which was not commanded until the exodus does not bind Christians;
2. The Sabbath was not commanded until the exodus;
3. Therefore, the Sabbath is not binding on us.

Only when point number one—the major premise—is employed can any one build an argument against the Sabbath out of the claim that it was not given until the exodus. But the trouble is that the Sabbath objector is not willing to stand by his logic when it is employed in connection with the other commandments of the decalogue.

Take the third precept, for example, that against taking the name of the Lord in vain. Previous to the exodus, there is no specific command on this subject. Shall we therefore conclude that we Christians are not obliged to keep this injunction? How blasphemous! But the foregoing logic would demand this.

Or, take the fifth precept, the command to honor our parents. There is no specific command on this point previous to the exodus. Are we Christians therefore freed from this important precept? How preposterous! Other examples might be taken from the ten, but surely it is superfluous to do so. The argument of the Sabbath opponents proves too much, and so proves nothing.



Therefore, we repeat, even if the Sabbath was not specifically commanded until the exodus, that fact does not release us today from keeping the seventh day. But the Bible specifically declares that the seventh day was sanctified by God, that is, set apart for a holy use, at the end of creation week, "because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." Gen. 2:3. If the seventh day was set apart for a holy purpose, then was it not a holy day? What more could possibly be needed to establish the sanctity and the uniqueness of a particular day than for God to sanctify it? And if it was a holy day, would not holy men, such as Enoch and Noah and Abraham, keep it holy each week? The mere fact that there is no mention of any one's keeping it before the exodus proves nothing at all, or else it proves too much, which is equivalent to the same thing. The Sabbath objector can take his choice. Let us place his argument in strictly logical form again to see how valid it is:

1. When the Bible does not record the observance of a holy day, that proves that the people during that period did not keep such a day;
2. The Bible does not record the keeping of the Sabbath from creation to the exodus;
3. Therefore, there was no Sabbath before the exodus.

Now it is a fact that throughout the whole of the Bible there is no record of the keeping of the Day of Atonement. Evidently we must therefore conclude that the Jews never kept that very solemn day. But this is absurd, for all agree that the Day of Atonement has been more faithfully kept throughout Jewish history than any other holy day, and even now is the most carefully kept of all Jewish holy days.

Apparently, then, the failure of the Scriptures to record the keeping of the Day of Atonement in all the centuries following the setting apart of the tenth day of the seventh month at Mt. Sinai, does not warrant the conclusion that that day was not observed; therefore we may most properly conclude that the failure of the book of Genesis to record the keeping of the Sabbath following the setting apart of the seventh day of the

weekly cycle, does not warrant the conclusion that the Sabbath was not observed during the period from creation to the exodus.

Thus do we find that the Sabbath objector cannot prove his statement, and that even if he were able to prove it, he would not invalidate the Sabbath.

## OBJECTION II

### **The Sabbath was given only for the Jews.**

The plausibility of this objection lies in the fact that the Sabbath commandment was formally proclaimed from Sinai to a multitude composed chiefly of Jews. And on this fact there is reared the most amazing conclusion that Christians are under no obligation to keep the Sabbath.

When the three disciples, Peter, James, and John,—all of them Jews,—were with Christ on the mount of transfiguration, there came a voice from heaven saying, "This is My beloved Son: hear Him." Luke 9:35. Are we to understand, therefore, that this command of the Father to "hear" Christ was to be obeyed only by those three disciples, or, at the most, only by the Jewish race to which they belonged? But that would be as reasonable as the conclusion regarding the Sabbath command. In each case there is a mountain. In each case God proclaims a command. In each case the congregation were Jews. Evidently, then, the mere fact that the particular audience is Jewish does not warrant the conclusion that the command is intended only for them.

To base an objection to a Bible command on the ground that it has definite Jewish connections will lead to the most astounding conclusions. All the Bible was written *by* Jews, and most of it quite strictly *to* Jews. All the Bible prophets were Jews; all the apostles were Jews. Christ Himself "took on Him the seed of Abraham" (Heb. 2:16), and walked among men as a Jew. And it was none other than Christ who declared: "Salvation is of the Jews." John 4:22. Shall we conclude, then, that the Bible prophets, the apostles, the Saviour and salvation, all should be confined to the Jews? To what lengths do we come when we follow out a wrong line of reasoning!

"But," the objector may reply, "it does not say anywhere that the Saviour and salvation were to be confined to the Jews." Very true; we agree heartily. 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 world-wide 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.

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 lighteth every *man* that cometh 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? In our answer to the preceding objection we clearly set forth the Scriptural proof that the Sabbath was instituted at the beginning of the world.

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. 56:1-8.)

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.)



Therefore we may properly conclude that the Sabbath was not only *not* given exclusively to the Jews, but on the contrary was intended for *all* men. Are you keeping it, and thus enjoying the blessing that God has promised to those who obey His word?

### OBJECTION III

**The Sabbath was simply a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and therefore has no meaning to us Gentile Christians.**

The text upon which this statement is based is Deuteronomy 5:15, and reads as follows: "Remember that thou wast 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."

First of all, let us 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 these 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 reach? Why, 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 farther 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 shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee: *therefore* I command thee this thing today." Deut. 15:15. Shall we conclude that liberality and love toward servants is a command originating at the exodus, and that all who lived before that time might deal grudgingly with their servants without incurring God's displeasure? Preposterous!

Again, let us read a more detailed command: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. *Therefore* shall ye 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, and that previous to that a man might "short change" his neighbor with impunity? Unbelievable!

Or take this further statement: "I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: ye 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 indorse 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, the text quoted by the objector 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 IV

**The Old Testament tells of how 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.**

First, let us quote the text in question. In Exodus 31:14 we read: "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people."

As we have discovered from examining other Sabbath objections, it is well to have all the facts before us ere we draw a conclusion. 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, some one has estimated that no less than nine of the ten commandments are specifically mentioned in connection with the penalty of death for their violation.

The first fact, then, that presents itself is that there was nothing unique in there being a death penalty for Sabbath 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. Yet it would be no more unreasonable than the contention that because present-day Sabbath keepers should not put Sabbath breakers 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 one who executes the punishment. When God was the direct ruler, He saw fit to have an immediate punishment inflicted. Now the evil doer 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 deca-

logue, which declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.

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). What could be more explicit than these terse declarations of Holy Writ? Let no man endeavor to explain them away.

#### **OBJECTION V**

**The Sabbath was one of the Jewish feasts that Christ abolished at the cross.**

The texts upon which this claim is built are as follows: "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Eph. 2:14, 15. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross. . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:14-17.



Let us compare these foregoing texts with an incident recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. We read there of how, after the gospel began to be preached to the Gentiles,—and those to whom the preceding texts were written were Gentiles,—dissension arose because certain men declared “that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.” Verse 5.

The apostles had met at Jerusalem to decide whether the Gentile converts should be required to carry out all the ceremonial statutes, such as circumcision and ceremonial purifyings, that Moses had given to the Jews. During the discussion, Peter declared: “Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put *a yoke upon the neck* of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?” Verse 10. The decision of the conference was that the Gentiles should not be required to carry out the ceremonial obligations.

Let us bring in for further comparison the letter that Paul wrote to the Galatians, another Gentile church. He says, “False brethren . . . came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into *bondage*.” Gal. 2:4. The context shows that the “false brethren” were demanding that these non-Jewish believers obey the requirements of the ceremonial law as touching circumcision and similar rites.

Farther on in the same chapter we find the record of a spirited exchange between Peter and Paul. Peter, who had been eating with the Gentiles,—a ceremonially unclean thing for an orthodox Jew in those days to do,—refused to continue this practice, because he feared the criticism of certain Jews who had just arrived from Jerusalem and who might object to his contaminating himself by mingling with those who did not keep the law of Moses. Paul declared that the gospel did not justify any such separation between Jews and Gentiles. The middle wall of partition had been broken down. Farther on in the letter Paul gives this counsel to the Galatians: “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with *the yoke of bondage*. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit



you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. 5:1-3.

Let us now draw our conclusion. The first point we can establish is that the law described in these various texts is not the ten commandment law, and for at least two definite reasons:

1. None of its precepts gives directions concerning circumcision or the eating of meats or partaking of drinks. If the reader's memory is hazy, he can speedily verify this statement by reading Exodus 20:3-17, where the ten commandments as spoken by God with His own voice, and as later written by God's own finger upon two tables of stone, are recorded. In fact, the ten commandments do not deal with *any* ceremonial questions, and therefore could not create a middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles. It was no precept of the ten that caused Peter to separate himself from the Gentile believers at meals.

2. The ten commandments did not deal with matters that were a "shadow of things to come." Instead, they dealt with eternal principles; and specifically the Sabbath commandment in the decalogue pointed, *not forward* to something that was to come, but *backward* to creation.

What law, then, is referred to in these texts? The answer is given right in one of the texts we have already quoted, "the law of Moses." Acts 15:5. This phrase, "the law of Moses," was the one generally used by the Jews to describe that extended group of statutes on ceremonial questions, such as circumcision and purifyings and meat offerings and drink offerings, which, under the dictation of God, but entirely apart from the decalogue, which was written by Jehovah Himself, Moses wrote down in a book. It was the carrying out of the numerous injunctions of this law of Moses that caused Peter to remove himself from the Gentile believers. And most patently a law that would operate to separate one group of believers from another could very literally be described as a "middle wall of partition."

And did this "law of Moses" deal with sabbath days apart from the seventh-day Sabbath of the decalogue? It did. In Leviticus the twenty-third chapter, which constitutes a part of this law of Moses, are found commands regarding a whole

group of annual sabbaths, that is, sabbaths that occurred once a year on fixed dates of certain months, such as the Passover sabbath on the fifteenth day of the first month. These dealt wholly with incidents of special interest to the Jews, and were truly a shadow of things to come. The Passover, for example, pointed forward to the crucifixion, when Christ, our Passover, was slain. (See 1 Cor. 5:7.)

The ancient Israelites had no possible reason to confuse these annual sabbaths, such as the Passover, with the seventh-day Sabbath of the fourth commandment, because they kept the Passover sabbath, for example, only once a year, on a fixed date of the month, whereas they kept the decalogue Sabbath once every week, irrespective of calendar dates. Thus in this particular alone it might be said quite accurately that there were fifty-two points of contrast between the two kinds of sabbaths, for are there not fifty-two weeks in the year?

But in order to remove any conceivable ground for confusion, Moses, in concluding his description of these annual sabbaths, or feasts, as they were interchangeably known, declared to the Israelites, "These are the feasts of the Lord, . . . *beside* the Sabbaths of the Lord." Lev. 23:37, 38. In other words, they were in addition to, apart from, the seventh-day Sabbath.

This understanding of the texts before us is no peculiar view of Seventh-day Adventists. Instead, it is the view widely held by conservative theologians. The following comments by Albert Barnes, widely quoted Presbyterian commentator, are representative:

"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. If he had used the word in the singular number, '*THE Sabbath*,' it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that the commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that 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 obligation.”—*Notes on Colossians 2:16, by Albert Barnes.*

Therefore it is evident that the apostle Paul, in speaking of “sabbath days” in the texts cited at the beginning of this chapter, refers to the annual sabbaths, which were a part of the ceremonial law of Moses; and that it was this law, with its numerous commands regarding circumcision, etc., that was nailed to the cross.

#### OBJECTION VI

**Christ changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday at the resurrection; and after the resurrection He always met with His disciples on Sunday.**

Probably this is the most commonly entertained idea regarding the Sabbath question. Many conscientious people really believe that Christ changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week at His resurrection. Now the whole matter can be settled easily and beyond all dispute if the Bible text showing this change can be produced. But there is no such text to be found between the covers of the Good Book. In fact, there would be no controversy over this whole matter of the Sabbath and Sunday if there were even *one* text stating that the day had been changed, and that we in the Christian dispensation should keep the first day instead of the seventh.

It is a matter of simple record that there are only six texts in the New Testament that mention the first day of the week in connection with Christ's life here on earth. For brevity's sake, we will give simply the references for them, as follows: Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19. (There are two other references in the New Testament to the first day of the week, but they deal with incidents subsequent to the ascension of Christ. We will discuss them in Objection VII.) A reading of these six texts reveals the following facts:

1. Each time Sunday is called simply the first day of the week; no title of holiness or special sanctity is employed.

2. There is no statement by Christ that any special significance whatever should henceforth be attached to the first day of the week.

3. Three of the four Gospel writers plainly state, as the contexts of the foregoing references reveal, that the Sabbath had ended when the first day of the week began.

4. Evidently, then, the only significance that can attach to the mention of the first day of the week in connection with the resurrection is the proof it affords of the desire of the Gospel writers to give an accurate history of the events surrounding the crucifixion, and to show that Christ's prophecy that He would be raised on the third day was fulfilled.

Now a word as to the claim that Christ, after His resurrection, always met with His disciples on Sunday. It is an interesting fact that those who make this claim do not cite John 21:1-5, which is the record of one of the meetings of Christ with His disciples. If this was on a Sunday, then evidently the disciples considered fishing a proper occupation for that day. Nor does Jesus reprove them. Instead He instructs them how to catch the fish. (See verse 6.)

The facts are, there are only three postresurrection meetings where the time is indicated:

1. The resurrection day, which was, of course, Sunday.

2. "And after eight days," when the doubting Thomas met Christ. John 20:26.

3. The day of the ascension, which occurred "forty days" after the resurrection. (See Acts 1:3, 9.)

A glance at the calendar will quickly reveal to the reader that if the resurrection day was on Sunday, the ascension, which was forty days later, could not possibly occur on a Sunday. There is a difference of opinion as to just what is intended by the phrase "after eight days," and we are willing to leave the reader to judge for himself whether this phrase gives any clear indication of a Sunday meeting.

Apparently, then, we have definite Biblical proof of Christ's meeting with His disciples on only one Sunday, namely, the

resurrection day. Thus we discover that the widely believed idea as to Christ's having changed the day and as to His having always met with His disciples on Sunday subsequent to His resurrection, is without any Bible foundation.

### OBJECTION VII

**It was the custom of the early Christians to meet on Sunday. Paul held communion on that day.**

Even if it be granted that the early Christians were in the habit of meeting on the first day of the week, this would not in itself prove that the Sabbath of the decalogue had been done away. For a custom into which people may fall, even though they are Christian people, cannot in itself nullify a clear command of God. Thus we might dismiss this Sabbath objection without further consideration.

In Objection VI we analyzed the texts that mention the first day of the week, so far as *Christ's* relationship to the day is concerned. We found that there were six, all referring to the resurrection day, and that they give not the slightest evidence that Christ changed the day. Therefore we really need not introduce them here. But because the claim is frequently made that the custom of Christians' meeting on Sunday began on that resurrection day, let us see what the Bible says.

We certainly have no desire to ignore the fact that the disciples were together on that resurrection Sunday, but we reject the claim that they were gathered together on that day for religious worship in honor of the resurrection, and that such worship indicated a change in the Sabbath. The Bible declares plainly that until the closing hours of that resurrection Sunday the disciples were skeptical of the report that Christ was risen, and that they were gathered together behind closed doors, in what was evidently their common abode (see Acts 1:13), for "fear of the Jews." (See John 20:19.) A group of men who had spent the day in fear and unbelief could hardly be said to have engaged in spiritual worship, least of all in worship celebrating the resurrection. Surely nothing would have amazed these disciples more than the thought that Christian



people, living in the twentieth century, should endeavor to base an argument for Sunday sacredness on the mere fact of their having been gathered together in their abode that Sunday.

Let us now examine the first of the two remaining texts that mention the first day of the week:

"Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20:7. This text is part of a running narrative describing various incidents of Paul's homeward journey 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." Apparently, then, "breaking bread" means simply partaking of food, even as we today sometimes speak of breaking bread, and the idea of a communion service is not necessarily contained in the phrase. However, even if some one should feel that there is ground for believing that the communion is thus intended, it would prove nothing distinctive for this particular day, 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.

When thus stripped of all surplus language, such an argument for Sunday 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 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 reckoned days from sunset to sunset, and not from midnight to midnight, as we do. (See Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; Lev. 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 on the “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.”—*Chap. 20, p. 520 (1 vol. ed.)*. 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.

Dr. Augustus Neander, one of the most learned of church historians, though a Sunday keeper himself, remarks thus concerning this incident in Acts 20:

"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," Vol. I, p. 337. Translation by Henry John Rose, 1831.*

Well, if this "passage is not entirely convincing" to a learned Sunday keeper, 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."

The second of the two remaining "first day" texts reads thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16:1-3. The objector endeavors to find in this remaining text a picture of a religious service when a company is gathered together, and the offering is being taken up. The argument, of course, is that if a service was held on Sunday, that proves Sunday is sacred, and, by inference, that the Sabbath of the decalogue 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 picture that is drawn from it. Instead of describing a church offering where the communicants pass over their gifts to some deacon, the record says that each one was to "lay by him in store." 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.

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. We quote only one such typical comment, that found in "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," a learned 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, M. A., p. 164.

When learned Sunday-keeping theologians are unable to find in this text any support for Sunday sacredness, it is hardly necessary for a believer in the seventh-day Sabbath to give extended consideration to the passage.

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 decalogue, which declares that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

#### OBJECTION VIII

**John the revelator was in the Spirit on "the Lord's day," which is Sunday.**

The text in question reads as follows: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Rev. 1:10.

The argument here is a subtle one, and depends on the meaning of words at different times in the history of the world. The

Sabbath objector proceeds on the known fact that many Christian people today describe Sunday as the Lord's day, and that this title for the first day of the week goes back to within a century or two of Christ. And though such a use of the phrase cannot be brought any nearer than this to the time of Christ, we are expected to believe that this title was used by the apostles in their writing.

But this cannot be proved. It is only an assumption based on the fact that in later times, long after John had died, people thus described the first day of the week. To endeavor to place in the mouth of a writer a definition employed long after his time, results sometimes in causing him to say the very opposite of what he intended, for words have a way of changing their meaning with the years. Take our little word "let." We use it today to mean "allow," or "permit." But about two centuries ago, it meant to "hinder," or "oppose,"—a meaning almost exactly opposite. (See 2 Thess. 2:7.) Or take the little phrase "by and by." A few centuries ago it meant "immediately," but today it conveys the thought of some indefinite future time. (See Luke 21:9.)

The only safe way, when we wish to build a proof on a lone word or phrase, is to find out just how the term was used at the time the author wrote. This principle might well be applied to other phases of life than theology, for too many tragic blunders grow out of trying to make people say what they never intended to say.

The question, therefore, is this: Was the term "Lord's day" one that the Bible writers in general and the apostles in particular used to describe Sunday? The answer, briefly, is, No. Instead, as we have already noted in foregoing objections, Sunday is never given any title in the Bible, but is described simply as the first day of the week. Now two of the eight references to Sunday are found in John's Gospel, which was probably written about the close of the first century, and shortly after the book of Revelation, which contains the phrase "Lord's day." Is it not strange, indeed, if Sunday had the holy title of Lord's day, that John, after writing the Revelation, should have turned around and described Sunday simply as "the first day of the

week" as he does in both instances in his Gospel account? (See John 20:1, 19.)

The only day that answers the description of Lord's day so far as Bible writers are concerned, is the seventh day of the week. God Himself declared that the "seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." Ex. 20:10. We are told by the prophet Isaiah that we should speak of the seventh day as "the holy of the Lord." Isa. 58:13. Finally, Christ Himself declared that He is "Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. Thus did Christ describe the seventh day of the week. John heard the Saviour utter these words. He knew also the words we have quoted from the decalogue and from the prophet Isaiah. Surely we need have no perplexity, then, in determining what day he meant when he wrote in the book of Revelation, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."

That writers a century or more later should have borrowed the phrase to describe Sunday, provides simply one more proof in confirmation of the well-established charge that the Christian church early departed from the true doctrines of the Bible, and endeavored to borrow Bible support for various unscriptural religious institutions.

### OBJECTION IX

**The resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity, and therefore we keep Sunday. Sabbath keepers are not Christians because they do not keep Sunday.**

Even if we grant that the resurrection is the greatest event in the history of Christianity, it does not therefore follow that the Sabbath of the decalogue should be abolished and Sunday worship be substituted in its place. Who are we frail mortals that we should proceed to 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. If human beings must decide which is the greatest event, 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 miraculous birth of Christ would be meaningless. The same is true of the crucifixion. Who, then, are we, to say dogmatically which is the greatest event in the history of Christianity?

Who could 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, who could 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?

But 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 at least because he does not honor it in the way the Sunday keeper has decided it should be honored.

But the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath provides the best proof that we honor Christ and carry out His explicit instruction. The last book of the Bible—the book of Revelation—opens thus, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him." Verse 1. Then follows a blessing upon him who reads and obeys the instruction contained in this book. A reading of this book reveals that the keeping of "the commandments of God" in connection with "the faith of Jesus" is the chief characteristic of the "saints," the true followers of Christ in the last days. (See Rev. 14:12.) Now in order to qualify as a keeper of "the commandments of God," it is necessary that the Christian observe the seventh-day Sabbath, for thus are we commanded in the fourth precept of the decalogue.



Furthermore, by keeping the Sabbath, which memorializes the creation of the world, we honor Christ as the Creator, "for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth." Col. 1:16. Only when we keep bright in our minds the fact of the creation shall we be led to remember that Christ brought all things into existence, and therefore "is before all things" (verse 17), the master of all things, and able to exercise creative power in behalf of poor, fallen men and make of them new creatures in Christ Jesus. And what will keep in our minds the great fact of the creation?—Why, the seventh-day Sabbath institution, "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:11.

Nor do Sabbath keepers fail to remember the fact of our Lord's resurrection and its meaning to the Christians, for we carry out faithfully the ordinance of baptism, which is intended of God to keep in mind both the death and the resurrection of Christ. (See Rom. 6:3-5.)

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. And furthermore, the keeping of Sunday has caused Christian people to blind themselves to the God-given weekly holy day, which is intended of Heaven to keep vivid in our minds the pre-eminence of Christ as the Creator of the universe. To such ends do men come when they set up an institution of their own, for that is what Sunday is.

#### OBJECTION X

The book of Genesis, which says that God rested on the seventh day and blessed it, was not written until the time of the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, 2,500 years after creation. Therefore the statement that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it," really refers to God's announcement of the Sabbath command at Sinai, and not to any act of blessing the seventh day at creation.

Probably in the whole category of Sabbath objections no more irrational one is to be found than this argument that the blessing and hallowing of the Sabbath was an act that took

place more than two thousand years after the end of the creation week.

Take, first, the point that the book of Genesis was not written at the time of creation, but twenty-five hundred years after. What of it? What if it were written five thousand years after? Would that prevent the writer from giving us an accurate historical record, even from a human standpoint, to say nothing of the fact that Genesis was written by Inspiration? Are not almost all books dealing with happenings in the world written a greater or less time after the events have taken place? Indeed, in the very nature of the case, a book cannot be written until afterward, unless it is a book of prophecy.

Secondly, take the assertion that the blessing and sanctifying of the day were acts subsequent to the resting on the day. Surely they were. There is no controversy on that point. The Lord blessed the day, and sanctified it because that in it He had rested. Therefore the blessing of the day must naturally follow the coming into existence of that day and God's having consumed its hours, so to speak, in a certain manner. But by what law of literature or of reason should we separate by twenty-five hundred years the second verse of chapter two, which tells of His resting, from the third verse, which tells of His act of blessing? If this be a proper procedure, why not also separate by a great period of time the other similarly phrased passages in the creation story that speak of God's pronouncing blessings following His creative acts on certain earlier days in the creative week?

For example, take the twenty-first and twenty-second verses of the first chapter, where we have the record of what took place on the fifth day. Certainly it was not until the living creatures that move in the deep had been created and the act completed that God blessed them. Likewise in verses 27 and 28 of the first chapter, where God's creative act of the sixth day, namely, His creation of man, was completed, and *then* a blessing pronounced upon the product of His creative work. In other words, if we are properly to believe that God's act on the fifth day, and His blessing upon that act, and likewise His creative act on the sixth day and His blessing upon it, are to be under-

stood as historical statements, all of which belong to virtually the same period of time, must we not, therefore, by every rule of language and logic, believe that God's resting on the seventh day and His blessing of that day belong likewise to the same historical period? Surely it is far better to compare scripture with scripture than to endeavor to tear texts apart, pulling one verse from the other down through the centuries for twenty-five hundred years, in a desperate attempt to support an unscriptural theory.

Finally, when we turn to the ten commandments themselves, as recorded in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, we find that the Lord, in speaking from Mt. Sinai in an audible voice, declared to all Israel the historical fact that "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." The whole statement is put in the same setting and the same tense, namely, past tense: the "Lord made," and the "Lord blessed." But the Sabbath opponent would tell us that the Lord made heaven and earth twenty-five hundred years ago, including resting on the seventh day, and therefore the Lord is now deciding to bless the Sabbath day and hallow it. The stiffnecked and unregenerate Israelites trembled at the voice of the Lord when He uttered His ten commandments, but great is the mistaken courage of the Sabbath opponents who make bold even to change the words of God.

#### OBJECTION XI

**The Sabbath is nowhere commanded in the New Testament, whereas all the other nine commandments are reaffirmed there.**

The objector declares that a study of the New Testament reveals that the various writers have commanded the observance of every one of the ten commandments except the fourth, and that therefore the Sabbath is not binding in the Christian dispensation. Even if we should grant that we cannot find any direct command for Sabbath observance in the New Testament, what would that prove? Nothing at all. Has God spoken only through New Testament writers? Did He not speak also

through the prophets of old? Peter, a New Testament writer, tells us that the Old Testament prophets "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:21. And shall we not therefore look to the Old Testament as well as the New for guidance in the living of holy lives?

When an objector attempts to build an argument against the Sabbath by confining the discussion to the New Testament, he is going directly against the statement of Paul, who declares that "all Scripture" is "profitable for doctrine" and "for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3:16. Yes, what if the apostles are silent! Is the *silence* of God's New Testament servants in the valleys of Judea more weighty than the *thunderings* of God Himself on Mt. Sinai? It is sad that the Sabbath objector is unable to hear the voice of God because of the silence of the apostles.

The New Testament is not written in refutation, but in exposition of the Old; not to supersede, but to amplify it. True, certain specific ceremonial and typical services of the Old Testament that pointed to the work of Christ are definitely described by the New Testament writers as abolished at the time of the crucifixion. But that is an entirely different thing from speaking of the whole of the Old Testament, with all its divine commands and inspired prophecies, as being abolished. Who are we to set ourselves up above both Old and New Testament writers, and declare that the Sabbath commandment, first given by the voice of God Himself, restated by virtually all the Old Testament prophets, and nowhere repealed by the apostles in the New, is not to be obeyed by Christians?

Thus even granting that the New Testament nowhere commands the observance of the Sabbath, that is no sound argument against God's holy day. What the objector needs to prove is that the New Testament *repeals* the Sabbath command, and this of course he cannot do, as we have already shown in answering the preceding objections.

The very fact that discussions on the Sabbath commandment are not found on the pages of the New Testament proves the very opposite of what the Sabbath objector is trying to establish. The Jews were zealous in their adherence to the various laws



and statutes enjoined by the prophets. And they were violent in their denunciation of any one who, by example or teaching, attempted to discredit those ancient precepts. Considerable space is devoted by the New Testament writers to the ordinance of circumcision. Why? Because they considered it important and binding? No, for the very opposite reason,—they considered it of *no* importance and as *abolished*. And their example and teaching in the matter had stirred up such a violent attack by the Jewish leaders that the natural result was an extended discussion of the subject in the New Testament.

Is it conceivable that the apostles could have taught that the Sabbath was abolished without raising an even greater commotion? Think of the stir that was created when Christ healed a man on the Sabbath day, and thus violated a minor requirement that the Jewish teachers had added to the Sabbath command. Surely the very fact that the New Testament nowhere raises the question concerning the fourth commandment, is the best proof in the world that the apostles set forth no new teaching on this particular doctrine.

The various references to the Sabbath in the New Testament are the sort of incidental ones that we would naturally expect to find in regard to a command over which no dispute waged. But, though naturally incidental, they nevertheless provide very interesting testimony in behalf of the perpetuity of the Sabbath. Brevity of space allows us to cite only a few typical examples:

1. All the New Testament writers, whenever they happen to mention the Sabbath in connection with some narrative, never in a single instance indicate in any way that the Sabbath had lost its distinctive sacredness.

2. Both Christ and the apostles are described on various occasions as preaching or worshiping on the Sabbath, as though that was the most natural procedure conceivable. And the New Testament informs us specifically that the Sabbath keeping of Christ's followers on the Sabbath following the crucifixion was "according to the commandment" (Luke 23:56), thus recognizing in the most natural way the binding force of the Sabbath command.

3. On the various occasions when Christ came into direct dispute with the Jews over what was lawful to be done on the Sabbath day, He never once even hinted that the Sabbath commandment was no longer binding, or that it was about to be abolished by the ushering in of a new dispensation.

4. In describing the judgments that were to come upon the Jews, Christ instructed His disciples as to the time when they should flee to the mountains from Jerusalem and Judea, and added: "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Matt. 24:20. To have to flee on the Sabbath would break the calm of that holy day. The destruction of Jerusalem did not take place until nearly forty years later. Yet all during this time the disciples were to keep the Sabbath ever in mind when they knelt in prayer. How could they, then, have preached the abolition of the Sabbath, when they were ever to keep this holy day uppermost in their minds in prayer?

#### OBJECTION XII

**All we need to do is to keep the spirit of the Sabbath commandment; and the spirit of it calls simply for our keeping one day in seven.**

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. 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 farther 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 shalt 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!

Now the Sabbath commandment says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." That is the simple, plain letter of it. Evidently it refers to one particular day, "the *seventh* day." 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 one 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?

Yes, surely the language of the Sabbath commandment is plain enough as regards the day. And there is nothing more clear from a reading of various incidents in the Good Book than that "the seventh day" has ever been understood to mean—as the very words themselves show—that a particular, specific day is intended. Indeed, this particular day could be so definitely known that the person who worked on that day was subject to the most extreme penalty. What hopeless confusion would soon have occurred if God had simply commanded that

one day in seven be kept holy! In the very nature of things, a specific day is necessary if the Sabbath is to be preserved.

And what is more, Sunday-keeping ministers have so definitely felt the need of a specific day that they have persuaded legislatures in many States to enact laws compelling all to rest on the first day of the week. They are willing to have "the seventh day" in *God's* law mean any day in the week, but they are ready to imprison the man who should thus interpret "the first day" in *their* Sunday law. Is not the fallacy apparent? And is it not evident that only one question remains to be answered,—a question that each reader must answer for himself: Shall I obey God's law and keep the seventh day; or man's, and keep the first?

### OBJECTION XIII

**Time has been lost. Because of calendar changes, we cannot really tell which is the seventh day.**

This objection very appropriately comes well down in the list, because it seems to be a point that Sabbath opponents never think about until they have discovered that almost all their other objections prove groundless. It is a classic illustration of an argument's proving too much, and one that brings the champion of first-day observance into as much difficulty as the defender of the true Sabbath.

If time has been lost, then what becomes of Sunday, the day that the Sabbath opposer is generally striving to protect with such vigor? Evidently, Sunday is lost with the Sabbath. No other conclusion is possible. If the Sunday keeper cannot tell what day is really Sunday,—which is the case if time has been lost,—then how can he declare that the day he now keeps as Sunday has any unique significance? And we would ask further, Why add hypocrisy to intolerance by attempting, through Sunday laws, to make all men rest on a particular day, which, by your own argument on "lost time," is probably not really Sunday at all?

We might properly dismiss the matter at this point, for it must be evident to the reader that the "lost time" argument

has not been seriously brought forth, that indeed the Sabbath opposer could not really believe it without proving himself a hypocrite in his defense of Sunday and Sunday legislation.

When a person makes a statement, the responsibility rests on him to offer proof for it. Now what evidence is offered in support of the sweeping declaration that time has been lost? None whatever. Then, how can we be expected to reply? There is nothing to reply to. The nearest approach to evidence is the statement that we have passed through some calendar changes since Bible times. The only strength this statement possesses lies in the air of mystery with which it is surrounded, as though calendar changes were something so elusive and dark that no one could really understand what took place in connection with them. But really there is nothing mysterious about the matter at all.

The simple facts are these: 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 1582 A. D., 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:

1582 A. D.		OCTOBER				1582 A. D.
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 while 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 days 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." —*Vol. IX, p. 251*. If the idea was never even mentioned at that time, it is a little late for Sabbath objectors to mention it now.

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 this 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 is the objector forced to go in order to maintain the idea that time has been lost,

for the facts are that the Jews, who have maintained their own calendar throughout the centuries, find themselves in exact harmony with the Christian peoples, so far as the days of the week are concerned.

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."

Moreover we have in Luke 23:56 the positive testimony of inspiration that at the time of the crucifixion the Jews had the true, definite seventh day in unbroken succession from creation, for it is there stated of certain women, that from the tomb "they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." The commandment requires rest upon the seventh day.

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 morn—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 "was past."

(See page 213 for a further treatment of this question.)

#### OBJECTION XIV

**The Sabbath cannot be kept on a round world, because in traveling around the earth a person either loses or gains a day.**

This is in the same category with the objection that time has been lost,—it proves too much; for if the Sabbath cannot be kept on a round world, then Sunday cannot. This is as evident as the noonday sun.

But do you find Sunday keepers in all the different corners of the earth perplexed in their Sunday keeping because of the round world? No; on the contrary, they are so certain that Sunday *can* be kept on such a world that they have urged the lawmakers in every so-called Christian nation to enact Sunday laws compelling every one to rest on the first day of the week. And if such zealous Sunday keepers were asked why they urge the keeping of that day everywhere in the world, they



would quote the Sabbath commandment in the decalogue, simply reading "the first day" where the command says "the seventh day." Now, does the command suddenly become world-wide in its application simply by changing "seventh" to "first"?

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.

It may take some knowledge of mathematics and astronomy to understand just *why* the apparent adding or dropping of a day is not a real loss or gain. But it takes only a little common sense, or just a sense of humor, to realize the simple *fact* that days *cannot really* be lost or gained, no matter what the appearances are.

But 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" objection 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 Hongkong 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 on 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 the command of God to keep "the seventh day"! Objection to Sabbath keeping comes, not from traveling far over this earth, but from wandering far from God.

#### OBJECTION XV

**Do you think God will keep men out of heaven because of a day?**

The true nature of this objection is immediately revealed when we restate it in this form: Do you think God is particular? And such a restating of the question reveals also the far-reaching nature of this objection, for if we reply that we do not think God is particular, then we immediately free ourselves, not only from Sabbath keeping, but from any and every other divine command that we do not wish to obey.

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? We need be in no doubt in the matter. The Bible provides us with a very direct and vivid answer.

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. Now 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 to 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? With these solemn facts before us, of how God brought summary punishment upon a man for laying his hand upon the holy ark, what shall be said of the man who lays

violent hands upon the Sabbath day, moving it about to suit his own convenience?

But we need not depend on analogy to prove our case. The Bible provides powerful illustrations of judgments that came upon men who violated His commandment regarding the Sabbath day. The Israelites, so the record would lead 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, do you think He will admit *you* to the heavenly Canaan if you willfully disregard that holy day?

#### OBJECTION XVI

**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 rest.**

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.

Now 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 that 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,—a feat that they have observed other Sunday keepers unable to do.

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? Why, 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? They plead innocent of holding the view that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday. No, no, they would make no such claim. But they proceed seriously to urge Sunday keeping because of a law that is built on the claim that the day was changed to Sunday. We are perplexed. We do not know what further to say against them, because we do not really know what they believe. And we are tempted to wonder whether they themselves know.

#### OBJECTION XVII

**The Sabbath cannot save any one. Why not preach Christ instead?**

The weakness of this objection becomes clearly evident by simply expanding the objection to its logical limits. The statement is made that the Sabbath cannot save any one; 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 decalogue 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 almost 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? That

it is as proper to preach the fourth as the third or the fifth, is surely evident. And when we think for a moment 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 admitted that no one can purchase admittance into heaven by Sabbath keeping, and have shown that such an admission 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 insure 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 insure 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 while 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 decalogue, 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 to be drawn from the objection 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. Two texts of Scripture are sufficient to reveal the close relationship between the law and the gospel. Christ said to His disciples, "If ye love Me, keep My com-

mandments." 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 because 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 XVIII

**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 is an objection presented by the members 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 that 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 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 any one who should add to or take from the words of the prophecy in the book. (See Rev. 22:18, 19.) Now 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. 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 His 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 from 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." John 16:8. 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 XIX

**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?**

Only those who have a very faulty knowledge of history would attach much weight to either of these objections, especially to the latter one, which we will answer first. 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 speakest, 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 some different standard than 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. Perhaps we shall never fully understand why men were so slow. But what we are here concerned with is the fact that they were, and that this fact is an indictment of *them*, and *not* of the doctrines they failed to see.

The relation of these facts to the objection 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. As to just *why* this Sabbath truth was almost completely suppressed for long years, awaiting the nineteenth century to burst forth again, is in the same category with the problem as to why the truth of righteousness by faith was almost wholly lost for long years, and did not burst forth again until the sixteenth century. When the objector has the hardihood to indict the glorious doctrine of righteousness by faith simply because of this long suppression, then will it be time enough for us to consider seriously the indictment of the Sabbath doctrine because of its long suppression.

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. And in Luther's day, what about all the "leading men"? Why, all the church dignitaries were spending their time trying to catch him to burn him. And what was it that Paul declared to

the early believers who were apparently troubled over this point? "Ye 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.

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 fact would still remain that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, for no man is big enough to change the commandments of God.

### OBJECTION XX

**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 within families, to say nothing of neighbors. Said Christ: "Suppose ye 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, and 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, a 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 cometh 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, —if they indeed trouble to think on such matters,—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?

## OBJECTION XXI

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

Is this really a proper objection to raise against a commandment of God? Should we decide first whether we will profit financially by following God's voice before we obey? What a different story the Bible would tell us of the great men of old if they had all stopped to reason out whether it would pay them to serve God! Men of God are made of a different kind of mettle than that.

What if you cannot make a living; you can make a dying. Nor would you be the first one who has been called on to pay with his life for serving God. The history of the children of God is one long record of martyrdom. There have always been men who would rather die than disobey God. It calls for courage and bravery to serve Heaven.

However, God often does not require the supreme sacrifice in order to serve Him. You say you could not make a living. How do you know? Did God tell you that you would starve to death, or was it just a temptation from the devil to keep you from making the right decision? No, you could not have read any such thought in the Bible, for Christ declares: "Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt. 6:30-33. And David, in his old age, wrote: "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." Ps. 37:25.

God still lives, and loves those who show their love to Him by obeying His commandments. Why not have faith in Him, and believe that He will enable you to make a living if you keep the Sabbath?

There are many thousands of men and women throughout the world who have displayed just that sort of faith in God, and have stepped out to keep the Sabbath. And has God failed them? He has not. True, some of them have had their faith tested for a time before they were able to find employment as Sabbath keepers. But they have not starved. The testimony of a third of a million Sabbath keepers disproves completely the objection we are here examining.

To the objector we would say: If you really think that God would desert you if you turned to serve Him, you need a new idea of God rather than of the Sabbath. But if, as we think is the case, you believe that God will fulfill His promise to provide for those who obey His commandments, and that even if He tests your faith you would rather die than disobey Him, then your duty is clear—keep the Sabbath.



## SECOND ADVENT OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

Why become stirred up over the second advent? No one can tell if Christ will come tomorrow or a thousand years from now. Christians through all the centuries have vainly expected Christ's coming. The apostles thought He would come in their day. But they were all mistaken.

It is true that the apostles set before the believers as the one important event of the future, the second advent of Christ. He was the center and circumference of their preaching. Looking back, they saw Christ crucified and then raised from the dead. Looking upward, they saw Christ ministering as the great High Priest for men. Looking forward, they saw Christ coming in the clouds of heaven. Earthly events did not enter into their reckoning. All was in terms of the relation of Christ to them,—what He had done for them, what He was doing for them, and how He would finally come to receive them unto Himself. The very fact that they fixed their thoughts so completely on this one future event might easily cause the superficial reader of the Bible to conclude that the apostles all believed and taught that Christ would return in their day. But this would be unwarranted.

Then there are a few specific statements, which, considered alone, might lead to the same conclusion. We cannot find space to analyze each of them separately. We will take the most typical one as an example.

Paul, in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, speaks of the dead who are raised and of those who "are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:15. Not only do objectors today conclude from this that the apostles expected the coming of the Lord in their day, but apparently some of the Thessalonians thought that Paul intended for them to understand that the day of Christ was right upon them.

But such an interpretation of Paul's words is wrong, for in his second epistle to them he took occasion to correct such an

impression, declaring: "Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by *letter as from us*, as that the day of Christ is at hand." 2 Thess. 2:2. Then he proceeds to assure them that that day would not come until after a certain great prophecy was fulfilled, and that this prophecy could not be fulfilled "except there come a falling away first." Verse 3. Paul told the elders of Ephesus that this falling away would come after his "departing," that is, after his death. (See Acts 20:28-30; 2 Tim. 4:7, 8.)

To his spiritual son, Timothy, he wrote from his death cell at Rome: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. 2:2. How evident it is that Paul looked forward to events quite beyond the span of his life and of his day, and to the transmitting of gospel truth down through the years!

If we always remember that the inspired writings of the Bible were not simply for those who first read them, but also for those who live at the close of the Christian era, Paul's statement in 1 Thessalonians 4:15, and similar statements by other apostles, will not prove perplexing.

To some of the apostles God may not have seen fit to give so explicit an understanding of the events that must precede the second advent doctrine as He did to Paul, for example, in which event they might most properly urge the believers to be always in a state of readiness for Christ's return.

In Old Testament times the prophets frequently did not understand the prophecies they uttered. It was left for those who lived near the time of their fulfillment to obtain the real understanding of them. Thus Peter explained to the New Testament church. (See 1 Peter 1:9-12.) And he reminded them: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn." 2 Peter 1:19.

The apostle John himself doubtless understood little of the prophecies contained in the Revelation, yet by inspiration he declared: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy." Rev. 1:3.

Thus, while we may freely grant that all the apostles may not have been given the same measure of knowledge concerning God's future plans, there is no possible reason for concluding that nothing can be known about the second advent. On this basis the Jews could properly have reasoned that nothing could be known about the first advent. We, looking back to their time, wonder why they were not all ready to receive Christ, so plain were the prophecies concerning the manner and time of His advent. There were some back there who did study the prophecies, and when the time drew near, God graciously revealed more fully their meaning to these searchers for truth. If we, today, are in an attitude of searching the prophecies, rather than scoffing at them, is it not possible that God may open their meaning to us more fully? And thus we may learn something very definite regarding the second advent.

We admit no *man* "can tell if Christ will come tomorrow or a thousand years from now." But prophecy can and does. Have you studied these inspired writings? Have you obeyed the injunction of Christ Himself to read and to understand the prophecies of Daniel? (See Matt. 24:15.) Have you studied Christ's own prophecy of His return? (See Matthew 24 and Luke 21.) Are you one of those who can claim the blessing because you have read, prayerfully and diligently, the Revelation? (See Rev. 1:3.) Until then, why declare that nothing can be known about the second advent? Seeing that the Bible reveals so plainly that in all past ages God has always told men when a great event was near at hand, are you ready to contend that He has changed His plan toward men, and will not give us any knowledge of the coming of an event that surpasses in grandeur all that have ever occurred? (See Amos 3:7.)

And now a word as to the statement that "Christians through all the centuries have vainly expected Christ's coming." You will doubtless agree that through most of the long centuries there was little of the Bible available, and that the blackness of the Dark Ages so definitely obscured truth that the Reformation was required to restore even the most primary doctrine of salvation by faith. Would you reason, therefore, that because distorted ideas concerning salvation have been rampant through

the centuries, we cannot hope to know anything about this vital truth? No, you reply, we need not be in darkness because men in former centuries were. We can study the Bible and learn what is the truth on this subject. Then why not take the same attitude on the subject of the second advent?

## OBJECTION II

**Seventh-day Adventists are always setting a time for the second coming of Christ.**

The very opposite is true, for we believe most fully the Saviour's words: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man." Matt. 24:36. But we also believe Christ's accompanying statement: "When ye shall see all these things [that is, certain definite signs], know that it [the second coming] is near, even at the doors." Verse 33.

One verse says that we cannot know; the other instructs us to "know." Yet there is no contradiction. One text deals with the exact time, the "day and hour;" the other, with the general nearness of the second coming. According to the very words of Christ, it is possible for us to "know" when the great day is "near, even at the doors," without knowing the "day and hour." This we believe and teach—nothing more, nothing less.

But, it may be objected, does not Paul say that the "Lord so cometh as a thief in the night"? Yes, and we believe this. But we also believe the verses that follow. They explain that the Lord will come as a thief only to the worldly, for the apostle adds: "Ye, brethren, are *not* in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." 1 Thess. 5:2-4. Why? Because there are prophecies that tell us when that day is "near, even at the doors." (See Matt. 24:3-36; Daniel 2; etc.)

It is the strangest fact of modern religion that so many otherwise good Christian people take no interest in finding out when the greatest event of all the ages is due. They seem to consider it a mark of piety to remain in ignorance regarding a truth so fully treated in both the Old and New Testaments. Strange piety!

Let us ask this question in closing: Are such persons following Christ's explicit instruction to "*know* that it is near, even at the doors"? And if not, how can they expect to be included in the happy company whom Christ's second coming will *not* "overtake" as a thief?

### OBJECTION III

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

There is a sense in which Christ comes to us at conversion. When we accept Him, He comes into our hearts by His Spirit and guides our lives. The spiritual experience of the Spirit's coming into the lives of the apostles was dependent on Christ's going away. Said the Master: "If I go not away, the Comforter ["which is the Holy Ghost"] will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." John 16:7; 14:26. Therefore this experience of spiritual fellowship with Christ through His Spirit is so far from being the second coming of Christ, that the fellowship is dependent on Christ's going "away."

When Christ spoke of His going away, He told His disciples that it was for the purpose of preparing a place for them. Then He added: "I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." (See John 14:1-3.) Now certainly Christ did not come to take the disciples away to the heavenly land on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came upon them. Yet when Christ comes again, an outstanding feature will be the receiving of believers unto Himself.

Said Paul to the Philippians, who were converted and had begun to walk the Christian way: "Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. 1:6. He spoke to the Thessalonians in similar vein when he declared to them: "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for His Son from heaven." 1 Thess. 1:9, 10. In both instances the people addressed by Paul were converted,



and in both instances they were instructed to look forward, "to wait" for the coming of Christ "from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus." Paul certainly did not believe that the coming of Christ was at conversion, but rather that conversion prepared us for the glorious *future* event of the coming of a personal Being who had been raised from the dead.

When Christ came the first time, His advent was literal. He was a real being among men. Even after His resurrection He said to His disciples: "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me, and see." Luke 24:39. What ground is there for concluding that His second advent will be less real? If He came literally the first time, are we not naturally to conclude, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that He will come literally at the second advent?

Not only is there no Bible evidence to the contrary; there is specific evidence in support of the natural conclusion as to the literality of His second advent. When Christ ascended, two heavenly messengers said to the disciples: "This *same* Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Acts 1:11. Couple with this the statement of Paul: "The Lord *Himself* shall descend from heaven." 1 Thess. 4:16. Not simply a spiritual influence will come again, but "this *same* Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven." Not even a heavenly representative, literal and real as such a representative might be, but "the Lord *Himself* shall descend from heaven."

We read also that when Christ comes, the brilliance of that coming lights the whole heavens, and its blinding glory causes the wicked to flee in terror. Further, we read that when Christ comes, the dead are raised to life, and these, accompanied by the living righteous, are caught up to meet the Lord in the air. (See Matt. 24:27; Rev. 6:14-17; John 5:28, 29; 1 Thess. 4:15-18.)

Only when a person is ready to spiritualize away the most literal and obvious value of words, can he support the notion that the second coming of Christ is spiritual, not literal. But when words are deprived of their most natural meaning, then

there is removed the very basis of discussion as to what the Bible teaches.

The very evidence which establishes the fact that the coming of Christ is literal, and that it is not to be confused with conversion, establishes also the belief that the coming cannot be at death. The wicked do not flee in terror at the death of a righteous man, nor are the righteous raised from the dead at death; yet the fleeing of the wicked and the raising of the righteous will characterize the second advent.

The advent of Christ will be so real that "every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him." Rev. 1:7.

#### OBJECTION IV

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

It seems strange that this objection should be presented, because almost without exception it comes from those who hold the quite widely accepted doctrine that the wicked go at death into hell-fire, there to stay through the ceaseless ages of eternity. If it seems to the objector more in harmony with the Christian idea of love to believe in never-ending torment as the portion of the wicked, rather than speedy destruction in connection with the second advent of Christ, then we must simply confess our inability to follow such reasoning, and close the discussion. But with the matter set forth in this definite way, we doubt very much whether the objector, or any one else, would think of affirming that greater love is indicated by the ceaseless tortures of hell than by the consuming of the wicked in connection with the second advent.

Every one who holds to the primary doctrine that there is a difference between right and wrong, and that there is a judgment day when God will reward men according to their deeds, must believe that there is a punishment for the wicked as well as a reward for the righteous. This is too evident for dispute by any believer in the Bible.

The believers in the literal second advent of Christ certainly are not unique in holding that the wicked will suffer.

Surely the consuming fires of the second advent could burn no more fiercely than those pictured in the hell-fire of the creeds of many denominations. How can it conceivably be argued that it is in harmony with the Christian idea of love to take the wicked to some *distant* place for punishment by eternal torment; while it is revolting to the Christian idea of love to punish them by death right *here* on the earth, where their sins have been committed?

God does not take any pleasure in the death of the wicked. (See Eze. 18:32.) It is not because God hates men, that He finally destroys the wicked. There is simply no other alternative left if He is to blot out sin from the universe. Sin is something found only in connection with moral beings, possessed of free will. The germs of sin can thrive only as they burrow deep into the very mind and heart. Thus the destruction of sin necessitates the destruction of those who are determined to hold on to their sins.

God has ever been of too pure eyes to behold iniquity. It has never been possible for sinful man to gaze upon the face of God. It is the pure in heart that will finally see God. When Moses in the mount sought to see God's face, his plea was denied. The Lord placed him in a "cleft of the rock," that he might be hid from the divine glory as God passed by. (See Exodus 33 and 34.)

From this we may learn a spiritual lesson. We as poor sinners may also be hid in the cleft of the rock, the rock Christ Jesus. The opportunity is offered to all to avail themselves of this protection. When hid in Christ, our sins are forgiven; His holy life covers us. We thus stand unafraid in the day when the glory of God is revealed from heaven at the second advent. The same awful brilliance envelops all, the righteous as well as the wicked. The difference is that the righteous are protected by the covering of Christ's righteousness, while the wicked stand spiritually naked. They must cry for the literal rocks to fall on them, and hide them from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne. They have brought death upon themselves by the course they have willfully taken throughout their lives.

**OBJECTION V**

**We should spend more time helping people to make this a better world, rather than stirring them up about another world, as is the case when the second advent doctrine is preached. To stir them up in this way leads only to fanaticism.**

All will agree that this world would be a much better place if sickness could be removed; and that our earth would be almost ideal if we could banish from men's hearts selfishness, jealousy, hatred, and lust.

But does the preaching to men to make ready for another world prevent us in any way from dealing with the first of these two basic troubles, that of sickness? No, assuredly not. Christ spent much of His time ministering to the sick, and yet He preached to the people: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, . . . but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven: . . . for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Matt. 6:19-21.

Christ commissioned His disciples to go out and heal the sick. This they did, but they also made the doctrine of the second advent, the preparing of men for heaven, the central feature of their preaching. And it is a simple matter of record that Seventh-day Adventists, who make the second advent so distinctive a feature of their preaching, are at the same time ministering to the sick through a chain of sanitariums and dispensaries in every continent. At the risk of being charged with boasting, we might add that in proportion to their membership, probably no other denomination carries on so large a medical missionary work as do Seventh-day Adventists.

In view of the objection before us, this is really a remarkable fact. Yet it is not remarkable, but rather the natural result of belief in the advent doctrine. The love of Christ that comes into the hearts of those who believe that He will come again, causes them to expend their time and means in aiding the sick and the suffering.

In preaching that Christ who had ascended would come again, the disciples made this present world a better one in which to live, not only by healing the sick, but also by helping the poor. Those who accepted the preaching and who had money,



willingly gave it into a general fund, so that those who were poor might not suffer. (See Acts 4:32-37.) What untold hunger and want might be relieved if that same spirit controlled the Christian church at large today!

And what of the relation of the vices of men's hearts to the doctrine of the second advent? Certainly all the schemes that the wise of this world have devised, have failed to provide any solution for the steadily growing problem of crime and moral corruption. Does the objector wish us to spend our time on some crime commission or social research committee, rather than on the preaching of the advent? If so, which committee or commission would he suggest, and what proof would he offer that our time would be profitably spent?

Men can devise ways of chaining the body, but not of changing the heart, and the prisoner goes forth from the jail ready to repeat his offense, or to commit a worse one. The fear of the law may hold back a wicked man from the outward act of violence, but he is nevertheless a criminal at heart, and awaits only the favorable opportunity to carry out his evil desires.

But when the mighty doctrine of the personal, literal return of Christ is preached to men, there is brought home to their sin-dulled senses with a vividness not otherwise possible, the tremendous fact that they must some day meet God face to face and give an account for their deeds. And that mighty truth may prove the means, under God, of arousing them to cry out for spiritual help, that they may be ready for that day. If the objector is willing to grant that religion has *any* message for man, then he must grant that the message of accountability to God, as set forth in the doctrine of the advent, is one of the most powerful that can ever be brought to the human heart.

Every man who accepts the advent doctrine and lives in the hope of meeting Christ face to face, has ever within his heart the mightiest incentive to holy living. "Every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." 1 John 3:3. And the man whose heart is purified is a good neighbor, a good citizen. The more such people there are in the world, the better place it is to live in.



## MORTAL MAN OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

**Man is made in the image of God; God is immortal; therefore man is immortal.**

Why should only one of God's attributes, that of immortality, be singled out for comparison? God is all-powerful. Does it therefore follow that man, made in the image of God, is also all-powerful? God is all-wise. Is man therefore possessed of boundless wisdom, because made in God's image? No, we are powerless before winds and waves and earthquakes, and our store of wisdom is pitifully small. We might enumerate at length other qualities possessed by the God of heaven, only to discover in each instance that man does not possess them. Therefore there is no basis for the claim that because God is immortal therefore man is.

But we would go further, and say that the Bible *nowhere* declares that man is immortal. Let us examine every text that uses either the word "immortal" or "immortality." It will take but a few moments. The reader may be surprised to learn that although the terms "immortality" and "immortal souls" are used very frequently by those who believe that the soul is undying, the Bible uses the word "immortality" only five times, and the word "immortal" only once. In this lone instance the term is applied to God: "Eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God." 1 Tim. 1:17. The five references that contain the word "immortality" are as follows:

1. Romans 2:7. In this text the Christian is exhorted to "seek" for immortality. Why should he seek for it if he already possesses it? In this same book of Romans, Paul quotes the prophet Elijah as saying of his enemies, "They seek my life." We understand from this that the prophet's enemies did not yet have his life in their hands. Therefore, when we are exhorted to seek for immortality, for a life that knows no end, we must conclude that we do not now possess such a life.

2. 2 Timothy 1:10. Here we learn that Christ "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." The only deduction from this is that, so far from immortality's being a natural possession of all men, it is one of the good things made possible through the gospel. Paul wrote: "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." Rom. 6:23. Why would we need this gift if we already had undying souls?

3. 1 Corinthians 15:53. This passage tells when we shall receive immortality. The time is "at the last trump." Then "this mortal must put on immortality." Why should the apostle Paul speak of our putting on immortality at a future date if we already possess it?

4. 1 Corinthians 15:54. This verse simply adds the thought that when "this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

5. 1 Timothy 6:16. Here we learn that God "only hath immortality." This final text settles the matter as conclusively as words could possibly do, and explains fully why we are exhorted to "seek" immortality, and why we are told that immortality is something that is to be "put on" "at the last trump."

Not only do we learn from these texts that we do not have immortality, but also we are told that God alone has it.

If space limits permitted, we might examine other texts which contain in the original Greek the same word that is translated "immortal" or "immortality" in the six texts we have just considered. But these additional texts would not necessitate any change in our conclusion; on the contrary, they would strengthen it. Take, for example, Romans 1:23, where Paul, speaking of the idolatrous action of the heathen, says that they "changed the glory of the uncorruptible [immortal] God into an image made like to corruptible [mortal] man." In the Greek, the word here translated "uncorruptible" is the same as that rendered "immortal" in 1 Timothy 1:17: "Eternal, *immortal*, invisible, the only wise God." Certain authoritative modern translations of the Bible use the word "immortal" instead of "uncorruptible" in Romans 1:23. For example, The Expositor's Bible translates the passage thus: "Transmuted the glory

of the immortal God in a semblance of the likeness of mortal man." The uncorruptible, the immortal God is sharply contrasted with corruptible, mortal man.

We read in John 5:26 that the "Father hath life in Himself," and that He hath "given to the Son to have life in Himself." But nowhere do we read that God gave to human beings to have life in themselves. That is why the Bible never speaks of man as immortal.

(See page 223 for an analysis of the meaning and use of "soul.")

## OBJECTION II

**Ecclesiastes 12:7 proves that there is a conscious, immortal entity that leaves the body at death.**

The text reads: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." This text speaks of the dissolution of man at death. We cannot accept the belief that this "spirit" is a conscious entity that is released at death and soars away, because:

1. If this "spirit" is a conscious entity when it "*returns*" to God, then it was a conscious entity when it *came* from God. The construction of the text demands this, for it gives us the specific statement that the dust returns to the earth "*as it was*," and unless otherwise stated, it would follow that the spirit returns as *it* was. In fact, for the believer in immortal souls to declare that the "spirit" needed lodgment within the so-called shell of the body in order to possess consciousness, would be to surrender the whole argument.

Now the Bible teaches the pre-existence of Christ before He was born in Bethlehem. But the view stated in the objection before us would demand the astounding conclusion that all the members of the human family, as spirits, had an existence before they were born on this earth. This makes good Mormon theology, with its unseen world of spirits waiting for human bodies in order to find abodes on this earth. But we doubt if any orthodox Christian could bring himself to accept this view.

2. If the "spirit" which returns to God is a conscious entity, the real man, then all men, whether good or bad, go to God at death. Are all to have the same destination? If it be said that the wicked go to God simply to receive judgment, we would reply that the Bible states definitely that the judgment is still a future event. (See Matt. 25:31-46; Rev. 22:12.)

3. We read that "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 2:7. We agree that the life and consciousness Adam possessed resulted from this breath of life. If the receiving of this breath of life denotes the acquiring of an immortal entity that lives on after death, then some astounding conclusions follow. The Bible tells us that when the flood came, "all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: *all in whose nostrils was the breath of life.*" Gen. 7:21, 22.

If the breath of life breathed into man gave to him an immortal something within his body, and this breath of life, departing at death, means the release of a conscious, immortal entity, then animals have immortality also. This is an inevitable conclusion. The breath of life within the animals was the same as that within man, for the Bible uses exactly the same language in describing both. Indeed, the very book of Ecclesiastes, which contains the text we are examining, says of man and beast that "they have all one breath [or "spirit," A. R. V., margin.]" Eccl. 3:19. No one will contend that a conscious entity leaves the beast at death. Why attempt, therefore, to make Ecclesiastes 12:7 teach the conscious-spirit doctrine regarding man?

No one believes more earnestly than does the writer that the Bible teaches that there are vast differences between men and beasts. But as regards the breath of life, or the spirit of life, the Bible makes no distinction.

4. Of the creation of man we read: "The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." Job 33:4. Job thus describes his state of being alive: "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in

my nostrils." Job 27:3. The act of dying is set forth in these words: "If He [God] set His heart upon man, if He gather unto Himself His spirit and His breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Job 34:14, 15. The spirit returns because it came from God and because God gathers it to Himself.

The whole cycle indicates nowhere a conscious entity, exercising a free will to go to God. On the contrary, the Bible declares that God gathers "unto Himself *His* spirit." If this returning spirit is the real man, then we would be forced to believe that certain pagan religions are right when they teach that man is but a manifestation of the Divine Spirit, and at death is absorbed again into that one great Spirit. We cannot accept this pagan view, which means that we cannot accept the view set forth in the objection based on Ecclesiastes 12:7.

(See page 223 for a further treatment of the word "spirit.")

### OBJECTION III

**The Bible describes the death of Rachel by saying that "her soul was in departing." Gen. 35: 18. (See also 1 Kings 17: 21, 22.)**

The reference from First Kings deals with the account of a child that died, and of how the prophet Elijah prayed: "O Lord my God, I pray Thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived."

These accounts of the child and of Rachel may be examined together. The explanation of one is obviously the explanation of the other.

The claim is that the "soul" that departed was the real person that soared away at death, leaving behind only the shell, the body; in other words, that really Rachel and the child departed. But such a view does not fit with the Bible description of the child's death. Elijah did not pray that the child return and re-enter his body, but "let this child's soul come into *him* again." "And the soul of the child came into *him* again, and *he* revived." The next sentence says that "Elijah took the child, and brought



him down out of the chamber," and gave him to his mother. The lifeless form is called "the child," or "him," and the revived boy being led by the prophet to his mother is described in exactly the same language. This complete failure of the Bible writer to use any difference in language in referring to the child before and after the resurrection miracle, is but typical of Bible writers throughout.

For example, take the Lord's statement to Adam: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Gen. 3:19. We all agree that God is addressing Adam. The personal pronoun "thou" could have no other meaning. But the whole sentence reads thus: "In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, till *thou* return unto the ground; for out of it was *thou* taken: for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return."

What rule of language permits the pronoun "thou" to have its correct personal meaning in the first part of a sentence, and a different, an impersonal value, in the remainder of the sentence? If the Lord, as we believe, really wished to inform Adam that he, not merely the so-called shell of a body, would return to the ground, could any plainer language have been used? Now if, in order to support a belief, it is necessary to give personal and impersonal values to one and the same pronoun when addressed to a single person in a single sentence, there must be something the matter with that belief. If we who teach that man is mortal and lies in the grave till the resurrection, are not to be permitted to use the ordinary rules of language and the most obvious meaning of words in presenting our view from the Bible, then of course we have no basis for discussion.

Perhaps believers in natural immortality think we are attempting to build too much of a case on the use of pronouns. But suppose the Lord had said to Adam, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou return unto Me." How triumphantly would they have reminded us that "thou" is a personal pronoun, and that therefore Adam was to return to God at death! Then surely we may be pardoned for calling attention to the fact that the Lord said the very opposite; namely, "*thou* return unto the ground."

Turning again, now, to Elijah and the child: If "he" and "him" mean neither he nor him in one half of the story, then this much only is certain, that personality can depart from personal pronouns. If when the child died, *he* really departed, why should the prophet pray that his "soul come into *him* again"? If at death *he* never really died, but simply departed, why should the record describe this miracle of resurrection by declaring that "*he* revived"? We despair of attempting to settle this question if personality elusively departs from personal pronouns at the ready convenience of the believers in natural immortality.

Now, what was this "soul" that departed and which, in the case of the child, came back again? The word "soul" here, and in the case of Rachel, is a translation of the Hebrew word *nephesh*. Gesenius, generally considered the greatest of Hebrew lexicographers, gives the following as the primary meaning of the word: "1. Breath." (See Job 41:21, where *nephesh* is translated "breath.")

We surely need not offer any apology for employing the primary definition given to a word by one of the most learned of Hebrew scholars. And when we do this, the whole matter becomes simple. When Elijah prayed, "the soul [*nephesh*, breath] . . . came into him again." Thus translated, the text finds a parallel in the account of the child's death in an earlier verse: "His sickness was so sore, that there was *no breath* left in him." Verse 17. This rendering of the passage agrees absolutely with the facts set forth in the preceding chapter concerning the "breath of life." The fact that "breath" in verse 17 is from a different Hebrew word, does not affect the comparison, seeing that both Hebrew words may properly mean "breath."

When we examine the account of this child's soul (*nephesh*) in terms of the original Hebrew word, we make still another interesting discovery. This word *nephesh* is translated "life" in the following passage from the creation story: "To every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life [*nephesh*], I have given every green herb for meat." Gen.

1:30. In the margin of the Bible, the translators give "a living soul," as a variant rendering for *nephesh*, "life." If the *nephesh* within the child proves that he is an undying soul, then it proves the same for the beasts, the fowls, and even the creeping things.

The writer personally would rather "seek" for the immortality the Bible promises the righteous at the second coming of Jesus, than to rest in the belief that this choice possession is already his simply because there is within him something (a *nephesh*) that is also found in the beast of the field. (See page 223 for a further treatment of the word "soul.")

#### OBJECTION IV

**Revelation 6:9, 10, proves that the souls of the righteous dead are in heaven.**

This passage of Scripture reads thus: "When He had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

It is at least interesting to note, by way of introduction, that the believers in natural immortality endeavor to prove their position by reference to the book of Revelation. Almost without exception they declare that Revelation is too mystical to be understood, whenever Seventh-day Adventists appeal to this book in support of doctrine. Does Revelation suddenly become plain and understandable when it is thought to support the belief of those who teach immortality? Do they wish in this lone passage to give a literal meaning to the words of this prophetic book? Evidently so; for their whole argument depends for its plausibility on a literal interpretation of the texts before us. We therefore wish to ask them certain questions to discover whether they are really willing to maintain that this is a literal passage.

If the souls of the righteous soar away at death to enter immediately into eternal happiness in the presence of God, how is it that the most worthy of these, the martyrs, should

be confined under an altar? Is this a particularly ideal location? Apparently not, for these souls seem to be in distress.

Why should they need to cry for vengeance on their persecutors, who had for centuries carried on these persecutions? The immortal-soul doctrine teaches that the wicked, at death, go immediately into the flames of hell. Surely the martyrs would not wish for any more terrible vengeance than this.

The believers in natural immortality contend vigorously that Christ's story of the rich man and Lazarus should be understood literally, and not as a parable. We shall consider this story later; but we raise one query in the present connection: If heaven and hell are so near together that the good man Lazarus could actually hear from the rich man's own lips the details of his suffering, why should the martyrs need to cry for vengeance? Are we to understand that these souls were not satisfied with the sights and sounds of torture and agony which, according to popular theology, greeted their eyes and ears as they looked over into hell?

But why continue the questions further? Indeed, why should we be asked to meet this passage of Scripture at all, when various of the most learned theologians declare that the passage should not be viewed literally? For example, Albert Barnes, the well-known Presbyterian commentator, affirms: "We are not to suppose that this *literally* occurred, and that John actually saw the souls of the martyrs beneath the altars, for the whole representation is symbolical; nor are we to suppose that the injured and the wronged in heaven actually pray for vengeance; . . . but it may be fairly inferred from this that there will be *as real* a remembrance of the wrongs of the persecuted, the injured, and the oppressed, *as if* such prayer were offered there; and that the oppressor has as much to dread from the divine vengeance *as if* those whom he has injured should cry in heaven to the God who hears prayer. . . . Every persecutor should dread the death of the persecuted *as if* he went to heaven to plead against him."—*Comments on Revelation 6:10 (italics his)*. Of course, in fairness to Barnes, we would make clear that he is a believer in soul immortality and consciousness in death, that indeed he even believes that in some fashion this



passage in Revelation provides proof of that doctrine. But this does not in any way invalidate his clear-cut admission that the passage should be viewed figuratively, not literally. That is all we wish to establish from his testimony. Just how he can make this admission, and yet believe that the passage supports soul immortality, he does not explain.

Adam Clarke, the Methodist scholar, says: "Their *blood*, like that of Abel, cried for vengeance. . . . We sometimes say, *Blood cries for blood*."—*Comments on Revelation* 6:9, 10 (*italics his*).

The limits of space do not permit us to discuss here the symbolical value of these texts, which form a part of a very important prophecy in the Revelation. Nor is it indeed necessary, for having shown that the language is not to be understood literally, we have removed the whole basis of the argument. Even literal souls are almost too airy and vaporous for the advocates of such a doctrine to describe or picture very satisfactorily. It would be asking too much to expect them to maintain their side of a discussion with nothing more substantial to present than symbolical souls under a symbolical altar uttering symbolical cries.

#### OBJECTION V

**Did not Paul declare that when he died he would go immediately to be with Christ? (See Phil. 1:21-23.)**

The passage reads thus: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better." Phil. 1:21-23.

If there were no other text in the Bible that dealt with the question of the final reward of the righteous, the reader might be pardoned for concluding that Paul expected, immediately at death, to enter heaven. This much we freely grant. But we would add at once that if a lone phrase in some one text of Scripture is to be viewed by itself, the Bible would seem to teach salvation by works, prayers for the dead, and other doctrines that Protestants consider unscriptural.



We cannot agree with the interpretation of Paul's words as given in the objection before us. Why? Because it would make the apostle contradict himself. Paul wrote much on the subject of being with Christ. Let us examine at least a part of his writings before drawing a conclusion concerning this passage.

In another of his letters, Paul goes into details as to the time when the righteous will go to "be with the Lord:" "The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4:16-18.

This states very plainly that the righteous dead and the righteous living will go "to meet the Lord" at the same time, for they are to be "caught up together." The time is when "the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven," that is, at the second advent. "And so [in this way, or by this means] shall we ever be with the Lord." Why should Paul teach here most emphatically that it was to be by means of the second advent that all the righteous, including himself, would go to be with the Lord, if he really believed that he would go at death?

The apostle made this statement to the Thessalonians because, said he, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not." Verse 13. He assured them in the next verse that if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, then we may be confident that the God who "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus" (Heb. 13:20) will also bring from the dead those who sleep in Jesus.

It is impossible to think that Paul believed that the righteous go to be with the Lord at death, since he specifically told the Thessalonians that the righteous, both the living and those raised from the dead, go "together" to "be with the Lord" at the second advent. He declared that he was writing them so that they would not be "ignorant." It is incredible that he would leave them in ignorance as to being with Christ at death, if

he thus believed. In fact, he told them the very opposite,—that the righteous dead do not go to be with the Lord at death, but await the resurrection morn. If he believed that we go to be with the Lord at death, why did he fail to mention this fact when he was writing specifically to “comfort” them? He exhorted them to find their “comfort” in a future event—the resurrection.

Those ministers today who believe in immortal souls, “comfort” the bereaved with the assurance that the loved one has already gone to be with the Lord, and they declare that we who hold a contrary view deprive a sorrowing one of the greatest comfort possible. Do they therefore indict Paul also?

Again, if Paul believed that the righteous go to God at death, why did he tell the Corinthian church that the change from mortality to immortality will not take place until the “last trump”? (See 1 Cor. 15:51-54.)

Or why did he tell the Colossians that when Christ appears, “*then* shall ye also appear with Him in glory”? Col. 3:4.

Or why should he have said, as the time of his own “departure,” by the executioner’s sword, was at hand, “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. 4:8.

Yes, and why should Christ Himself tell His disciples that they would once more be with Him when He fulfilled His promise: “I will come again, and receive you unto Myself”?

Yes, why should Christ have focused the attention of the troubled disciples wholly on His second advent if it were really true that all of them would go to be with their Lord immediately at death?

These, and other passages we could quote, are in hopeless contradiction to the interpretation placed on the words of Paul in the objection before us. Are we to conclude, therefore, that Scripture contradicts itself? No. Paul in his statement to the Philippians does not say *when* he expects to be with Christ. He states briefly his weariness of life’s struggle, his desire to rest from the conflict, if that would cause Christ to be “magni-

fied." But to this veteran apostle, who had so constantly preached the glorious return of Christ as the one great event beyond the grave, the falling asleep in death was immediately connected with what would occur at the awakening of the resurrection,—the being "caught up" "to meet the Lord."

It is not an unusual thing for a Bible writer to couple together events that are separated by a long span of time. The Bible does not generally go into details, but concerns itself with setting forth the really important points of God's dealing with man along the course of the centuries. For example, Isaiah 61:1, 2, contains a prophecy of the work that Christ would do at His first advent. In Luke 4:17-19 is the account of Christ's reading this prophecy to the people, and informing them: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Verse 21. But a close examination will reveal that Christ did not read all the prophecy from Isaiah, though apparently it is one connected statement. He ended with the phrase: "To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." But the very next phrase in the sentence is: "And the day of vengeance of our God." He did not read this, because it was not yet to be fulfilled. The whole span of the Christian era was to pass before the day of God's vengeance was to come. This long period of time is not even suggested in the prophecy, but other Bible passages indicate this fact clearly, and it is by examining all these other passages that we learn how to understand a brief, compressed prophecy like that of Isaiah 61.

Or take the prophecy of the second advent as given in 2 Peter 3:3-13. If no other Bible passage was compared with this one, the conclusion might easily be reached that the second advent of Christ results immediately in the destruction of this earth by fire. Yet when we compare 2 Peter 3 with Revelation 20, we learn that a thousand years intervene between the second advent and the fiery destruction of this earth. Peter was giving only a brief summary of the outstanding events impending. He passed immediately from the great fact of the second advent over to the next great act in the drama of God's dealing with this earth, its destruction by fire. But with Peter's prophecy, as with that of Isaiah, there is no need for confusion if we follow

the Bible plan of comparing scripture with scripture to fill in the details.

Now if Peter could place in one sentence (2 Peter 3:10) two great events separated by a thousand years, and Isaiah could couple in another sentence (Isa. 61:2) two mighty events separated by more than nineteen hundred years, why should it be thought strange if Paul followed this plan, and coupled together in one sentence (Phil. 1:23) the sad event of dying with the glorious event of being "with Christ" at the second advent? In the other passages we have quoted from Paul, the death of the Christian is directly connected with the resurrection at Christ's advent, events which we know are separated by a long span of time. Therefore the mere fact of the coupling together of the event of dying with the event of being with the Lord, does not necessarily mean that these two events are immediately related. And when we follow the Bible rule of comparing scripture with scripture, we discover that the two events are widely separated.

#### OBJECTION VI

**Paul said that he was "willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Cor. 5:8.**

If the reader will open his Bible to this fifth chapter of Second Corinthians, he will discover that Paul is dealing with three different possible states. Let us classify his statements regarding them:

1. "Our earthly house." "At home in the body." "Absent from the Lord." This house can be "dissolved." "In this we groan."

2. "Unclothed." "Naked."

3. "A building of God." "House not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Our house which is from heaven." "Clothed upon." "Present with the Lord." "Absent from the body."

If the "earthly house" means our present, mortal body, as all agree, then unless there is clear proof to the contrary, it would logically follow that our heavenly house is the immortal body. And thus by a process of elimination the "unclothed,"



"naked" state can mean none other than that state of dissolution known as death.

We are assured of the desired third state because we have "the earnest [pledge] of the Spirit." Verse 5. But how will God's Spirit finally insure our reaching this desired state? Paul answers: "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also *quicken your mortal bodies* by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8:11.

The learned Dr. H. C. G. Moule well says: "That same Spirit, who, by uniting us to Christ, made actual our redemption, shall surely, in ways to us unknown, carry the process to its glorious crown, and be somehow the efficient cause of 'the redemption of our body.'"—*The Expositor's Bible, comment on Romans 8:11.*

Now, if the fulfilling to us of that pledge of the Spirit is the change that takes place in our mortal bodies at the resurrection, then we must conclude that the change to the third state, that of being "clothed upon" with the heavenly house, comes at the resurrection, and consists of the change in our bodies from mortal to immortal.

Paul declares further: "We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Rom. 8:22, 23. That he is here dealing with the same problem as in 2 Corinthians 5, is evident:

## ROMANS 8:22, 23

"Groan within ourselves."  
 "First fruits of the Spirit."  
 "Waiting for."  
 "Redemption of our body."

## 2 CORINTHIANS 5:1-8

"We groan."  
 "Earnest of the Spirit."  
 "Earnestly desiring."  
 "Clothed upon" with heavenly house.

Thus we conclude again that the change from the "earthly house" to the "house which is from heaven" is an event that involves the "redemption of our body," which "redemption,"



all agree, occurs at the resurrection day. (See also Phil. 3: 20, 21.)

The apostle states that he longs to be "clothed upon" with the heavenly house, "*that mortality might be swallowed up of life*," or, as the American Revised Version states it, "that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life." Verse 4. In other words, "what is mortal" loses its mortality by this change.

According to the immortal-soul doctrine, "what is mortal" is the body only, which at death dissolves in the grave; while the soul simply continues on in its immortal state, freed from the mortal body. But Paul longs to be "clothed" with the heavenly house, "*that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life*." Thus by their own tenets, the immortal-soul advocates must agree that Paul in this passage is not dealing with an experience that takes place at death. We might therefore close the discussion.

In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul declared: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." When? "At the last trump." And what will take place? "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." And what will result from this? "*When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.*" 1 Cor. 15:51-54. This last phrase parallels the language in 2 Corinthians 5: "What is mortal [or subject to death] may be swallowed up of life." The swallowing up of death, or mortality, is still a future event.

That Paul expected to be "clothed upon" with the heavenly house at the resurrection day, is the certain conclusion from all his statements. Being "present with the Lord" is contingent upon being "clothed" with the heavenly house. Therefore the being "present with the Lord" awaits the resurrection day. How beautifully this agrees with the apostle's statement to the Thessalonians, that at the *resurrection* we are caught up "to meet the Lord," and "so shall we ever be *with the Lord*." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.

If it seems strange to some that Paul should speak of putting off one "house" and putting on another when he meant simply

the change in our bodies from mortal to immortal, we would remind them that he uses a similar figure of speech when describing the change that takes place in the heart at conversion. He declares that we should "put off . . . the old man," and "put on the new man." Eph. 4:22-24.

The fact that Paul coupled together the being freed from the earthly house and the being clothed upon with the heavenly, does not prove that he expected an *immediate* transfer from one to the other. He makes specific reference to an "unclothed," a "naked" state. On the question of immediate transfer, the reader is referred to the discussion of Philippians 1:21-23 in the preceding chapter.

With propriety might Paul "groan" for the day when he could put off this mortal body, with all the evils suggested by it, and could put on, be "clothed upon," with the promised immortal body, in which body he would be ready "to meet" and to "ever be with the Lord."

#### OBJECTION VII

**Christ, during the time between His crucifixion and His resurrection, went and preached to the spirits in prison. 1 Peter 3:18-20.**

The passage reads thus: "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

We wonder why the believers in the immortality of the soul should quote this passage. If it gives them aid and comfort on this one doctrine, it thereby gives them great discomfort on two other doctrines, or rather heresies, according to orthodox Protestantism,—purgatory and a second probation. If Christ went to preach to certain sinners after their death, the clear inference is that a second chance, or probation, was being extended to them. And if there was this second probation; then

the place of torture in which they were confined was one from which there was escape, and that is perilously close to the idea of purgatory.

Furthermore, if Christ at His crucifixion really preached to lost spirits, why did He single out only the spirits of those who were "disobedient" "in the days of Noah"? Were none others entitled to a second chance? Away with an interpretation of Peter's words that would make him support such heresies!

Peter teaches the very opposite of the second-probation doctrine, declaring that the preaching took place "when once [or, at the time when] the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." The phrase, "which sometime were disobedient," is simply an interjected explanatory statement. If the passage is read without this phrase, the time of the preaching can easily be seen: "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison . . . *when* once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah."

But how did Christ go to preach to these people? The text says: "By *which* also He went and preached." Now the "which" refers back to "the Spirit." Thus Peter is declaring that it was by the agency of "the Spirit" that Christ preached to these "spirits in prison" in the days of Noah.

Christ told His disciples that it was the Spirit that would "reprove the world of sin" (see John 16:7-9), and that they were therefore to wait until they were endued with the Spirit before they started out to preach. When the disciples brought conviction to sinners in the Christian era, the real source of the preaching was the indwelling Spirit of God.

Now was there a preacher of God in antediluvian days through whom the Spirit could preach to men? Yes, Peter tells us that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness." 2 Peter 2:5. In the inspired account of God's plan to destroy the earth by a flood, we read: "The Lord said, *My Spirit* shall not always strive [or, plead] with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." Gen. 6:3. Then follows the account of God's calling Noah to make ready for the flood. In other words, God's Spirit preached to these antediluvians through Noah, "a preacher of righteousness," waiting,

in His long-suffering, a hundred and twenty years before finally destroying them.

But why should these people be said to be "in prison"? The Bible describes those who are in the darkness of sin as being "prisoners" and as being in a "prison house." And, specifically, the prophet Isaiah declares that the work of Christ, with "the Spirit of the Lord God" upon Him, was "the opening of the prison to them that are bound." (See Isa. 42:7; 61:1; cf. Luke 4:18-21.) The work of the Spirit in antediluvian times was evidently the same as in the time of Christ,—the preaching to those who are prisoners of sin, offering them a way of escape.

Only one query remains. It will be asked why these people to whom Noah preached were called "spirits" if they were men alive on the earth. We will let an eminent commentator, Dr. Adam Clarke, answer this. The fact that he is a believer in the immortal-soul doctrine makes his testimony on this passage particularly valuable. After declaring that the phrase, "he went and preached," should be understood to mean, "by the ministry of Noah," he remarks:

"The word *pneumasi*, *spirits*, is supposed to render this view of the subject improbable, because this must mean *disembodied spirits*; but this certainly does not follow; for *the spirits of just men made perfect*, Heb. 12:23, certainly means *righteous men*, and *men still in the church militant*; and *the Father of spirits*, Heb. 12:9, means *men still in the body*; and *the God of the spirits of all flesh*, Num. 16:22 and 27:16, means *men, not in a disembodied state*."—*Comments on 1 Peter 3:19* (italics his).

Another learned commentator, Dr. J. Rawson Lumby, in *The Expositor's Bible*, remarks that during the earlier centuries, which was the period when the Catholic religion, with its belief in purgatory, was dominant, the passage was interpreted to mean that Christ went to preach to souls in hell. "But at the time of the Reformation the chief authorities expounded them [these words of Peter's] of the preaching of Christ's Spirit through the ministry of the patriarch [Noah]."—*Comments on 1 Peter 3:17-22*.

Dr. John Pearson, in his "Exposition of the Creed," a classic Church of England work, observes: "It is certain then that Christ did preach unto those persons which in the days of Noah were disobedient, all that time 'the long-suffering of God waited,' and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. And it is as certain that He never preached to them after they died."—Page 166.

Why should we be asked to explain this passage in harmony with our views when eminent theologians, who believe in the immortality of the soul, admit that the immortal-soul doctrine is not here taught?

### OBJECTION VIII

**Christ told the thief on the cross that he would be with Him that day in Paradise. (See Luke 23:43.)**

The text reads thus: "Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

Believers in the doctrine of immortal souls, or spirits, boldly bring forth 1 Peter 3:18-20 in an attempt to prove that when Christ died on the cross He went down to preach to certain lost souls in hell. But that claim is no sooner proved to be groundless than we are confronted with this text in Luke 23:43, and informed that when Christ died on the cross He went immediately to Paradise. We believe that Christ did not go to Paradise that crucifixion Friday, and for the following reasons:

If the reader will compare Revelation 2:7 with Revelation 22:1, 2, he will see that Paradise is where the "throne of God" is. Therefore, if Christ had gone to Paradise that Friday afternoon, He would have gone into the very presence of God. But Christ Himself, on the resurrection morning, declared to Mary, as she fell at His feet to worship Him: "Touch Me not; for I am *not yet ascended* to My Father: but go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God." John 20:17. How perfectly this statement of Christ's agrees with the words of the angel to the women at the tomb: "Come, see the place where the



*Lord lay.*" Matt. 28:6. He had lain in the tomb, that was why He said on the resurrection morning, "I am *not yet* ascended to My Father."

Are we therefore to be placed in the embarrassing position of attempting to decide whether to accept the statements made to the women by Christ and the angel on Sunday morning, or the statement made by Christ to the thief on Friday afternoon? No, Christ did not contradict Himself. Note the punctuation of Luke 23:43. Then remember that the punctuation in the Bible is quite modern. The early manuscripts of the Bible not only did not use the comma, which is the particular punctuation mark in this sentence, but they actually ran the words right together in the line. Our translators used their best judgment in placing punctuation marks, but their work was certainly not inspired. Therefore we need not be held to these marks made by translators only about four hundred years ago, when we are endeavoring to determine the intent of the writers of nineteen hundred years ago.

The change of a comma may make a great difference in the meaning. If I should write thus: "The teacher says my boy is no good," I would mean one thing. But I would mean something quite different if I wrote it with the help of two commas, thus: "The teacher, says my boy, is no good." The words are the same, but the meaning is different. Now if the translators, who did such excellent work in general, had placed the comma in Luke 23:43 after "today" instead of after "thee," we would not be confronted with an apparently hopeless contradiction. Christ's words could then properly be understood thus: Verily I say unto thee today (this day when it seems that I am deserted of God and man and am dying as a common criminal), Thou *shalt* be with Me in Paradise. Instead of being deprived of meaning, the word "today" takes on a real significance.

A similar sentence construction is found in the writings of the prophet Zechariah: "Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope: even today do I declare that I will render double unto thee." Zech. 9:12. The context shows that the rendering "double" was not to take place on that very "today,"

but was a future event. It is evident that "today" qualifies "declare." Even so in Luke 23:43, if "today" be allowed to qualify "say," which is not only proper grammar, but a parallel to the language of Zechariah, there is no contradiction between the message to the thief and that to Mary. And, we should add, there is no conscious entity soaring away to Paradise that sad Friday afternoon.

### OBJECTION IX

**How do you harmonize with your belief in the unconsciousness of man in death, the Bible account of the witch of Endor, who brought forth Samuel to talk with King Saul? (See 1 Sam. 28:7-19.)**

How do those who believe that at death the righteous go *up* to heaven and the wicked *down* to hell, harmonize this Bible narrative with *their* belief? Let us examine the story:

Saul commanded his servants, "Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her." Verse 7. They found such a woman at Endor. The woman inquires, "Whom shall I *bring up* unto thee? And he [Saul] said, *Bring me up* Samuel." Verse 11. A moment later the woman declared, "I saw gods *ascending out of the earth*. . . . An old man *cometh up*; and he is covered with a mantle." Verses 13, 14. "And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to *bring me up*? . . . Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hands of the Philistines: and *tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me*." Verses 15-19.

This narrative says nothing about the prophet Samuel's coming down from heaven for this occasion. Saul uses the words, "*bring up*." The witch uses the same and similar expressions, "*bring up*," "*ascending out of the earth*," "*cometh up*." And to Samuel are attributed equivalent words, "*bring me up*." If any one might claim this weird, tragic story, it would be we who believe that when the dead return to this earth they come "*up*" "*out of the earth*." But in seeking evidence regarding the state of man in death, we do not consider it safe to rely on the events and conversations of a devil-infested,

God-condemned séance. However, inasmuch as the believers in the immortality of the soul appeal to this séance, we would inquire of them how they harmonize all these statements with *their* belief. Can "up" mean "down"?

Again, the narrative thus describes "Samuel:" "An old man . . . covered with a mantle." Is this the way an immortal spirit would appear? Does it actually take on a body? If so, where does it obtain the body? If it be answered that there was a resurrection, we would reply that such a confession spoils the whole case, for we believe that the dead may be raised. But we do not believe that the devil has power to raise the dead, and certainly God was not at the bidding of this witch, who was under the divine death edict for practicing this very art of sorcery. Thus, to say that a resurrection took place creates only the worse embarrassment. (See the following regarding the divine sentence of death against witches: Lev. 20:27; Deut. 18:10, 11. The spirit that controlled them was thus not of God, but of the devil.)

Now the record tells us later that Saul climaxed his sinful course by committing suicide. (See 2 Sam. 31:4.) But "Samuel," foretelling Saul's death, declares: "Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be *with me*." Pray tell, where did Samuel dwell, if the suicide Saul was to be with him? Really, we marvel that those who believe the doctrine of natural immortality ever bring up this Bible story, for by so doing they "bring up" Samuel from the "earth" when, according to their view, he is supposed to be in heaven; and they have the wicked Saul going to "be with" the holy Samuel, when he is supposed, instead, to go to be with the devils in hell.

But why does the story speak of "Samuel" if he was not really there? The record does not say that *Saul* saw "Samuel," for when the witch cried out, he inquired, "What sawest *thou*?" And a moment later, "What form is he of?" If Samuel had really been there, why would not Saul have seen him? Were only the hag's eyes keen enough to discern "an old man . . . covered with a mantle"? We read that "Saul perceived that it was Samuel." The word "perceived" is from a different Hebrew word than "saw." The meaning is that Saul understood,

or concluded, as a result of the description given by the witch, that Samuel was present.

The devil was the inspiration of the witch's activities, and the devil is the archdeceiver. We conclude therefore that this woman was practicing a deception on Saul. She, deceived also by the devil, probably thought she saw Samuel. Saul, in turn, accepted her explanation. The Bible narrative then simply describes this spiritualistic séance in terms of the suppositions of the witch and of Saul. This is a literary rule known as the *language of appearance*. When the story says "Samuel," we may understand it to mean simply that devil-generated apparition, that doubtless appeared, and which they *supposed* was Samuel.

#### OBJECTION X

**Christ's story of the rich man and Lazarus proves the immortality of the soul. (See Luke 16:19-31.)**

This story says nothing about immortal souls leaving the body at death. Instead, the rich man after he died had "eyes" and a "tongue," that is, very real bodily parts. He asked that Lazarus "dip the tip of his finger in water." If the narrative is to be taken literally, then the good and bad at death do not soar away as intangible spirits, but go to their rewards as real beings with bodily parts. Yet how could they go there bodily, seeing that their bodies had been buried in the grave?

Again, if this is a literal account, then heaven and hell are near enough for a conversation to be held between the inhabitants of the two places—a rather undesirable situation, to say the least. If the believers in natural immortality claim that this is a literal picture of the geography of heaven and hell, then they must surrender the text concerning the "souls under the altar" crying for vengeance against their persecutors. (See Rev. 6:9-11.) Both passages cannot be literal. If the righteous can actually see the wicked in torture, why should they need to cry for vengeance?

When the rich man pleaded that Lazarus be sent back to earth to warn others against hell, Abraham replied: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." And "if

they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one *rose from the dead*." Verses 29, 31. Thus the narrative nowhere speaks of disembodied spirits, not even in the matter of returning to warn men. Instead, return is in terms of rising "from the dead."

To avoid believing that spirits have bodies and that heaven and hell are really near enough for conversations, does the objector now wish to view this story simply as a parable? Then we would remind him that theologians with one accord agree that doctrines ought not to be built upon parables or allegories. A parable, like other illustrations, is generally used to make vivid one particular point. To attempt to build doctrines on every part of the story would generally result in absurdity, if not utter contradiction. Certainly to try to find in the illustration a proof for a belief the very opposite of that held by the speaker or writer, would violate the most primary rule governing illustrations. We affirm that the objector, by using this parable to prove that men receive their rewards at death, would cause Christ to contradict Himself.

Elsewhere Christ states definitely the time when the righteous receive their reward and the wicked are cast into the consuming fire: "*When the Son of man shall come in His glory, . . . and before Him shall be gathered all nations; . . . then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom. . . . Then shall He say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.*" Matt. 25:31-41.

There is no need that one return to give warning regarding the fate beyond the grave, because the living "have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." We, the living, are therefore surely justified in understanding the parable in harmony with what the prophets have said. Malachi, for example, states that "the day cometh" (it is a future event) when the wicked are to suffer the torments of consuming fire. (See Mal. 4:1-3.) The Old Testament writers are very emphatic in stating that the dead, righteous and wicked alike, lie silent and unconscious in the grave until the resurrection day. (See Job 14:12-15, 20, 21; 17:13; 19:25-27; Ps. 115:17; Eccl. 9:3-6, 10.)



Thus to declare the story a parable or an allegory, gives the objector no more support than if he declared it to be literal, unless he wishes to maintain the impossible claim that a particular point in a figurative story should be taken literally, even though there is thus created a direct contradiction of the literal statements of "Moses and the prophets" and Christ (in Matthew 25).

We believe that the story is a parable, which was the usual method Christ employed in His teaching, even though here, as in various other instances, He does not specifically so state. We therefore seek to find just what lesson Christ was trying to teach, and do not attempt to make the parable prove anything more than this. Evidently, Christ was wishing to rebuke the Pharisees, "who were covetous." Luke 16:14. They, indeed many of the Jews, thought that riches were a sign of God's favor, and poverty of His displeasure. Christ drove home the one primary lesson, that the reward awaiting the covetous rich, who have naught but crumbs for the poor, was the very opposite of what the Jews believed.

This is what the parable is intended to teach. It would be as consistent for us to contend that Christ taught here also that the righteous literally go to "Abraham's bosom," and that heaven and hell are within speaking distance, as that He taught that the reward comes immediately at death. Christ guarded against the drawing of unwarranted conclusions from this lesson He was teaching the Jews, by placing it in the setting of a story. He doubly guarded it by declaring in closing that "Moses and the prophets" should be the guide to the living as regards their fate beyond death. Yes, He triply guarded it by definitely describing the return of any one from the dead in terms of a resurrection.

By employing the language of allegory He could very properly have the unconscious dead carry on a conversation, without necessitating the conclusion that the dead are conscious. Elsewhere in the Bible we find the vivid parable of the trees going "forth on a time to anoint a king over them," and of the conversation carried on between them. (See Judges 9:7-15; also 2 Kings 14:9.) Why not attempt to prove by this parable

that trees talk and that they have kings? No, you say, that would be trying to make it prove more than was intended by the speaker. We agree. The same rule holds for the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

### OBJECTION XI

The Bible speaks of "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46) for the wicked, and of "everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:41) in which they will burn, and of their being "tormented day and night forever and ever" (Rev. 20:10). This proves the immortality of the soul.

The words translated "everlasting" and "forever" do not necessarily mean *never ending*. These terms, when found in the New Testament, come from the Greek noun *aiōn*, or from the adjective *aiōnios* derived from this noun. When we examine various Scripture texts containing *aiōn*, we discover at once how impossible it would be to attempt to make this Greek root always mean an *endless* period. We read in Matthew 13:39 and elsewhere of "the *end* of the world [*aiōn*]." How could there be an "end" to something if it were endless? (Here is an illustration of where *aiōn* might be translated "age," the "world" being viewed in its aspect of time. In Colossians 1:26 *aiōn* is thus translated.) We read of Christ that He has been exalted above "every name that is named, not only in *this* world [*aiōn*], but also in *that which is to come*." Eph. 1:21. We read of "this *present* world [*aiōn*]." 2 Tim. 4:10. Thus again we see that an *aiōn* can have an *end*, for this present *aiōn* is to be followed by another and a different one. The Bible speaks of what "God ordained *before* the world [*aiōn*]." 1 Cor. 2:7.

Of Christ we read also: "Thou art a priest forever [*aiōn*]." Heb. 5:6. Here "forever," or *aiōn*, clearly means this present age, for all theologians agree that Christ's work as a priest comes to an *end* when sin has been blotted out. (The work of a priest is to deal with sin. See Heb. 2:17 and 5:1.)

Paul, writing to Philemon regarding the return of his servant Onesimus, said: "Thou shouldst receive [have, A. R. V.] him forever [*aiōnios*], . . . both in the flesh, and in the

Lord." Philemon 15, 16. (Here we have the adjective that is derived from *aiōn*.)

H. C. G. Moule, in that scholarly commentary, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," remarks on this text: "The adjective tends to mark *duration as long as the nature of the subject allows*. And by usage it has a close connection with things spiritual. 'Forever' here thus imports both natural and spiritual permanence of restoration; '*forever*' on earth, and then hereafter; a final return to Philemon's home, with a prospect of heaven in Philemon's company."

We need not here raise the question as to whether Moule has altogether correctly measured Paul's words. We inquire simply: How could Philemon have Onesimus "*'forever*' on earth, and then hereafter," unless the earthly "*forever*" had an end to it?

We read of "Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them . . . suffering the vengeance of eternal [*aiōnios*] fire." Jude 7. Are those cities, set ablaze long ago as a divine judgment, still burning? No, you say, their ruins are quite submerged by the Dead Sea. The Bible itself specifically states that God turned "the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes." 2 Peter 2:6. Now the fate of these cities is declared to be a warning to all wicked men of the fate that impends for them. Therefore if the "*aiōnios* fire" of that long ago judgment turned into ashes those upon whom it preyed, and then died down of itself, we may properly conclude that the "*aiōnios* fire" of the last day will do likewise.

When we turn to the Old Testament, we discover that "everlasting" and "forever" sometimes signify a very limited time. We shall quote texts in which these two terms are translated from the Hebrew word *olam*, because *olam* is the equivalent of the Greek *aiōn*.

The Passover was to be kept "forever [*olam*]." Ex. 12:24. But it ended with the cross. (See Heb. 9:24-26.) Aaron and his sons were to offer incense "forever [*olam*]" (1 Chron. 23:13), and to have an "everlasting [*olam*] priesthood." Ex. 40:15. But this priesthood, with its offerings of incense, ended at the cross. (See Heb. 7:11-14.) A servant who desired to

stay with his master, was to serve him "forever [*olam*]." (See Ex. 21:1-6.) How could a servant serve a master to endless time? Will there be masters and servants in the world to come? Jonah, describing his watery experience, said: "The earth with her bars was about me forever [*olam*]." Jonah 2:6. Yet this "forever" was only "three days and three nights" long. Jonah 1:17. Rather a short "forever." Because Gehazi practiced deceit, Elisha declared: "The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee [*Gehazi*], and unto thy seed forever [*olam*]." 2 Kings 5:27. Should we conclude, therefore, that Gehazi's family would never end, and that thus leprosy would be perpetuated for all time to come?

Thus by the acid test of actual usage, we discover that in a number of cases *aion*, *aiōnios*, and *olam* have a very limited time value.\*

What Bible usage thus reveals, Greek scholars confirm. For example, Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, a standard work, gives the following as the principal meanings of *aion*: "A space or period of time, especially a lifetime, life. . . . Also one's time of life, age: the age of man. . . . 2. A long space of time, eternity. . . . 3. Later, a space of time clearly defined and marked out, an era, age, . . . this present life, this world."

Alexander Cruden, in his Concordance, which for many years was the one great concordance in the English language, remarks under the word "eternal:" "The words eternal, everlasting, forever, are *sometimes* taken for a long time, and are not always to be understood strictly."

---

\* The agreement in meaning between *olam* and *aion* is revealed in two ways:

1. The Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, always translates *olam* by *aion*. (See "A Greek and English Lexicon," by Edward Robinson, under the word *aion*.)

2. The New Testament writers, in quoting an Old Testament passage, or using an Old Testament phrase, where *olam* is used, translate it by *aion*, or by the adjectival form, *aiōnios*. Note the following quotations:

Hebrews 1:8, "forever and ever [*aiōn*]," quoting Psalms 45:6, "forever and ever [*olam*]."

Hebrews 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21, "forever [*aiōn*]," quoting Psalms 110:4, "forever [*olam*]."

1 Peter 1:25, "forever [*aiōn*]," quoting Isaiah 40:8, "forever [*olam*]."

Hebrew 13:20, "everlasting [*aiōnios*]," as in Genesis 17:19, "everlasting [*olam*]."

2 Peter 1:11, "everlasting [*aiōnios*]," as in Psalms 145:13, "everlasting [*olam*]."



The learned Archbishop Trench, D. D., in his authoritative work, "Synonyms of the New Testament," remarks concerning the primary sense of *aiōn*: "In its primary, it signifies time, short or long, in its unbroken duration; oftentimes in classical Greek the duration of a human life."—Pages 208, 209.

During recent years many discoveries have been made of Greek writings of the first century A. D. These writings, called *papyri*, enable us to know just how the Greek was written and just what meanings belonged to words at the very time when the New Testament authors wrote. The Greek scholars J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, in their monumental work entitled "The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament," cite various instances in the *papyri* where *aiōn* is equivalent simply to the "period of life" of a person. Under "*aiōnios*" they make the following statement in summing up the evidence as to its usage by the first century Greek-speaking people of the Roman Empire: "In general, the word depicts that of which the horizon is not in view, whether the horizon be at an infinite distance, . . . or whether it lies no farther than the *span of a Cæsar's life*." (Italics ours.)

Now, having proved from the Bible and from Greek scholars that *aiōn* and *olam* are elastic terms, and oftentimes mean only a very limited period, we have removed the very basis on which rests the objection before us. But our case is even stronger when we note the rule that commentators give for measuring the time involved in *aiōn* or *olam* in any text.

Adam Clarke, the great Methodist scholar, in commenting on Gehazi's leprosy (2 Kings 5:27), remarks: "The *forever* implies as long as any of his [Gehazi's] posterity should remain. This is the import of the word *le-olam*. It takes in the whole extent or duration of the thing to which it is applied. The *forever* of Gehazi was till his posterity became extinct." This agrees with the statement found in the quotation given earlier from Moule on Philemon 15: "The adjective [*aiōnios*] tends to mark duration as long as the nature of the subject allows." Therefore, we should first decide whether a "subject" is so constituted that he can live endlessly, before we decide that hell-fire will continue endlessly. Now note the statement made



in the well-known commentary by J. P. Lange: "The bodies and souls of the wicked will suffer *as long as they are capable of suffering*, which, *since they are immortal*, will . . . be forever."—*Comment on Jude 7* (italics ours). The scholarly theologians do not attempt, as does the objector, to prove that souls are immortal because the judgment fires burn for an *aiōn*. On the contrary, knowing that the time value of *aiōn*, *aiōnios*, and *olam* must be determined by the "nature of the subject" involved, these scholars conclude that the fire will burn endlessly because they believe that the souls of the wicked "are immortal." But the claim that the soul is immortal is the very point to be proved.

The Bible nowhere declares that the soul is immortal. (See answer to Objection I.) On the contrary, the Bible uses words that clearly convey the thought that in the case of the wicked the "nature of the subject" demands the conclusion that complete and speedy annihilation will take place. The wicked are described as "chaff," "stubble," "wax," "fat," etc. (See Matt. 3:12; Mal. 4:1; Ps. 68:2; 37:20.) We are told explicitly that the fire "shall burn them up" and "shall leave them neither root nor branch," so that "they shall be ashes under the soles" of the feet of the righteous. Mal. 4:1-3.

Now, while we can thus correctly conclude that the "everlasting" torment of the wicked is but a limited period, we can at the same time logically conclude that the "everlasting" reward of the righteous is an unending one, for we are explicitly told that the righteous "put on immortality" at the advent of Christ. (See 1 Cor. 15:51-55.) Thus the "nature of the subject" being immortal, the "everlasting" is correctly understood as meaning *endless*.

## OBJECTION XII

**The Bible repeatedly speaks of hell and hell-fire, and of the wicked going down into hell when they die. This proves the conscious state of the dead.**

The simple way to answer this objection is to examine the use of the word "hell" throughout the Bible. In the Old Testament, "hell" is always translated from the Hebrew word

*sheol*, which means simply "the unseen state." (See Young's Analytical Concordance.) The idea of fire or punishment is not found in the word. We read: "Then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his God out of the fish's belly, . . . out of the belly of hell [*sheol*] cried I." Jonah 2:1, 2. It would be difficult to imagine anything akin to fire in connection with a cold sea monster. The marginal reading of this text gives "the grave" as the translation of hell, or *sheol*.

*Sheol* is very frequently translated "grave." Both good and bad go there. "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave [*sheol*]?" Ps. 89:48. The godly man Job said: "If I wait, the grave [*sheol*] is mine house." Job 17:13. The psalmist wrote: "The wicked shall be turned into hell [*sheol*]." Ps. 9:17.

In the New Testament the word "hell"\* is translated from the three following Greek words:

1. Once from the root *tartaros*, which means "a dark abyss." (See Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.) This word is used in connection with the casting out of the evil angels from heaven down into "darkness." There is no idea of fire or torment in the word. The passage specifically declares that these angels are "reserved unto judgment." It is a future event. (See 2 Peter 2:4; Rev. 12:7-10.)

2. Ten times from *hades*, which means "the nether world, the grave, death." (See Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.) *Hades* describes the same place as *sheol*. This is evident from two facts:

a. The Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, almost without exception, uses *hades* as the translation of *sheol*.

b. In quoting the Old Testament prophecy regarding Christ: "Thou wilt not leave My soul in hell [*sheol*]," the New Testament writer gives, "hell [*hades*]." (See Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27.)

---

\* Following are the New Testament references where the word "hell" is used:

1. From *tartaros*, 2 Peter 2:4.

2. From *hades*, Matt. 11:23; 16:18; Luke 10:15; 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; Rev. 1:18; 6:8; 20:13, 14.

3. From *Gehenna*, Matt. 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5; James 3:6.

When the word "hell," translated from *hades*, appears in the New Testament, the reader should not understand it to mean the exclusive abode of the wicked, a place of fire and brimstone, because:

a. The primary definition of *hades*, as already noted, does not demand such an understanding of the word.

b. We have shown that the Old Testament speaks of the righteous as well as the wicked going down to *sheol*. We have also shown that *hades* describes the same place or state. Did the ancient patriarchs go down into a place of flames?

c. The New Testament speaks of Christ's being in *hades*. (See Acts 2:27.) In order to be consistent, most of those who believe in the doctrine of disembodied souls and present-burning hell-fire, feel forced to interpret this text in Acts to mean that Christ's disembodied soul went *down* into hell-fire when He died on the cross, though at other times they endeavor to prove from Luke 23:43, 46, that Christ went *up* to God when He died. Both positions certainly cannot be right. The fact is that neither is correct.

In Objection VIII, page 110, we showed that Luke 23:43 is wrongly interpreted. The interpretation of Acts 2:27 is equally false. As Christ died He cried out, "It is finished." His dying completed His suffering to save mankind. The erroneous ideas held by most theologians as to hell and *hades* have caused them their perplexity when reading this text in Acts. They cannot understand why Christ should descend into hell-fire.

Though a believer in soul immortality, Albert Barnes, the eminent Presbyterian commentator, boldly disposes of the difficulty by discarding in this text the lurid value which theology has given to the word *hades*. He remarks: "The Greek word *hades* means literally a place devoid of light, a dark, obscure abode." In view of this he explains the text thus: "The meaning is simply, *Thou wilt not leave Me AMONG THE DEAD.*" (Emphasis his.) Incidentally, he reminds his readers that the original word for soul may be understood to mean "the individual himself." That is why Barnes renders "My soul" by "Me."

Thus we may view Acts 2:27 as proving that *hades* means simply the abode of the dead, even though righteous, and thus in no way connected with fire or torment.

We conclude thus also from 1 Corinthians 15:55, where the word "grave" is a translation of *hades*, and describes that over which the righteous are finally victorious at the resurrection. Incidentally, 1 Corinthians 15:55 is a quotation from the Old Testament (Hosea 13:14), where the equivalent word *sheol* is employed.

In one other text the translators of the King James Version indicated that "hell" may properly be translated by "grave." In Revelation 20:13, where "hell" is given in the text, the marginal reading is "the grave."

d. The Greek scholars who made the American Revised Version, sensing doubtless that our word "hell" has come to mean a place of fire and torment, did not use it to translate the Greek term *hades*. Instead, they simply transferred the Greek word *hades* right into the English. They use the word "hell" to translate a different Greek word, one which we will examine in a moment.

e. Moulton and Milligan, whose work on the Greek we mentioned in the preceding chapter, give this bit of information: "The word [*hades*] is common on tombstones in Asia Minor." —"*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*," under "*Hades*." We need hardly remark that the bereaved in Greek-speaking Asia Minor would surely not use the word *hades* on tombstones if it meant what English-speaking people mean by the word "hell."\*

3. Twelve times from *Gehenna* (or, as it is sometimes transliterated, *Geenna*). This is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word *Hinnom*, the name of a valley near Jerusalem "used as a place to cast carcasses of animals and malefactors, which were consumed by fire constantly kept up." (See Liddell

---

\* The only place in the Bible where fire or torment is coupled with *hades* is in Luke 16:23. This is in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, which we have already examined. It is an accepted rule in theology that doctrines should not be based upon parables. It is even more questionable to attempt to discover the real meaning of a word by the setting in which it is placed in a parable or allegory.

and Scott's Greek Lexicon.) Thus *Gehenna* is the only word of those translated "hell" in the Bible, that has any idea of fire or torment resident in it.

Now in connection with the twelve times *Gehenna* is used, two facts stand out:

1. The "body" as well as the soul is said to be "cast into hell." Twice is the phrase used, "the whole body." (See Matt. 5:29, 30; 10:28.)

2. In not one of the twelve instances does the text tell *when* the wicked will be "cast into hell." The fiery judgment is simply described as a *future* event. This takes the whole point out of the objection before us.

However, these two facts contain evidence that this future event does not follow *immediately* after death. The "whole body" is not cast into the flames at death, and there is no suggestion in the texts that the "soul" is cast in at one time and the "body" at another. The immortal-soul doctrine, by defining "soul" as the real man and the body as but a fleshly prison house, really asks us to believe that the real man goes immediately at death to hell-fire, and then at some distant future date God raises the body, which has turned to dust, and consigns it to the fires. We avoid such an irrational and unscriptural conclusion by understanding the phrase, "soul and body," to mean the whole person, viewed physically and mentally in his entirety, "the whole body." But when are persons cast bodily into the judgment fires? Not now, certainly. That takes place at the last great judgment day, when the wicked dead who have been raised, and who have been judged guilty, are "cast into the lake of fire." (See Rev. 20:11-15.)

Note that the wicked are here said to be "cast into" the fire, as though to describe the act of hurling an object into the flames. Note, further, the interesting fact, which is surely more than a mere coincidence in words, that the very same word "cast" (even in the original Greek) is repeatedly used in the various *Gehenna* texts. In no less than six of these texts we read "Cast into hell [*Gehenna*]." (See also Matt. 25:31, 41, as to the time when the wicked are consigned to the judgment flames.)



From all the foregoing we reach the conclusion that the Bible does not support the idea that the wicked go at death into the flames of hell, but that the day when the impenitent objects of God's wrath are "cast into *Gehenna*" is still in the future.

### OBJECTION XIII

**The Bible says that hell-fire will not be quenched and that "their worm dieth not." (See Mark 9:43-48 and Isa. 66:24.) This proves the immortality of the soul.**

Even if we should agree that *unquenched* means endlessly burning, we would not find it necessary to accept the doctrine that at death an immortal soul is freed from man and lives apart from the body. These texts do not speak of disembodied souls, or spirits, burning. The Bible paints a picture of literal, wicked men at the judgment day being "cast into the lake of fire." (See Revelation 20.) Christ speaks of the "whole body" being "cast into hell." Matt. 5:29, 30. If it be replied that the body would be destroyed by the flames, and therefore only the spirit would be left, we ask for the Bible proof that spirits, or souls, are impervious to fire. Christ declared we should "fear Him which is able to destroy *both* soul and body in hell." Matt. 10:28. If "destroy" means *consume* as regards the "body," we demand very clear proof if we are expected to believe that "destroy" means *leave unconsumed* as regards the "soul." A failure to produce such proof really takes the whole point out of the objection based on Mark 9 and Isaiah 66.

In Mark 9:43-48 Christ quite evidently refers to the same judgment fires as those described in Isaiah 66:24, where we read: "They [the righteous] shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses ["dead bodies," A. R. V.] of the men that have transgressed against Me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." We are told in so many words that the agencies of "worm" and "fire" are working, *not* upon disembodied spirits, but upon bodies, *dead* bodies.

The word "hell" used in Mark 9:43-48 is from the Greek word *Gehenna*. This term, as we learned in the preceding

chapter, is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word *Hinnom*, the name of a valley near Jerusalem, "used as a place to cast carcasses of animals and malefactors, which were consumed by fire constantly kept up." (See Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.)

Christ here uses this Valley of *Hinnom* to teach His hearers the fate that awaits the wicked. Certainly the Jews who heard His words could not possibly have obtained any idea of wicked, disembodied souls endlessly suffering. They saw in *Hinnom* dead bodies being devoured by flames, or if the flames did not reach them, then by worms, those ever-present agents of destruction and disintegration. The fact that the fires of *Gehenna* were ever kept burning, were "not quenched," was the surest proof that whatever was cast into them would be entirely consumed. To declare that if a fire keeps ever burning, then whatever is cast into it keeps ever living, is to go contrary both to the evidence of our senses and to the testimony of Scripture.

The question may now be asked: If whatever is cast into this fire is completely consumed, why will the fire always be kept burning? The answer is, It will not. A city-wide conflagration once enveloped Chicago. If we should describe that fire by saying that the flames could not be quenched, would you conclude that Chicago was still burning? No, you would simply understand that the fire raged until it had devoured everything within reach. Common knowledge makes unnecessary the additional statement that the fire itself then died down.

It is this natural sense of the word "quench" that we find used in the Bible. The Lord through Jeremiah declared to the ancient Jews, "If ye will not hearken unto Me, . . . then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof [of Jerusalem], and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Jer. 17:27. (In the Septuagint the very same Greek word is here used for "quenched" as in Mark 9.) In 2 Chronicles 36:19-21 we read of the literal fulfillment of this prophecy when the Babylonians put the torch to the city. Is that fire still burning? are those Jewish "palaces" ever consuming, but never quite consumed? How preposterous, you say. Then why

should any one wish to take Christ's statement in Mark 9 and force from it the conclusion that the judgment fire will never end; and then build upon this the conclusion that the wicked will ever be consuming, but never quite consumed; and then finally rear upon this the conclusion that therefore the wicked have immortal souls?

Each and every one of these conclusions is unwarranted by logic and contrary to Scripture. The Bible nowhere says that souls are immortal, but declares that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Eze. 18:4. The Bible nowhere says that the wicked will ever be consuming; instead it declares that they will become "ashes." Mal. 4:3. The Bible does not say that the judgment fires will burn endlessly, for we read that these fires are due to God's setting ablaze this wicked earth, and that following this conflagration He creates "a new earth." (See 2 Peter 3:7-13 and Revelation 20 and 21.) There must therefore be an end to the fire, else this earth could not be re-created. In other words, the very promise of God to give us a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, is contingent upon there being an end to the judgment fires.

#### OBJECTION XIV

**The doctrine that a Christian at death goes down into the grave, there to lie unconscious until the resurrection day, is a gloomy belief.**

Even if we granted that the doctrine is gloomy, this would not be any proof that it is false. The question is not whether a doctrine appears gloomy or bright to our way of thinking, but whether it is taught in the Bible. Certainly the objector will agree that the doctrine of never-ending torment for the wicked is even worse than gloomy, yet it does not occur to him that the doctrine is therefore proved false. No, our feelings and fancies are hardly a safe guide in making any final decisions on questions of doctrine.

But we do not grant the charge made in this objection. It is more sentimental than sound. What does a sleeping man know of the passage of time, or of his condition in sleep?

Likewise, what do those who "sleep in the dust of the earth" (Dan. 12:2) know of the passing of millenniums, or of the fact that the earth is their couch? Their return to consciousness, at the voice of Christ, is the signal for them to "come forth." John 5:28, 29. And as the righteous, raised from the dead, look back over the centuries of their "sleep," the whole period will seem but a moment; and as they look forward to an endless eternity, their period of unconsciousness will seem even less than a moment.

We repeat, the charge is more sentimental than sound; and sentiment, when not re-enforced with some ethical consideration, is not a valid objection. But we go farther, and say that the charge is not even sentimentally sound. The minister who becomes eloquent in describing the happiness of Mr. Brown's departed son, finds his tongue cleaving to the roof of his mouth when he attempts to preach the funeral sermon for the late lamented son of Mr. Jones, who died in a drunken debauch. Mr. Brown is always cheered by the thought that his beloved son is enjoying the happiness of heaven, while Mr. Jones is ever haunted with the belief that his equally beloved, though wayward, son is suffering constantly the unspeakable tortures of hell. Yet the state of mind of both fathers is the result of the same doctrine! If the matter is to be decided on sentiment, then we insist that Mr. Jones as well as Mr. Brown be asked to answer the question: Is the doctrine of "soul sleeping" more gloomy than that of the immortality of the soul?

Or view the matter from another standpoint. Let us say that the godly Mr. Jones dies and that the wayward son lives. According to the immortality doctrine, a departed father gone to glory can see what his children are doing, can even hover near them as a spirit. Would heaven be any place of happiness for Mr. Jones as he gazed down upon the course his wastrel son was following? The father's state would be even more distressing in heaven than on earth, for while on earth he could possibly do something by counsel and example to reform his son, but in heaven he could only helplessly watch this child of his heart move steadily on to destruction. And then, when the son finally dies, the father's anguish is only intensified by the

thought that this erring son has been transferred from earth to the endless tortures of hell-fire. All this logically follows from the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

In view of this, we marvel that an objection based on sentiment should ever be raised against the doctrine called "soul sleeping." We freely grant that any thought of death and the grave is tinged with sorrow and gloom, for death and the grave are enemies in God's universe. But is the sadness really lessened for the human family by belief in the immortal-soul doctrine? No, the very opposite. We believe that both the Bible and sentiment agree in favor of the doctrine of unconsciousness in the grave until the resurrection day.



## SANCTUARY AND ATONEMENT OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

**Seventh-day Adventists reject the atonement of Christ. They make of no effect the death of the Saviour, because they believe that His atonement for sin was not completed on Calvary.**

There lies before us, as we write, a tract which presents such charges, and endeavors to support them with certain garbled quotations from the writings of Mrs. E. G. White. Those who raise objections to our doctrines almost invariably endeavor to find some statement from Mrs. White's works that appears to support their charges. They do so because, as they explain, Mrs. White is considered by Seventh-day Adventists as a prophet, and her writings therefore correctly set forth the denomination's beliefs. In view of this we shall quote from Mrs. White's writings to show what we really do believe is the relation of Christ to the sinner.

In the book entitled, "Steps to Christ," Mrs. White wrote: "Christ took upon Himself the guilt of the disobedient, and suffered in the sinner's stead."—*Page 36*. Again: "Christ must be revealed to the sinner as the Saviour dying for the sins of the world."—*Id.*, *p. 30*. These are but representative; many equally strong statements might be quoted.

How well do the foregoing statements agree with the words of John the Baptist as to Christ: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29. And how beautifully do they harmonize with the declaration of Peter, that Christ "bare our sins in His own body on the tree." 1 Peter 2:24.

We believe that the death of Christ provided a divine sacrifice sufficient to atone for the sins of the whole world. And we believe, further, that when we confess our sins, God does then and there forgive them; and that unless we afterward turn away to a life of wickedness, this divine forgiveness is complete and final, so far as we are concerned. But we also hold that, in

harmony with the Levitical type of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16), there is a great final day when God will formally blot out of existence the sins of all who "shall be *accounted* worthy to obtain that [heavenly] world." Luke 20:35. This final accounting must come at the very close of probation, for only when we have run our entire course and the records are complete, could this act—which settles our destiny for eternity—take place. Therefore the great hour of God's judgment is the logical time for all accounts to be finally settled. In making such statements, we but echo the words of Christ, "He that shall endure unto the *end*, the same shall be *saved*." Matt. 24:13.

Denying the atonement of Christ is one thing, and believing that the final disposition of sins is yet future, is an altogether different thing. We do not deny the atonement; we differ simply as to the *time* when the atonement does its *final* work for the believer. We believe unqualifiedly that our sins are forgiven and will be blotted out wholly and only by virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ. No discussion as to the *time* involved in the divine transaction can blur the real question at issue; namely, whether or not Christ and *Christ only* makes atonement for us. We do not believe that our Saviour's precious atoning blood loses any of its efficacy merely as the result of the passage of time. That certain acts of Christ subsequent to Calvary are also necessary in the plan of salvation from sin, is evident by reference to such texts as the following: Romans 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:17; Hebrews 7:25.

Of those who charge us with teaching strange doctrines because we believe that Christ's work of atonement for sin was begun instead of completed on Calvary, we ask these questions: If complete and final atonement was made on the cross for *all* sins, then will not all be saved? for Paul says that He "died for all." Are we to understand you as being Universalists? "No," you say, "not all men will be saved." Well, then, are we to understand that you hold that Christ made complete atonement on the cross for only a limited few, and that His sacrifice was not world-embracing, but only partial? That would be predestination in its worst form.

We are free from the dilemma that such questions as these create. We believe that Christ on the cross *made provision* for the atonement for all sinners. Thus all who *will* may be saved. But we believe also that only those who "endure unto the end . . . shall be saved." Thus we escape, on the one hand, the false doctrine of Universalism; and on the other, the equally false doctrine of claiming full and final salvation for a man before he has endured "unto the end." Therefore if the saving of a man involves his deeds "unto the end," which must be true of the last man saved in the world, as well as of those of former generations, the final phase of Christ's saving work of atonement cannot be completed until the end.

## OBJECTION II

**Seventh-day Adventists make Satan their savior, sin bearer, and vicarious substitute.**

We believe, with all evangelical Protestants, that there is no other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved than the name of Jesus Christ. We qualify this in no way. Not until the plan of salvation is *completed* and the righteous have been saved for eternity through the atoning work of Christ, does Satan enter into the picture. Our belief as to the relationship of Satan to our sins might perhaps be stated more or less exactly with the aid of an illustration:

A group of men have been arrested, tried, and convicted of certain crimes. A heavy fine is imposed upon them. They are in a hopeless state, for they are penniless. But their hopelessness is changed to joy: a rich philanthropist offers to pay their fine. They accept, and are freed. The case is apparently settled. But no; the court, continuing its investigations, discovers that a person of fiendish cunning has really dominated these poor men, and has seduced them into their course of wrong doing. He is captured, and judgment is meted out to him. He is made to pay a heavy fine—much heavier even than that from which the poor men have been freed by the gracious act of the philanthropist; for the court reasons that the fiend is doubly guilty.

We all consider that the court has acted rightly. No one would think for a moment that because the group of men have been freed, therefore the matter is necessarily closed. And because the fiend has to pay the penalty for the crimes of the group of men whose heavy fines have been paid by the philanthropist, no one feels that any reflection is being cast upon the gift of the rich man. The penalty that was to have been meted out to that group was completely paid by the gift, yet the fiend must finally suffer for the same crimes, because he was primarily responsible for them.

This, in vague outline, and with the handicaps of analogy, illustrates our view as to the relation of Satan to our sins. We are guilty before God. We are penniless and in a hopeless state, but Christ paid the price necessary to set us free—not with silver or gold, but with the price of His own precious blood. He is the philanthropist—the lover of man—in our illustration. The penalty for our sins is fully paid, for His gift is all-sufficient. He makes full and complete atonement for us.

But the court of heaven determines that Satan, the archfiend, has been the real instigator of all sin, from the very day when he seduced our first mother, Eve. He is brought before the bar of justice, and indicted, not simply for his own sins, but for the primary responsibility for the sins of those who have been pardoned. It is as though our Advocate, having obtained our pardon, turns prosecuting attorney against our fiendish adversary, causing to return upon his own head the mischief and woe into which the now pardoned and saved sinners had been drawn during their lives.

Thus instead of viewing Satan in any sense as our savior from sin, our doctrine makes most vivid the fact that he is the *author* of sin. Instead of viewing him as one who was made "to be sin for us, who knew no sin," we view him as one who, being the primary instigator of all sin, is about to suffer the final judgments of God. To all Christian peoples we say: If this be heresy, make the most of it. (See page 229 for a discussion of the scapegoat.)

## GENERAL OBJECTIONS

### OBJECTION I

**Seventh-day Adventists, in their opposition to Sunday laws, show themselves to be in league with the disreputable elements of the country.**

It does not follow that because two individuals or organizations oppose a measure, they are actuated by the same motive. Indeed, they often have nothing in common. One man opposes unrestricted immigration because he conscientiously feels that only by restriction can the great mass of undesirables be kept out of the country. Another opposes the same measure for the selfish reason that he does not want to see any competition in the field of labor for fear he will not be able to demand his own price for his work. How altogether different are the motives prompting these two men! Yet both are on the same side—the opposition—as to the measure.

Again: Some men favor unrestricted immigration, and for the reason that they wish the downtrodden of Europe to have a chance in this country; while others—certain unscrupulous employers—support such a measure because they feel that it will result in cheap labor for their factories. Philanthropist and profiteer on the same side. Strange? No; a most common occurrence. Do we accuse one of being in league with the other? No—that is, not if we have regard to the truthfulness of our statements and the correctness of our logic.

Thus it is with us and Sunday legislation. We oppose it because it is a violation of the principles of religious liberty. The disreputable elements oppose Sunday laws because such laws take away from them their most lucrative day for business. There is nothing in common between us. In drawing this sharp contrast between ourselves and the disreputable elements, we do not wish to convey the thought that all other opponents of Sunday laws besides ourselves belong to the disreputable group. There are many citizens who for a variety of very proper reasons may oppose Sunday laws.



The stand taken by Seventh-day Adventists is that any business or institution that is sufficiently questionable to justify closing it on one day, should be closed every day in the week. Thus we are seven times more opposed to these evil elements than the most ardent Sunday law advocate with his one-day-a-week closing measure. Take, for example, our militant fight for prohibition through many years. When most church people seemed willing to compromise by seeking only a Sunday closing of saloons, we worked to have them shut up seven days in the week, 365 days in the year.

## OBJECTION II

**Seventh-day Adventists teach that only they will be saved, and that all Sunday keepers have the mark of the beast.**

We hold neither of these positions. In the writings of Mrs. E. G. White, whom our opponents so frequently declare is our chief exponent of doctrine, are found these words: "Among the heathen are those who worship God ignorantly, those to whom the light is never brought by human instrumentality, yet they will not perish. Though ignorant of the written law of God, they have heard His voice speaking to them in nature, and have done the things that the law required. Their works are evidence that the Holy Spirit has touched their hearts, and they are recognized as the children of God."—*"The Desire of Ages,"* p. 638.

Could any utterance be more liberal? We doubt whether the objector would subscribe to such a pronouncement. He would hold that it was *too* liberal. But surely we cannot be at once too narrow and too broad in our teaching on this vital question. We cannot be expected to plead guilty to both charges. No. We plead innocent of both, and offer the following as being the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists on the relation of the Sabbath and Sunday to salvation:

We agree unreservedly with the inspired statement: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 16:31. Yet no Christian would hold that in the Scriptures "saved" means no more than being relieved from the punishment for

sin. That is, of course, all-important; but he who would be saved from the wages of sin must first of all be saved from the practice of sin, as promised, "He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21); and again in Romans 8:1-4 it is declared, as summed up in verse 4, that Christ gave His life for man, "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Conversion is more than a philosophical change of the mind; it is, as declared in John 3:5-8, a new birth. The first assent of the mind, that recognition of the need of divine help, which prepares the way for conversion, must be followed by whole-hearted yielding to the will of God under the transforming power of the Holy Spirit; this is the new birth declared by Christ to be absolutely essential to salvation.

And this must be followed by growth in grace and in "the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 3:18. When we first believe, we are as babes; but as we feed upon God's word, we grow. As we see more clearly the righteous requirements of the Bible and accept them, we become stronger and stronger Christians. This growth is to continue. "He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. 1:6. So long as a Christian continues to grow, that is, to walk in harmony with the fuller light that the Bible continues to shed on his path, he is on the road that leads to life everlasting in the kingdom of God.

Thus with the question of the Sabbath. A great many otherwise earnest Christians have never had revealed to them the sinfulness of violating the fourth command of that moral law which says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and are therefore—mark this well—counted as right in the sight of God and as worthy of a home in heaven. But the Christian who has seen from a careful study of the Scriptures that the fourth commandment calls for the giving up of Sabbath violation, must either accept the Sabbath or else come under the condemnation of God. And is a condemned man a saved man?

We believe that God in His infinite wisdom has seen fit to make the Sabbath the great test of loyalty to Him in these last

days, and that before earthly probation closes men will have had brought to them a knowledge of this truth, and will have to make decisions for eternity. *Then* those who reject the added light automatically cut themselves off from God, and receive the mark of apostasy, the mark of the beast. To such, the words of Christ surely apply: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak for their sin." John 15:22. That is our teaching regarding the relation of Sabbath and Sunday keeping to salvation.

### OBJECTION III

#### **Seventh-day Adventists are calamity howlers.**

This charge is only a half truth, since an examination of our books and magazines will reveal the fact that almost all of the so-called calamity-howling paragraphs are in quotation marks. And those quotation marks are significant because they inclose the words of some well-known authority in the political, social, religious, educational, or economic world.

You may pick up a representative issue of our papers, and read an article portraying the awful increase of crime among the youth of the nation. But you will find that the most doleful portions of it are merely excerpts from authentic and indisputable official records or from the published statements of some judge or leading educator who is an authority on the subject. You may read an article in our journals telling of the dark future before the world, but a close examination discloses that the picture is painted dark, not by our writer, but by the renowned world statesmen whom he quotes. Again, you may perhaps glance through one of our editorials, which brings forward the charge that material advancement is no criterion of moral progress, and that the marvelous scientific inventions of our age are but means to our destruction. But upon rereading, you observe that authoritative quotations form the background of the editorial.

Not to "howl" about calamities, but to give the Bible explanation of them, is our work. When statesmen, presidents, and prime ministers are declaring that there is something wrong

with the world and that the future is dark with a nameless dread, it behooves every clear-thinking man to inquire, What do these things mean? To arouse men everywhere to a realization of the seriousness of the times in which we live, and then to give them the solution of the perplexing question, is our task. We endeavor to arouse by quoting from those who are authorities on world conditions; and then we strive, as a people with a message for this time, to prepare men for the climax that is ahead by turning the Bible searchlight on the problem.

#### OBJECTION IV

##### **Seventh-day Adventists are proselyters.**

To this charge we plead "guilty," for the dictionary says that to proselyte is "to win over to a different opinion, belief, sect, or party," and that is our work. Christ Himself gave us that work in His command, "Go ye therefore, *and make disciples of all the nations*, baptizing them," etc. Matt. 28:19, A. R. V. This proselyting was the work of Peter, James, and John, and the mighty evangelist Paul, and we but follow in their steps, continuing the work that they began. To the nominal believers in God the apostles preached that the Messiah of the Old Testament had come. They called upon the heathen to turn "from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus." 1 Thess. 1:9, 10. They went to the uttermost parts of the earth in their work of winning men over to a different belief,—their God-given task of proselyting.

So with us. To the nominal believer we preach that the Christ of the Old and the New Testament, the Christ who came once to die for our sins, will soon return to this earth. We call upon the heathen to turn from their idols to the true God, and to prepare for the soon coming of His Son from heaven.

Everywhere we find men and women holding unscriptural beliefs regarding the great events that are just ahead, and failing to worship the Creator of the heavens and the earth, as He has commanded, on the Sabbath. (See Ex. 20:8-11; Rev. 14:6, 7.) If we remain true to God, we must use every means

possible to turn men from these wrong beliefs—to proselyte them. We are recreant in our duty to Heaven if we do otherwise. Where would the world be today if Luther and Calvin and others of the Reformers had not gone about preaching to men to turn from their former views on religion—proselyting them? Our task is to complete the work of these Reformers, and we are happy to follow their example and adopt their methods.

We would ask the objector two questions: If it be wrong to proselyte among Christian people on the ground that they have all the truth they need, no matter in what church they are, why then do you hold to the empty though expensive form of separate denominations? But if you object to merging your sect with others into one grand organization because you feel that you have some vital doctrines that others do not have, why do you not endeavor to persuade the Christian people in other churches to accept those doctrines—why do you not proselyte?

#### OBJECTION V

**Seventh-day Adventists hold fanatical views on health reform and vegetarianism, and by such teachings restrict the liberty that belongs to Christians.**

Half a century ago, when this charge was first made, it seemed to have some strength, and we were compelled to answer it alone. But today, after fifty years of research in medical lines, the scientist meets this accusation for us, and changes the word “fanatical” to “sane” and “scientific” as regards our views on liquor, tobacco, tea, coffee, pork, and flesh foods in general. We hold that these things, most of which are incorrectly called “food,” are to a greater or less degree harmful to the body. And for this claim, as we have just stated, there is now abundant medical support. Therefore we believe that they have no proper place in our diet. Paul exclaims: “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body.” 1 Cor. 6:19, 20.



How a Christian can partake of a food or a drink that is in any way injurious, and still obey the solemn command to "glorify God in your *body*," we do not know. It is impossible! And when it is added that "if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy," we are forced to conclude that a man who knowingly partakes of such food does so at the peril of his soul. 1 Cor. 3:17.

Further: We are to co-operate with God in our habits and customs for the development of perfect Christian characters. It is a known fact that right habits of eating and drinking have much to do with a good disposition, as well as with a sound constitution. Certainly the reverse holds good, for it has been well remarked that "eating pork makes dirty blood, dirty skin, and dirty natures." Any one of a number of other words might be substituted in the place of "pork" without necessitating a change in the rest of the quotation.

The apostle Peter clearly shows that there is a direct relation between food and holiness. When he writes, "Be ye holy in all manner of conversation ["living," A. R. V.]," he refers to the Old Testament passage containing God's condemnation of unclean foods. (See 1 Peter 1:15, 16; cf. Lev. 11:44-47.)

But it will be urged: Does not the Bible allow us to partake of certain meats termed "clean"? Yes, permission is given. But let us ask, What would you think of a man who, because it pleased his palate, made a part of his diet some herb that science has proved is injurious to the body, and who defended his suicidal course by stating that the Bible said that he might eat of any herb? (See Gen. 1:29.) You would think the man insane, and probably would answer him that this statement in Genesis must be considered in the light of the continual degeneracy taking place as the result of the curse resting upon the world. Thus with the eating of what was once termed in the Scripture "clean" meat. It is susceptible of the clearest proof that upon animals, as well as upon men, there have come more and more diseases, until today meat as a whole is *far* from being the best food for the human stomach.

However, recognizing the fact that every man must be guided by his own conscience in all matters not explicitly set

forth in the Scriptures, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination does not make the eating of the so-called "clean" meats a test of fellowship, but urges its members to study carefully the whole question of their diet in the light of scientific and medical findings, so that they will not in any particular "defile the temple of God."

While remembering the Biblical pronouncement that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink," we do not fail to keep in mind the inspired command: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Rom. 14:17; 1 Cor. 10:31.

Endeavoring to obey this and other like admonitions which have been quoted in this chapter, has led the members of this denomination, contrary to the desires of carnal appetite, to become abstemious in all matters of diet, especially as to meat eating. We hold that such a course enables us more easily to obey the injunction, "Abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul," and to follow the practice of Paul, who declared, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." 1 Peter 2:11; 1 Cor. 9:27.

Of those who think that by our placing upon ourselves such restrictions in regard to various articles of food, we curtail the liberty belonging to Christians in this age, we ask this question: In view of the fact that there will be no meat in the menu of heaven, or of the earth made new, for there will be no death there, would you say that you now have more Christian liberty than you will possess in that heavenly land you hope some day to reach?

#### OBJECTION VI

**Seventh-day Adventism is a new "ism," and holds new and unscriptural doctrines.**

This charge is a half truth; true as regards the length of time this denomination as such has existed, false as regards the nature of the doctrines it holds.

As to the newness of our denomination, we would state simply that if age is the criterion of relative religious worth, then the Catholic Church is on a much higher plane than all the Protes-

tant churches, and Buddhism still higher than Catholicism. But what fallacious reasoning! As to our teaching new and unbiblical doctrines, we would say:

One of the chief characteristics of our doctrines is their antiquity; and for all of them we have a "Thus saith the Lord," as the copious Scriptural references in all our books and papers attest.

Take, for example, our teaching concerning the Sabbath. This doctrine was given at creation (Gen. 2:2, 3) and incorporated in the earliest Scriptural code of laws, the decalogue, fifteen hundred years before Christ. (See Ex. 20:2-17.) In this connection it might be added that almost in the same breath most of our opponents charge us with teaching *new* doctrines and with holding to an "*old Jewish Sabbath*." How a dogma can be at once both new and old they do not explain.

In teaching the doctrine of the second coming of Christ, that "the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon all," we but repeat the words of Enoch, "the seventh from Adam." Jude 14, 15. The antiquity of that doctrine, therefore, is not open to question.

Our belief that a meatless diet is the ideal, can hardly be termed new. Adam and Eve were given a vegetarian dietary, and by the Lord Himself. (See Gen. 1:29.)

From primitive times God's people have had the blessing of prophets, and have believed in the principle of prophetic guidance. (See Gen. 20:7; Ex. 15:20.) We believe that the gift of prophecy still belongs to the church. Certainly there is nothing new about this doctrine.

We believe that Christians should pay tithe. But we refer to such men as Abraham and other most ancient worthies for our precedent. (See Gen. 14:20.)

Our doctrines of a personal devil, who is responsible for sin, of a creation by the fiat of Almighty God, of a literal second advent, and of a punishment by fire of all sinners, are in harmony with the teachings of Bible writers thousands of years ago, and—mark this too!—they are in harmony with the teachings of the founders of most of the Protestant churches, as their creeds and confessions will testify. The evolutionary doctrine,

which banishes creation and finds no room for the advent; the view that sin is only imaginary, and that somehow all will finally be saved, *these* are new teachings. Yet they are given out from many Protestant pulpits today. Not Seventh-day Adventists, but popular preachers are the promulgators of new and unscriptural doctrines.

The reason for our existence as a denomination is not to give out new doctrines, but to restate the old and proved ones, and to "contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Jude 3. In doing so we realize that we must often teach contrary to the popular view. But if the extent of one's departure from accepted teaching is the measure of one's heresy, then the early apostles were the greatest heretics who ever lived. Indeed, they were accused by the nominal people of God of turning the "world upside down." (See Acts 17:5, 6.)

In giving to men the everlasting gospel and the messages of warning for this time, every Seventh-day Adventist is willing to face the charge of heresy, saying with the mighty evangelist Paul: "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.*" Acts 24:14.

## OBJECTION VII

**Seventh-day Adventists have a prophet like many other of the modern "isms," and they make of her writings a second Bible.**

The very way in which this charge is framed would lead the ordinary reader to the conclusion that because certain modern cults have as one of their characteristics the presence of prophets whose messages certainly do not come from God, therefore any denomination possessing a prophet must be in the same class with these "isms." They would have us infer that the term "prophet" should always be coupled with "false." But is this necessarily true? Because there are false prophets, does it therefore follow that all prophets are false? Because there is counterfeit money, does it therefore follow that all money is counterfeit? Certainly not. Where there is counterfeit, there is also genuine; where there is false, there is also true.

In an age when such a distorted idea possesses the minds of almost all regarding the relation of prophecy to God's plan of salvation, it is necessary that the history of the doctrine be gone over briefly in order for us to obtain a correct conception of the issue at hand. Unenlightened on it, we shall surely fall into one of two grievous difficulties: either we shall take up with anything that possesses uncanny powers, or else we shall turn down everything that claims supernatural origin. To do the first is to become hopelessly lost; to do the second is to go contrary to the divine command, "Despise *not* prophesyings." 1 Thess. 5:20. Instead, we should pursue the middle course, and "try the spirits whether they are of God." 1 John 4:1.

All through the history of God's dealing with His people there have been prophets and prophetesses. From the days of Moses and Miriam, through the times of Deborah, Huldah, and Anna, a prophetess "of a great age" in the time of Christ, even to the last years of the apostolic period when the four daughters of Philip the evangelist "did prophesy," God has seen fit to give His instruction to the church through the agency of men and women upon whom He has placed the Spirit of prophecy. (See Ex. 15:20; Judges 4:4; 2 Kings 22:14; Luke 2:36; Acts 21:8, 9.) Finally, the Bible tells us explicitly that the church in the closing days of its earthly history will possess this gift. (See Rev. 12:17; cf. Rev. 19:10.)

So necessary did Solomon regard the gift of prophecy that he wrote, "Where there is no vision, the people *perish*." Prov. 29:18. And there is no reason to believe that in these last days, when every kind of deception and heresy is abroad, when the very elect are in danger of being ensnared (see Matt. 24:24), the statement of Solomon should be any less applicable than in his day.

Further, it is clear that God has given instruction to His church through prophets without adding to the permanent body of Sacred Writings. Have we not many cases in the Scriptures where prophets gave messages, both written and verbal, which most certainly were inspired, but which form no part of the Bible? Assuredly. (See 2 Chron. 9:29; Acts 21:8, 9.)



With this foundation laid, we are prepared to draw the Scriptural conclusion that the presence of a prophet in the church need not necessarily be a sign that that denomination is false. On the contrary, it may be the best evidence possible that God is especially directing that movement. We may also conclude that one may be a true prophet of God, giving out inspired utterances without stating that which should be considered in any sense an addition to the great standard of truth, the Bible.

It is not within the scope of this short statement to prove that the writings of Mrs. E. G. White, whom we regard as having possessed the gift of prophecy, are of God, nor is it our intention in any way to defend them. They need no defense. The writings themselves furnish the best proof of their divine origin. However, we do not therefore hold that these writings, though inspired, should be considered as a second Bible or an addition to it. In this we are consistent with our foregoing conclusions. "The written testimonies," it is explained in Mrs. White's published works, "*are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed. Man's duty to God and to his fellow man has been distinctly specified in God's word; yet but few of you are obedient to the light given. Additional truth is not brought out; but God has through the Testimonies simplified the great truths already given.*"—"Testimonies for the Church," Vol. II, p. 605.

In closing, we desire to ask the objector two questions: If you hold that true prophets do not belong to this age, are you prepared to maintain the logical inference that God has acted partially, and has been more gracious to men in past ages than to us who live in this most perilous time of the church? But seeing that the scriptures cited in this chapter clearly show that the gift of prophecy belongs to, and will be found in, the true church in these days, how do you explain its absence from the church of which you are a member?

## Part II



## PROTESTANTISM AND THE LAW OF GOD

FROM Reformation times down to the definite organization of the main Protestant bodies, the confessions of faith and creeds of Protestantism have generally contained some statement concerning the law of God. An examination of these statements reveals that Protestantism in general believes three important facts concerning the law:

1. That the decalogue is God's moral standard for Christians.

2. That a clear distinction is made between the decalogue and the ceremonial and other laws of ancient Israel.

3. That obedience to the decalogue is not to be construed as being contrary in any way to grace—that law and gospel belong together in the Christian life.

For some readers, two words in the following quotations may require a little explanation. The word "catholic," written thus with a small "c" and coupled with the word "church" in the Protestant creeds means the whole body of Christian believers. The word "symbol" is used as a synonym for "creed" or "confession."

The text of these creedal statements is that given in the authoritative source work by Philip Schaff, "The Creeds of Christendom," in three volumes, fourth edition, revised and enlarged, published by Harper & Brothers. All references to Schaff in connection with the following quotations are from this work.

### The Waldensian Catechism

[*"The Waldensian Catechism . . . must have been written before 1500. . . . It consists of fifty-seven questions, . . . and as many answers. . . . It embodies the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments. . . . Under the head of Faith we have a practical exposition of the Apostles' Creed and the ten commandments, showing their subjective bearing on a living faith."*—Schaff, Vol. I, pp. 572, 573.]

*"9. What is living faith?*

*"It is faith active in love (as the apostle testifies, Gal. 5:6), that is, by keeping God's commandments. Living faith is to*

believe in God, that is, to love Him and to keep His commandments."

**The Confession of the Waldenses, 1655 A. D.**

["This confession belongs to the Calvinistic family. . . . It is still in force, or at least highly prized among the Waldenses in Italy. The occasion which called it forth entitles it to special consideration. It was prepared and issued in 1655, together with an appeal to Protestant nations, in consequence of one of the most cruel persecutions which Roman bigotry could inspire."—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 757.*]

"We believe, . . .

"XXXIII. Finally, that we ought to receive the symbol of the apostles, the Lord's prayer, and the decalogue as fundamentals of our faith and our devotion."

**Luther's Small Catechism, 1529 A. D.**

[Speaking of this catechism in connection with the Heidelberg and the Shorter Westminster Catechisms, Schaff says: "These are the three most popular and useful catechisms that Protestantism has produced."—*Vol. I, p. 543.* Part I is entitled "The Ten Commandments," consisting chiefly of a series of questions on each of the ten commandments in order. Then follow immediately the two questions and answers given below.]

"What does God say about all these commandments?

"He says this:

"I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My commandments."

"What does this mean?

"Answer:

"God threatens to punish all who transgress these commandments: we should, therefore, fear His anger, and do nothing against such commandments. But He promises grace and every blessing to all who keep them: we should, therefore, love and trust in Him, and gladly obey His commandments."

**The Heidelberg Catechism, 1563 A. D.**

["The Heidelberg Catechism was translated into all the European and many Asiatic languages. . . . It is stated that, next to the Bible, the 'Imitation of Christ,' by Thomas à Kempis, and Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress,' no book has been more frequently translated, more widely circulated or used." "As a standard of public doctrine the Heidelberg Catechism is the most catholic and popular of all the Reformed sym-



bolts."—*Schaff, Vol. I, pp. 536, 540.* Schaff adds that this "was the first catechism planted on American soil," and that it is "the honored symbol of the Dutch and German Reformed Churches in America."—*Id., p. 549.*]

"*Question 92.*—What is the law of God?

"*Answer.*—[The answer consists of a verbatim quotation of the ten commandments as given in Exodus 20:1-17.]

"*Ques. 93.*—How are these commandments divided?

"*Ans.*—Into two tables, the first of which teaches us, in four commandments, what duties we owe to God; the second, in six, what duties we owe to our neighbor."

[The next twenty questions, 94 to 113, deal with the significance of each of the ten commandments.]

"*Ques. 114.*—Can those who are converted to God keep these commandments perfectly?

"*Ans.*—No; but even the holiest men, while in this life, have only a small beginning of this obedience, yet so that with earnest purpose they begin to live, not only according to some, but according to all the commandments of God.

"*Ques. 115.*—Why, then, doth God so strictly enjoin upon us the ten commandments, since in this life no one can keep them?

"*Ans.*—First, that all our life long we may learn more and more to know our sinful nature, and so the more earnestly seek forgiveness of sins and righteousness in Christ; secondly, that we may continually strive and beg from God the grace of the Holy Ghost, so as to become more and more changed into the image of God, till we attain finally to full perfection after this life."

#### **The Form (or Formula) of Concord, 1577 A. D.**

["The last of the Lutheran Confessions." "The Formula of Concord is, next to the Augsburg Confession, the most important theological standard of the Lutheran Church, but differs from it as the *sectarian* symbol of Lutheranism, while the other is its *catholic* symbol."—*Schaff, Vol. I, pp. 258, 338.* The object of this Formula was to bring harmony into Lutheranism after some thirty years of theological disputation. Among the many questions raised by various theologians was that of the proper relation of the law to the gospel. Schaff well observes in this connection: "Protestantism in its joyful enthusiasm for the freedom and all-sufficiency of the gospel, was strongly tempted to antinomianism [no-law-ism], but restrained by its moral force and the holy character of the gospel itself."—*Id., p. 277.* The following quotation from the Formula of Concord shows how clearly and how vigorously the no-law doctrine was repudiated:]

## ART. VI.—OF THE THIRD USE OF THE LAW

## “STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

“Since it is established that the law of God was given to men for three causes; first, that a certain external discipline might be preserved, and wild and intractable men might be restrained, as it were, by certain barriers; secondly, that by the law men might be brought to an acknowledgment of their sins; thirdly, that regenerate men, to all of whom, nevertheless, much of the flesh still cleaves, for that very reason may have some certain rule after which they may and ought to shape their life, etc., a controversy has arisen among some few theologians concerning the third use of the law, to wit: whether the law is to be inculcated upon the regenerate also, and its observation urged upon them or not? Some have judged that the law should be urged, others have denied it.

## “AFFIRMATIVE

*“The sound and godly doctrine concerning this controversy.*

“1. We believe, teach, and confess that although they who truly believe in Christ, and are sincerely converted to God, are through Christ set free from the curse and constraint of the law, they are not, nevertheless, on that account without law, inasmuch as the Son of God redeemed them for the very reason that they might meditate on the law of God day and night, and continually exercise themselves in the keeping thereof (Ps. 1:2; 119:1 sqq.). For not even our first parents, even before the fall, lived wholly without law, which was certainly at that time graven on their hearts, because the Lord had created them after His own image (Gen. 1:26 sq.; 2:16 sqq.; 3:3).

“2. We believe, teach, and confess that the preaching of the law should be urged not only upon those who have not faith in Christ, and do not yet repent, but also upon those who truly believe in Christ, are truly converted to God, and regenerated and are justified by faith. . . . [Sections 3 to 6 amplify the foregoing statement.]

## “NEGATIVE

*“Rejection of false doctrine.*

“We repudiate, therefore, as a false and pernicious dogma, contrary to Christian discipline and true piety, the teaching that

the law of God (in such wise as is described above) is not to be set forth before the godly and true believers, but only before the ungodly, unbelievers, and impenitent, and to be urged upon these alone."

**The Scotch Confession of Faith, 1560 A. D.**

["Subscription [to this Confession] was required from all ministers [in Scotland] first in 1572. From that time till the Revolution of 1688 this native Confession was the only legally recognized doctrinal standard of both the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches in Scotland." "Edward Irving . . . bestowed this encomium upon it: 'This document is the pillar of the Reformation Church of Scotland.'"—*Schaff, Vol. I, pp. 682, 684.* The old spelling is given, but with possibly a few exceptions, the meaning can easily be understood.]

**"ART. XV.—OF THE PERFECTIOUN OF THE LAW, AND THE  
IMPERFECTIOUN OF MAN**

"The Law of God we confesse and acknowlege maist just, maist equall, maist halie, and maist perfite, commaunding thir thingis, quhilk being wrocht in perfectioun, were abill to give life, and abill to bring man to eternall felicitie. Bot our nature is sa corrupt, sa weake, and sa unperfite, that we ar never abill to fulfill the warkes of the Law in perfectioun. Zea, gif we say we have na sinne, evin after we ar regenerate, we deceive our selves, and the veritie of God is not in us. And therefore, it behovis us to apprehend Christ Jesus with His justice and satisfaction, quha is the end and accomplishment of the Law, be quhome we ar set at this liberty, that the curse and malediction of God fall not upon us, albeit we fulfill not the same in al pointes. For God the Father beholding us, in the body of His Sonne Christ Jesus, acceptis our imperfite obedience, as it were perfite, and covers our warks, quhilk ar defyled with mony spots, with the justice of His Sonne. We do not meane that we ar so set at liberty, that we awe na obedience to the Law (for that before wee have plainly confessed), bot this we affirme, that na man in eird (Christ Jesus onlie except) hes given, gives, or sall give in worke, that obedience to the Law, quhilk the Law requiris. Bot when we have done all thingis, we must falle down and unfeinedly confess, that we are unprofitable servands. And therefore, quhosoever boastis themselves of the merits of their awin works, or put their trust in the works of supererogation, boast themselves in that quhilk is nocht, and put their trust in damnable idolatry."

**The Second Helvetic Confession, 1566 A. D.**

[This confession was written by Henry Bullinger, of Zurich, Switzerland, Zwingli's successor. "Bullinger . . . preserved and completed the work of his predecessor [Zwingli], and exerted, by his example and writings, a commanding influence throughout the Reformed Church inferior only to that of Calvin." "The Helvetic Confession is the most widely adopted, and hence the most authoritative of all the Continental Reformed symbols, with the exception of the Heidelberg Catechism. . . . Upon the whole, the Second Helvetic Confession, as to theological merit, occupies the first rank among the Reformed confessions."—*Schaff, Vol. I, pp. 391, 394, 395*. This confession is accompanied by a number of explanatory footnotes, as is the case with various of the creeds and symbols. In quoting from this confession we have placed these footnotes in brackets in the text.]

**"CHAPTER XII.—OF THE LAW OF GOD**

"We teach that the will of God is set down unto us in the law of God; to wit, what He would have us to do, or not to do, what is good and just, or what is evil and unjust. We therefore confess that 'the law is good and holy' (Rom. 7:12); and that this law is, by the finger of God, either 'written in the hearts of men' (Rom. 2:15), and so is called the law of nature, or engraven in the two tables of stone, and more largely expounded in the books of Moses (Ex. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:22). For plainness' sake we divide it into the moral law, which is contained in the commandments, or the two tables expounded in the books of Moses; into the ceremonial, which does appoint ceremonies and the worship of God; and into the judicial law, which is occupied about political and domestic affairs.

"We believe that the whole will of God, and all necessary precepts, for every part of this life, are fully delivered in this law. . . .

"We teach that this law was not given to men, that we should be justified by keeping it; but that, by the knowledge thereof, we might rather acknowledge our infirmity, sin, and condemnation; and so, despairing of our strength, might turn unto Christ by faith. . . .

"The law of God [to wit, the moral law, comprehended in the ten commandments], therefore, is thus far abrogated; that is, it does not henceforth condemn us, neither work wrath in us; 'for we are under grace, and not under the law' (Rom. 6:14). Moreover, Christ did fulfill all the figures of the law; wherefore the shadow ceased when the body came, so that, in



Christ, we have now all truth and fullness. Yet we do not therefore disdain or reject the law. We remember the words of the Lord, saying, 'I came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them' (Matt. 5:17). We know that in the law [to wit, in the moral law] are described unto us the kinds of virtues and vices. We know that the Scripture of the law [to wit, the ceremonial law], if it be expounded by the gospel, is very profitable to the church, and that therefore the reading of it is not to be banished out of the church. For although the countenance of Moses was covered with a veil, yet the apostle affirms that 'the veil is taken away and abolished by Christ' (2 Cor. 3:14). We condemn all things which the old or new heretics have taught against the law of God."

**The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of  
England, 1571 A. D.**

[The official statement of doctrine of the Church of England.]

**"ARTICLE VII.—OF THE OLD TESTAMENT**

"The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

**American Revision of the Thirty-nine Articles by the Protestant  
Episcopal Church, 1801 A. D.**

**"ARTICLE VII.—OF THE OLD TESTAMENT**

"The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be



received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

**The Anglican Catechism, 1549 and 1662 A. D.**

*(Church of England, and Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America)*

["The Catechism of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, is found in all editions of 'The Book of Common Prayer,' between the baptismal service and the order of confirmation."—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 517.* The American edition contains a few minor changes. Such changes as occur in the section quoted below are indicated in parentheses.]

"*Question.*—You said that your godfathers and godmothers (sponsors) did promise for you that you should keep God's commandments. Tell me how many there be.

"*Answer.*—Ten.

"*Ques.*—Which be (are) they?

"*Ans.*—The same which God spake in the twentieth chapter of Exodus [then follows the recital of the decalogue].

"*Ques.*—What dost thou chiefly learn by these commandments.

"*Ans.*—I learn two things: my duty towards God, and my duty towards my neighbor. [Then follow two questions, one concerning the duty to God, and the other, the duty to our neighbor.]

"*Catechist.*—My good child, know this, that thou art not able to do these things of thyself, nor to walk in the commandments of God, and to serve Him, without His special grace; which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer."

**The Irish Articles of Religion, 1615 A. D.**

["Probably composed by the learned Archbishop James Ussher." "Adopted by the . . . Irish Episcopal Church." "Practically superseded by the Thirty-nine Articles." "Important as the connecting link between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession, and as the chief source of the latter."—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 526.*]

"84. Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites be abolished, and the civil precepts thereof be not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is freed from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

**The Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647 A. D.**

[Of the Westminster Assembly that drew up this confession, Schaff declares: "Whether we look at the extent or ability of its labors, or its influence upon future generations, it stands first among Protestant councils."—*Vol. I, p. 728*. The Westminster Assembly carried on its work during that period in English history when the Puritans, who desired to reform more fully the English church from any trace of Roman Catholicism, were in the ascendancy. With minor variations, the Westminster Confession is considered authoritative by Presbyterian bodies everywhere.

Particular attention is called to the texts of Scripture given as proofs of the statements in the confession. Those texts most frequently used by the No-Law advocates, are here used in such connections by the framers of this confession as to show the difference between moral and ceremonial laws, and the perpetuity of the former, etc.]

**"CHAPTER XIX.—OF THE LAW OF GOD**

"I. God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which He bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience; promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it; and endued him with power and ability to keep it.<sup>1</sup>

"II. This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness; and, as such, was delivered by God upon Mt. Sinai in ten commandments, and written in two tables;<sup>2</sup> the first four commandments containing our duty toward God, and the other six our duty to man.<sup>3</sup>

"III. Beside this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, His graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits;<sup>4</sup> and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties.<sup>5</sup> All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.<sup>6</sup>

"IV. To them also, as a body politic, He gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people,

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 1:26, 27, with Gen. 2:17; Rom. 2:14, 15; 10:5; 5:12, 19; Gal. 3:10, 12; Eccl. 7:29; Job 28:28.

<sup>2</sup> James 1:25; 2:8, 10-12; Rom. 13:8, 9; Deut. 5:32; 10:4; Ex. 34:1 [Am. ed. Rom. 3:19].

<sup>3</sup> Matt. 22:37-40 [Am. ed. Ex. 20:3-18].

<sup>4</sup> Heb. 9; 10:1; Gal. 4:1-3; Col. 2:17.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Cor. 6:17; Jude 23.

<sup>6</sup> Col. 2:14, 16, 17; Dan. 9:27; Eph. 2:15, 16.

not obliging any other, now, further than the general equity thereof may require.<sup>7</sup>

"V. The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof;<sup>8</sup> and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it.<sup>9</sup> Neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation.<sup>10</sup>

"VI. Although true believers be not under the law as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified or condemned;<sup>11</sup> yet is it of great use to them, as well as to others; in that, as a rule of life, informing them of the will of God and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly;<sup>12</sup> discovering also the sinful pollutions of their nature, hearts, and lives;<sup>13</sup> so as, examining themselves thereby, they may come to further conviction of, humiliation for, and hatred against sin;<sup>14</sup> together with a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ, and the perfection of His obedience.<sup>15</sup> It is likewise of use to the regenerate, to restrain their corruptions, in that it forbids sin;<sup>16</sup> and the threatenings of it serve to show what even their sins deserve, and what afflictions in this life they may expect for them, although freed from the curse thereof threatened in the law.<sup>17</sup> The promises of it, in like manner, show them God's approbation of obedience, and what blessings they may expect upon the performance thereof;<sup>18</sup> although not as due to them by the law as a covenant of works;<sup>19</sup> so as a man's doing good, and refraining from evil, because the law encourageth to the one, and deterreth from the other, is no evidence of his being under the law, and not under grace.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ex. 21; 22:1-29; Gen. 49:10, with 1 Peter 2:13, 14; Matt. 5:17, with verses 38, 39; 1 Cor. 9:8-10.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. 13:8-10; Eph. 6:2; 1 John 2:3, 4, 7, 8 [Am. ed. Rom. 3:31, and 6:15].

<sup>9</sup> James 2:10, 11.

<sup>10</sup> Matt. 5:17-19; James 2:8; Rom. 3:31.

<sup>11</sup> Rom. 6:14; Gal. 2:16; 3:13; 4:4, 5; Acts 13:39; Rom. 8:1.

<sup>12</sup> Rom. 7:12, 22, 25; Ps. 119:4-6; 1 Cor. 7:19; Gal. 5:14, 16, 18-23.

<sup>13</sup> Rom. 7:7; 3:20.

<sup>14</sup> James 1:23-25; Rom. 7:9, 14, 24.

<sup>15</sup> Gal. 3:24; Rom. 7:24, 25; 8:3, 4.

<sup>16</sup> James 2:11; Ps. 119:101, 104, 128.

<sup>17</sup> Ezra 9:13, 14; Ps. 89:30-34.

<sup>18</sup> Lev. 26:11, 10, 14, with 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 6:2, 3; Ps. 37:11, with Matt. 5:5; Ps. 19:11.

<sup>19</sup> Gal. 2:16; Luke 17:10.

<sup>20</sup> Rom. 6:12, 14; 1 Peter 3:8-12, with Ps. 34:12-16; Heb. 12:28, 29.

"VII. Neither are the forementioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the gospel, but do sweetly comply with it:<sup>21</sup> the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely and cheerfully which the will of God, revealed in the law, requireth to be done.<sup>22</sup>

"CHAPTER XX.—OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND LIBERTY  
OF CONSCIENCE

"I. The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law.<sup>23</sup> . . . All which were common also to believers under the law;<sup>24</sup> but under the New Testament the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected.<sup>25</sup>

**The Westminster Shorter Catechism, 1647 A. D.**

[“This catechism was prepared by the Westminster Assembly in 1647, and adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1648; by the Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia, May, 1788; and by nearly all the Calvinistic Presbyterian and Congregational Churches of the English tongue. . . . It is more extensively used than any other Protestant catechism except perhaps the Small Catechism of Luther and the Heidelberg Catechism.”—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 676.*]

“*Question 14.*—What is sin?

“*Answer.*—Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God.

“*Ques. 39.*—What is the duty which God requireth of man?

“*Ans.*—The duty which God requireth of man is obedience to His revealed will.

“*Ques. 40.*—What did God at first reveal to man for the rule of his obedience?

“*Ans.*—The rule which God at first revealed to man for his obedience, was the moral law.

“*Ques. 41.*—Wherein is the moral law summarily comprehended?

“*Ans.*—The moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments.

“*Ques. 42.*—What is the sum of the ten commandments?

<sup>21</sup> Gal. 3:21 [Am. ed. Titus 2:11-14].

<sup>22</sup> Eze. 36:27; Heb. 8:10, with Jer. 31:33.

<sup>23</sup> Titus 2:14; 1 Thess. 1:10; Gal. 3:13.

<sup>24</sup> Gal. 3:9, 14.

<sup>25</sup> Gal. 4:1-3, 6, 7; 5:1; Acts 15:10, 11.

*Ans.*—The sum of the ten commandments is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our strength, and with all our mind; and our neighbor as ourselves.

*Ques. 43.*—What is the preface to the ten commandments?

*Ans.*—The preface to the ten commandments is in these words: 'I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.'

*Ques. 44.*—What doth the preface to the ten commandments teach us?

*Ans.*—The preface to the ten commandments teacheth us, that because God is the Lord, and our God and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep all His commandments."

[Then follows a series of questions and answers explaining in order each of the ten commandments.]

#### **The Savoy Declaration of the Congregational Churches, 1658 A. D.**

[Concerning the "general creeds or declarations of faith which have been approved by the Congregational Churches in England and America," Schaff declares: "They agree substantially with the Westminster Confession, or the Calvinistic system of doctrine, but differ from Presbyterianism by rejecting the legislative and judicial authority of presbyteries and synods, and by maintaining the independence of the local churches." "The American Congregationalists have from time to time adopted the Westminster standards of doctrine [the Westminster Confession of Faith], with the exception of the sections relating to synodical church government."

"The first and fundamental Congregational confession of faith and platform of polity is the Savoy Declaration, so called from the place where it was composed and adopted [Savoy, in the Strand, London]." —*Vol. I, pp. 829, 835.* "The Savoy Declaration is merely a modification of the Westminster Confession to suit the Congregational polity." —*Id., Vol. III, p. 718.* Schaff indicates "the principal omissions, additions, and changes." No change is noted in Chapter XIX, "Of the Law of God," or in Section I of Chapter XX, "Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience," of the Westminster Confession.]

#### **The Confession of the Society of Friends, Commonly Called Quakers, 1675 A. D.**

["The most authoritative summary of the principles and doctrines of the Religious Society of Friends."—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 789.*]

##### **"THE EIGHTH PROPOSITION**

##### **"Concerning Perfection**

"In whom this holy and pure birth is fully brought forth [the "spiritual birth," as discussed in the seventh proposition]



the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united and subjected unto the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the evil one, but to be free from actual sinning and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord.

### **The Baptist Confession of 1688**

(The Philadelphia Confession)

[“This is the most generally accepted confession of the Regular or Calvinistic Baptists in England and in the Southern States of America. It appeared first in London, 1677. . . . It was adopted early in the eighteenth century by the Philadelphia Association of Baptist Churches, and is hence called also the Philadelphia Confession of Faith.

“It is a slight modification of the Confession of the Westminster Assembly (1647) and the Savoy Declaration (1658), with changes to suit the Baptist views on church polity and on the subjects and mode of baptism.”—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 738.* Schaff notes the specific changes made in certain chapters of the Westminster Confession. No change is noted in Chapter XIX, “Of the Law of God,” or of Section I of Chapter XX, “Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience.”]

### **The New Hampshire Baptist Confession, 1833 A. D.**

[“Widely accepted by the Baptists, especially in the Northern and Western States. . . . The text is taken from the ‘Baptist Church Manual,’ published by the American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.”—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 742.*]

#### **“XII.—OF THE HARMONY OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL**

“We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government;<sup>1</sup> that it is holy, just, and good;<sup>2</sup> and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin;<sup>3</sup> to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible church.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 3:31; Matt. 5:17; Luke 16:17; Rom. 3:20; 4:15.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. 7:12, 7, 14, 22; Gal. 3:21; Psalms 119.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. 8:7, 8; Joshua 24:19; Jer. 13:23; John 6:44; 5:44.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. 8:2, 4; 10:4; 1 Tim. 1:5; Heb. 8:10; Jude 20, 21; Heb. 12:14; Matt. 16:17, 18; 1 Cor. 12:28.

**The Methodist Articles of Religion, 1784 A. D.**

["The Twenty-five Articles of Religion were drawn up by John Wesley for the American Methodists, and adopted at a conference in 1784. They underwent some changes, chiefly verbal. . . . They are a liberal and judicious abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. . . . The text is taken from the official manual of 'The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church,' ed. by Bishop Harris, New York, 1872."—*Schaff, Vol. III, p. 807*. All the important branches of Methodism contain in their creeds the following from these Articles of Religion:]

**"VI.—OF THE OLD TESTAMENT**

"The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

**The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church, 1839 A. D.**

["The most authoritative doctrinal standard of the orthodox Græco-Russian Church."—*Schaff, Vol. II, p. 445*.]

**"ON THE LAW OF GOD AND THE COMMANDMENTS**

"485. What means have we to know good works from bad?

"The inward law of God, or the witness of our conscience, and the outward law of God, or God's commandments.

"486. Does Holy Scripture speak of the inward law of God?

"The apostle Paul says of the heathen: 'Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.' Rom. 2:15.

"487. If there is in man's heart an inward law, why was the outward given?

"It was given because men obeyed not the inward law, but led carnal and sinful lives, and stifled within themselves the

voice of the spiritual law, so that it was necessary to put them in mind of it outwardly through the commandments. 'Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions.' Gal. 3:19.

"488. When and how was God's outward law given to men?

"When the Hebrew people, descended from Abraham, had been miraculously delivered from bondage in Egypt, on their way to the Promised Land, in the desert, on Mt. Sinai, God manifested His presence in fire and clouds, and gave them the law, by the hand of Moses, their leader.

"490. You said that these commandments were given to the people of Israel: must we, then, also walk by them?

"We must; for they are in substance the same law which, in the words of St. Paul, has been 'written in the hearts' of all men, that all should walk by it.

"491. Did Jesus Christ teach men to walk by the ten commandments?

"He bade men, if they would attain to everlasting life, to 'keep the commandments;' and taught us to understand and fulfill them more perfectly than had been done before He came. Matt. 19:17; and 5."

[Questions No. 492 to 608 deal in detail with each of the ten commands.]

#### **D. L. Moody on the Ten Commandments**

In addition to these quotations from the great Protestant creeds and confessions, we wish to give an extended quotation from the writings of the evangelist, D. L. Moody. He was the founder of the Moody Bible Institute, which has been followed by the creation of Bible institutes in various parts of the country. These Bible institutes today are probably the most pronounced in their declarations against the law of God, and in their denunciation of those who teach that the law has any place in the life of the saved man. The statements from D. L. Moody speak for themselves.

The book from which the following quotations are taken is entitled: "Weighed and Wanting, Addresses on the Ten Commandments, by D. L. Moody." Published by Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago. Copyright 1898 by The Bible Institute Colportage Association. The frontispiece consists of a ✓

reproduction of the ten commandments as given in Exodus 20: 3-17. There are twelve chapters, an introductory chapter entitled, "Weighed in the Balances," then a chapter on each of the ten commandments, and a closing chapter entitled, "The Handwriting Blotted Out."

[The first quotation is from the chapter entitled, "Weighed in the Balances."]

"It is a favorite thing with infidels to set their own standard, to measure themselves by other people. But that will not do in the day of judgment. Now we will use God's law as a balance weight. . . .

"Let me call your attention to the fact that God wrote on the tables of stone at Sinai as well as on the wall of Belshazzar's palace. . . .

✓ "The law that was given at Sinai has lost none of its solemnity. Time cannot wear out its authority or the fact of its authorship.

"I can imagine some one saying, 'I won't be weighed by that law. I don't believe in it.'

"Now men may cavil as much as they like about other parts of the Bible, but I have never met an honest man that found fault with the ten commandments. . . .

"Now the question for you and me is, Are we keeping these commandments? Have we fulfilled all the requirements of the law? If God made us, as we know He did, He had a right to make that law; and if we don't use it aright, it would have been better for us if we had never had it, for it will condemn us. We shall be found wanting. The law is all right, but are we right? . . .

"Some people seem to think we have got beyond the commandments. What did Christ say? 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, and the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.' The commandments of God given to Moses in the mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people. The Jews said the law was not given in Palestine (which belonged to Israel), but in the wilderness, because the law was for all nations.

"Jesus never condemned the law and the prophets, but He did condemn those who did not obey them. Because He gave new commandments, it does not follow that He abolished the old. Christ's explanation of them made them all the more searching. . . .

"The people must be made to understand that the ten commandments are still binding, and that there is a penalty attached to their violation. We do not want a gospel of mere sentiment. The sermon on the mount did not blot out the ten commandments. . . .

"Paul said: 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.' But does this mean that the detailed precepts of the decalogue are superseded, and have become back numbers? Does a father cease to give children rules to obey because they love him? Does a nation burn its statute books because the people have become patriotic? Not at all. And yet people speak as if the commandments do not hold for Christians because they have come to love God. Paul said: 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.' It still holds good. The commandments are necessary. So long as we obey, they do not rest heavy upon us; but as soon as we try to break away, we find they are like fences to keep us within bounds. Horses need bridles even after they have been properly broken in. . . .

"Now, my friend, are you ready to be weighed by this law of God? A great many people say that if they keep the commandments, they do not need to be forgiven and saved through Christ. But have you kept them? I will admit that if you perfectly keep the commandments, you do not need to be saved by Christ; but is there a man in the wide world who can truly say that he has done this? Young lady, can you say: 'I am ready to be weighed by the law'? Can you, young man? Will you step into the scales and be weighed one by one by the ten commandments?

"Now face these ten commandments honestly and prayerfully. See if your life is right, and if you are treating God fairly. God's statutes are just, are they not? If they are right, let us see if we are right. Let us pray that the Holy Ghost may search each one of us. Let us get alone with God and read His law—read it carefully and prayerfully, and ask Him to show us our sins and what He would have us to do."  
—Pages 10-17.



[The next quotation is from the chapter entitled, "The Fourth Commandment."]

"I honestly believe that this commandment is just as binding today as it ever was. I have talked with men who have said that it has been abrogated, but they have never been able to point to any place in the Bible where God repealed it. When Christ was on earth, He did nothing to set it aside; He freed it from the traces under which the scribes and Pharisees had put it, and gave it its true place. 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' It is just as practicable and as necessary for men today as it ever was—in fact, more than ever, because we live in such an intense age.

"The Sabbath was binding in Eden, and it has been in force ever since. The fourth commandment begins with the word 'remember,' showing that the Sabbath already existed when God wrote this law on the tables of stone at Sinai. How can men claim that this one commandment has been done away with, when they will admit that the other nine are still binding? . . .

"Once when I was holding meetings in London, in my ignorance I made arrangements to preach four times in different places one Sabbath. After I had made the appointments, I found I had to walk sixteen miles; but I walked it, and I slept that night with a clear conscience. I have made it a rule never to use the cars, and if I have a private carriage, I insist that horse and man shall rest on Monday. I want no hackman to rise up in judgment against me.

"My friends, if we want to help the Sabbath, let business men and Christians never patronize cars on the Sabbath. I would hate to own stock in those companies, to be the means of taking the Sabbath from these men, and have to answer for it at the day of judgment. Let those who are Christians at any rate endeavor to keep a conscience void of offense on this point."  
—Pages 46-50.

[The next quotation is from the closing chapter entitled, "The Handwriting Blotted Out."]

"We have now considered the ten commandments, and the question for each one of us is, Are we keeping them? If God should weigh us by them, would we be found wanting or not wanting? Do we keep the law, the *whole* law? Are we obey-

ing God with all our heart? Do we render Him a full and willing obedience?

"These ten commandments are not ten different laws; they are one law. If I am being held up in the air by a chain with ten links and I break one of them, down I come, just as surely as if I break the whole ten. If I am forbidden to go out of an inclosure, it makes no difference at what point I break through the fence. 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' 'The golden chain of obedience is broken if one link is missing.' . . .

"For fifteen hundred years man was under the law, and no one was equal to it. Christ came and showed that the commandments went beyond the mere letter; and can any one since say that he has been able to keep them in his own strength? . . .

"I can imagine that you are saying to yourself, 'If we are to be judged by these laws, how are we going to be saved? Nearly every one of them has been broken by us, in spirit, if not in letter.' I almost hear you say: 'I wonder if Mr. Moody is ready to be weighed. Would he like to put those tests to himself?'

"With all humility I reply that if God commanded me to step into the scales now, I am ready.

"'What!' you say, 'haven't you broken the law?'

"Yes, I have. I was a sinner before God the same as you; but forty years ago I pleaded guilty at His bar. I cried for mercy, and He forgave me. If I step into the scales, the Son of God has promised to be with me. I would not dare to step in without Him. If I did, how quickly the scales would fly up!

"Christ kept the law. If He had ever broken it, He would have had to die for Himself; but because He was a Lamb without spot or blemish, His atoning death is efficacious for you and me. He had no sin of His own to atone for, and so God accepted His sacrifice. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. We are righteous in God's sight because the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ is unto all and upon all them that believe. . . .

"If the love of God is shed abroad in your heart, you will be able to fulfill the law."—*Pages 119-124.*

## SUNDAY SACREDNESS IN THE REFORMATION MOVEMENT

A KNOWLEDGE of the growth of the doctrine of Sunday sacredness in the Reformation movement, will enable the reader to understand better the degree to which the Reformation caused a reform in the doctrine of a divinely ordained weekly rest day. We may willingly grant that the immediate successors of Luther moved upward a very great distance from the laxity of the Dark Ages when they endeavored to obey more fully the fourth commandment, even though their interpretation of it was to a greater or less degree faulty.

The most interesting fact that stands out is that the doctrine of the sanctity of a weekly rest day gained strength only as increasing emphasis was placed on the truth that the fourth commandment is morally binding on Christians. Without this emphasis, Protestantism would never have had stamped upon it that measure of regard for a weekly holy day that has quite definitely distinguished reformed churches from the Catholic Church. When religious leaders today attack the binding claims of the fourth commandment in their attempt to meet the Sabbath truth, they are attacking the very foundation on which has been reared whatever degree of sanctity Protestantism has attached to a weekly rest day.

It is sad that the Reformers did not move on into the full light concerning the fourth commandment; but what is to be said of their spiritual successors today who would attempt to *abolish* the command? We are moving on in the true path of reformation when we give increasing emphasis to the importance of the fourth commandment, and insist that this command be obeyed exactly as God gave it, and not as changed during the centuries of apostasy.

The following historical sketch is from Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., one of the foremost of modern church historians:

**Philip Schaff on Sabbath Reform**

"Ch[apter] XXI. 'Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day' [of the Westminster Confession, 1647 A. D.], must be mentioned as (next to the Irish Articles) the first symbolical indorsement of what may be called the Puritan theory of the Christian Sabbath which was not taught by the Reformers and the Continental Confessions, but which has taken deep root in England, Scotland, and the United States, and has become the basis of a far stricter observance of the Lord's day than exists in any other country. This observance is one of the most prominent national and social features of Anglo-American Christianity, and at once strikes the attention of every traveler.

"The way was gradually prepared for it. Calvin's view of the authority of the fourth commandment was stricter than Luther's, Knox's view stricter than Calvin's, and the Puritan view stricter than Knox's. The Prayer Book of the Church of England, by incorporating the responsive reading of the decalogue in the regular service, kept alive in the minds of the people the perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment, and helped to create a public sentiment within the Church of England favorable to the Puritan theory, although practically great desecration prevailed during Elizabeth's reign. The 'judicious' Hooker, who was no Puritan, says: 'We are bound to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty which God's immutable *law* doth exact *forever*.'

"Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign the Sabbath question assumed the importance and dignity of a national movement, and of a practical reformation which traveled from England to Scotland and from both countries to North America. The chief impulse to this movement was given in 1595 by Dr. Nicholas Bownd (or Bound), a learned Puritan clergyman of Norton in Suffolk. He is not the originator, but the systematizer or first clear expounder, of the Puritan theory of the Christian Sabbath, namely, that the Sabbath or weekly day of holy rest is a primitive institution of the benevolent Creator for the benefit of man, and that the fourth commandment as to its substance (that is, the keeping holy one day out of seven) is as perpetual in design and as binding upon the Christians as any other of the ten commandments, of which Christ said that not 'one jot or one tittle' shall pass away till all be fulfilled.

"The work in which this theory was ably and earnestly vindicated proved to be a tract for the times. Heylin, a High



Church opponent, says 'that in a very little time it grew the most bewitching error, the most popular deceit that had ever been set on foot in the Church of England.' Fuller dates from it 'the more solemn and strict observance of the Lord's day.' . . .

"The Puritan Sabbath theory was denounced and assailed by the rising school of High Churchism as a Sabbatarian heresy and a cunningly concealed attack on the authority of the Church of England, by substituting the Jewish Sabbath for the Christian Sunday and all the church festivals. Attempts were made by Archbishop Whitgift in 1599, and by Chief Justice Popham in 1600, to suppress Bownd's book and to destroy all the copies, but 'the more it was called in, the more it was called on;' its price was doubled, and 'though the book's wings were clipped from flying abroad in print, it ran the faster from friend to friend in transcribed copies, and the Lord's day, in most places, was most strictly observed. The more liberty people were offered, the less they used it. . . . It was sport for them to refrain from sports. . . . Scarce any comment, catechism, or controversy was set forth by the stricter divines, wherein this doctrine (the diamond in this ring) was not largely pressed and proved; so that, as one saith, the Sabbath itself had no rest.'

"At last King James I brought his royal authority to bear against the Puritan Sabbatarianism so called, and issued the famous 'Book of Sports,' May 24, 1618, which was afterwards republished, with an additional order, by his son, Charles I, no doubt by advice of Archbishop Laud, October 18, 1633. This curious production formally authorizes and commends the desecration of the evening of the Lord's day by dancing, leaping, fencing, and other 'lawful recreations,' on condition of observing the earlier part by strict outward conformity to the worship of the Church of England. The professed object of this indulgence to the common people was to check the progress of the Papists and Puritans (or 'Precisians'), and to make 'the bodies more able for war' when his majesty should have 'occasion to use them.' The court set the example of desecration by balls, masquerades, and plays on Sunday evening; and the rustics repaired from the house of worship to the alehouse or the village green to dance around the Maypole and to shoot at butts. To complete the folly, King James ordered the book to be read in every parish church, and threatened clergymen who refused to do so with severe punishment. King Charles repeated the



order. But in both cases it became the source of great trouble and confusion. Several bishops disapproved of it. Archbishop Abbott (the Puritan predecessor of Laud) flatly forbade it to be read at Croydon. The Lord Mayor of London commanded the king's own carriages to be stopped as they were passing through the city on a Sunday. James raged and swore, and countermanded the prohibition. The Lord Mayor yielded, with this answer: 'While I was in my power I did my duty; but that being taken away, it is my duty to obey.' Some clergymen, after reading the book from the pulpit, followed it up by a sermon against it, or by reading the fourth commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,' and added, 'This is the law of God, the other the injunction of man.' Those who refused to read the royal 'Book of Sports' were suspended from office and benefice, or even excommunicated by Laud and his sympathizing fellow bishops. Many left England, and joined

'The pilgrim bands, who crossed the sea to keep  
Their Sabbaths in the eye of God alone,  
In His wide temple of the wilderness.'

"This persecution of conscientious ministers for obeying God rather than men gave moral strength to the cause of Sabbath observance, and rooted it deeper in the affections of the people. It was one of the potent causes which overwhelmed Charles and Laud in common ruin. The sober and serious part of the nation were struck with a kind of horror that they should be invited by the highest authorities in church and state to destroy the effect of public worship by a desecration of a portion of the day consecrated to religion.

"On the Sunday question Puritanism achieved at last a permanent triumph, and left its trace upon the Church of England and Scotland, which reappeared after the licentious period of the Restoration. For, although the Church of England, as a body, never committed itself to the Puritan Sabbath theory, it adopted at least the practice of a much stricter observance than had previously obtained under Elizabeth and the Stuarts, and would never exchange it for the Continental laxity, with its disastrous effects upon the attendance at public worship and the morals of the people.

"The Westminster Confession, without entering into details or sanctioning the incidental excesses of the Puritan practice,

represents the Christian rest day under its threefold aspect: (1) as a divine law of nature (*jus divinum naturale*), rooted in the constitution of man, and hence instituted (together with marriage) at the creation, in the state of innocence, for the perpetual benefit of body and soul; (2) as a positive moral law (*jus divinum positivum*), given through Moses, with reference to the primitive institution ('Remember') and to the typical redemption of Israel from bondage; (3) as the commemoration of the new creation and finished redemption by the resurrection of Christ; hence the change from the last to the first day of the week, and its designation 'the Lord's day' (*dies Dominica*). And it requires the day to be wholly devoted to the exercises of public and private worship and the duties of necessity and mercy.

"To this doctrine and practice the Presbyterian, Congregational, and other churches in Scotland, England, and America have faithfully adhered to this day. Yea, twenty-seven years before it was formulated by the learned divines of Westminster, the Pilgrim Fathers of America had transplanted both theory and practice, first to Holland, and, finding them unsafe there, to the wild soil of New England. Two days after their landing from the 'Mayflower' (December 22, 1620), forgetting the pressing necessities of physical food and shelter, the dreary cold of winter, the danger threatening from wild beasts and roaming savages, they celebrated their first Sunday in America." —*"The Creeds of Christendom,"* Vol. I, pp. 776-782 (4th edition, in 3 volumes, Harper & Brothers).

#### Sixteenth Century Reformers' Sabbath Views

The attitude of the sixteenth century Reformers toward the Sabbath is well illustrated by quotations from two of the most authoritative confessions of that century, the Augsburg Confession, 1530 A. D.; and the Second Helvetic Confession, 1566 A. D.:

#### Augsburg Confession, 1530 A. D.

##### PART II, ARTICLE VII.—OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER

"The Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they

ought to come together, it appears that the [Christian]\* Church did for that purpose appoint the Lord's day: which for this cause also seemed to have been pleasing, that man might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the Sabbath nor of another day, was of necessity."

**Second Helvetic Confession, 1566 A. D.**

**CHAPTER XXIV.—OF HOLYDAYS, FASTS, AND CHOICE OF MEATS**

"Although religion be not tied unto time, yet can it not be planted and exercised without a due dividing and allotting out of time. Every church, therefore, does choose unto itself a certain time for public prayers, and for the preaching of the gospel, and for the celebration of the sacraments; and it is not lawful for any one to overthrow this appointment of the church at his own pleasure. For except some due time and leisure were allotted to the outward exercise of religion, without doubt men would be quite drawn from it by their own affairs.

"In regard hereof, we see that in the ancient churches there were not only certain set hours in the week appointed for meetings; but that also the Lord's day itself, ever since the apostles' time, was consecrated to religious exercises and to a holy rest; which also is now very well observed by our churches, for the worship of God and the increase of charity. Yet herein we give no place unto the Jewish observation of the day, or to any superstitions. For we do not account one day to be holier than another, nor think that mere rest is of itself acceptable to God. Besides, we do celebrate and keep the Lord's day, and not the Jewish Sabbath, and that with a free observation."

**Later Views Regarding the Sabbath Command**

The doctrine of the Sabbath as set forth in the Irish Articles of Religion and in the Westminster Confession, to which Schaff refers in the preceding historical sketch, are given on the following page. (The reader is referred to pages 156 and 157 for a statement as to the importance of the Irish Articles and the Westminster Confession and the relation of one to the other.)

---

\* "Christian" is placed in brackets, Schaff explains, to indicate that the word is not in the original Latin text of the Confession, though it is in the German text.

**Irish Articles of Religion, 1615 A. D.**

## PARAGRAPHS 46-56.—OF THE SERVICE OF GOD

"56. The first day of the week, which is the *Lord's day*, is wholly to be dedicated unto the service of God; and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business, and to bestow that leisure upon holy exercises, both public and private."

**Westminster Confession, 1647 A. D.**

## CHAPTER XXI.—OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP AND THE SABBATH DAY

"VII. As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so in His word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him:<sup>1</sup> which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week,<sup>2</sup> which in Scripture is called the Lord's day,<sup>3</sup> and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath."<sup>4</sup>

**Schaff's Comment on the Augsburg Confession  
Sabbath Doctrine**

The foregoing statements from Protestant creeds reveal very clearly what Schaff means when he speaks of the changing views of Protestantism toward the authority of the fourth commandment. In a footnote in comment on the Sabbath doctrine statement (Article VII) in the Augsburg Confession, Schaff remarks:

"This view of the Christian Sabbath, which was held by all the Reformers, and still prevails on the Continent of Europe, overlooks the important fact that the Sabbath has a moral as well as a ceremonial [?] aspect, and is a part of the decalogue, which the Lord did not come 'to destroy, but to fulfill' (Matt. 5:17, 18; comp. 22:37-40; Rom. 3:31; 10:4). As a periodical day of rest for the body, and worship for the soul, the Sabbath is founded in the physical and moral constitution of man, and

<sup>1</sup> Ex. 20:8, 10, 11; Isa. 56:2, 4, 6, 7 [Am. ed. Isa. 56:6].

<sup>2</sup> Gen. 2:2, 3; 1 Cor. 16:1, 2; Acts 20:7.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. 1:10.

<sup>4</sup> Ex. 20:8, 10, with Matt. 5:17, 18.



reflects the rest of God after the work of creation (Gen. 2:3). Under this view it is of primitive origin, like the institution of marriage, and of perpetual obligation, like the other commandments of the decalogue. A lax theory of the Sabbath naturally leads to a lax practice, and tends to destroy the blessing of this holy day. The Anglo-American churches have an unspeakable advantage over those of the Continent of Europe in their higher theory and practice of Sabbath observance, which dates from the close of the sixteenth century. Even Puritan rigor is better than the opposite extreme."—*Vol. III, p. 69, footnote.*

In our very present day in the United States that active force for Sunday sacredness, the Lord's Day Alliance, rests its conviction as to the importance of a weekly holy day on the ground that the fourth commandment is still in force, as the following quotation reveals:

#### **The Lord's Day Alliance on the Sabbath Doctrine**

"The Alliance holds that the fourth commandment is still in full force and effect. It believes that the Sabbath was given, not merely for one nation, but for all people, and that the world needs it today more than ever, both as a day of rest from excessive activity and as a day for religious inspiration in an age of worldliness and doubt. It holds that Christ did not abolish the fourth commandment, as some have held, but rather that in freeing the Sabbath from narrow and technical interpretations He strengthened and spiritualized the holy day. He said He came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law.

"The change of the observance of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week did not end an old institution or begin a new one, but added new life and significance to the divine command. Thus not only was the day of the resurrection of Jesus celebrated, but the Sabbath was cleansed from the technicalities and traditions by which its free sanctities had been obscured."—*Supplement to the January-February, 1921, Lord's Day Leader, official publication of the Lord's Day Alliance.*

Thus in English-speaking countries in discussing the Sabbath with those who subscribe to this generally accepted view of a fourth-commandment basis for Sunday, the proposition is narrowed down to this simple question: Where is the Bible text



to prove that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week?

In dealing with those who hold to the so-called Continental view of the Sabbath, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession, etc., the question is: Where is the Bible proof that the fourth commandment deals with merely a ceremonial requirement, when the whole decalogue is admittedly the binding moral code for Christians?

In no case should it be logically necessary to meet a thousand and one quibbles about grace and the abolition of the law before coming to the central question of the Sabbath. The evidence from the Protestant creeds reveals beyond all controversy that a man repudiates one of the most basic beliefs of Protestantism when he discards the decalogue.

## WERE THE ANNUAL SABBATHS DECALOGUE SABBATHS? GAMBLE THEORY EXAMINED

ABOUT 1900 a Methodist minister, Samuel Walter Gamble, wrote a book entitled, "Sunday, the True Sabbath of God," in which he brought forth a series of astounding claims regarding the nature of the ancient Jewish calendar. On these claims he built an argument against the seventh-day Sabbath and for Sunday. The book was brought forth admittedly as an attack on Seventh-day Adventists and their Sabbath preaching. We might perhaps dispose of the book with the brief observation that though it was produced for the express purpose of providing Sunday keepers with a new and invincible argument against Sabbatarians, and though the writer of the Introduction declared, "It is this or nothing," Gamble's book failed to win any scholarly support. Sunday-keeping theologians ridiculed unsparingly some of the key claims of the book.

However, three reasons prompt us to examine the theory:

1. Though the Gamble book died quietly with scarcely an obituary notice from the theologians whom it was intended to aid, the shadowy apparition of the theory is invoked quite frequently by the opponents of the Sabbath.\*

---

\* A choice illustration of how the ghost of the Gamble theory enters into important present-day Sabbath discussions, is found in the following quotation from the *Lord's Day Leader*, official organ of the Lord's Day Alliance:

"Nowhere did God designate the seventh day of the week [as the Sabbath]. It could not have been appointed for the seventh day of the week without interfering with the law of the Passover. The Passover was a movable feast. It was appointed to be held on the fourteenth day of the month of Abib, or Nisan. It was therefore a calendar date, and not a weekly day. This was the first great sabbath of the year, and the other sabbaths followed every seventh day. Now everybody knows that a calendar date, such as a birthday or Fourth of July, cannot fall on the same day of the week two years in succession.

"Now let us be reasonable about this matter, and admit, as all intelligent Jewish rabbis do, that the ancient sabbaths fell on the seventh day after the Passover, and not on the seventh day of the week, and that in the course of seven years each day of the week was in turn the sabbath for a whole year. This was the law as long the Jewish nation lasted."—*September-October, 1928*.

Of course Sunday law reformers, of all people, find comfort in such a theory as Gamble's, because it enables them to invoke the Sabbath command in favor of Sunday; for is not Sunday a seventh day after six days of work?

2. Two leaders in the recent calendar revision movement, Moses B. Cotsworth and C. F. Marvin, resurrected the Gamble theory, touched it up here and there, and sent it forth again with such publicity as they were able to command. (Of its relation to calendar revision we are not here concerned, of course.)

3. While the mere refuting of a fanciful theory may be rather profitless, though necessary, the discussion of this particular theory furnishes an excellent opportunity to set forth much positive evidence and truth regarding the Jewish annual sabbaths and the difference between them and the weekly Sabbath.

We shall not attempt to go into all the details of the theory, but confine ourselves to the primary claims on which it rests. If these collapse, they carry down with them the secondary claims.\* We shall deal with the theory in terms of its revived form as given out by Cotsworth and Marvin in a 32-page pamphlet entitled, "Moses the Greatest of Calendar Reformers," published by the International Fixed Calendar League. However, so far as the main arguments are concerned there is *no* difference between the original and the revived form. On the opposite page is a reproduction of the calendar which, according to this theory, was given to the Jews by Moses at the time of the exodus. The claims made regarding it are as follows:

#### **Alleged Mosaic Calendar Described**

1. Moses, at the time of the exodus, established a solar calendar of 365 days. This calendar consisted of twelve thirty-day months, plus five extra days, three of which extra days were inserted at the end of the sixth month (Elul), and two at the end of the twelfth (Adar). These five extra days, while reckoned as days of the week, were not counted as days of the month.

2. The "seventh day" of the fourth commandment was not the "seventh day" of the week as we understand it today, but

---

\* We wish to acknowledge our great indebtedness to the Rev. Dr. Moses Hyamson, LL. D., rabbi of *Orach Chaim* (Path of Life) Congregation, New York, and professor of codes at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York. Rabbi Hyamson gave to us more than a whole day of his valuable time in explanation of the various customs of the ancient Israelites and in elucidation of Scriptural passages involved in this theory. He is regarded not only by his orthodox associates, but also by reformed rabbis, as one of the most learned of Hebrew scholars.

ABIB (Nisan) 1st Month						
WORK DAYS						Sabbath
1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						
IYAR (Ziv) 2d Month						
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				
SIVAN 3d Month						
Pentecost— ("Extra Sabbath")			1	2	3	4
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			
TAMMUZ 4th Month						
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	
AB 5th Month						
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						
ELUL 6th Month						
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	(1)	(2)	(3)	
TISHRI (Ethanim) 7th Month						
WORK DAYS						Sabbath
1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	6th	7th
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						
BUL (Heshvan) 8th Month						
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				
CHISLEV (Kislev) 9th Month						
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		
TEBETH 10th Month						
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
SHEBAT 11th Month						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					
ADAR 12th Month						
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	(4)	(5)	

THE ALLEGED MOSAIC PERPETUAL CALENDAR

simply the seventh day after six days of labor. Therefore to speak of the days of the Mosaic calendar as Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc., is not accurate. The specifically mentioned sabbath days in the Jewish ritual, such as Passover sabbath, etc., give the key, and the remainder of the sabbaths in the year are located in the calendar simply by spacing out six working days before each of them.

3. The fifth day of the third month (Sivan), while reckoned as a day of the month, was not counted as a day of the week. This was the day of Pentecost. It was an "extra sabbath," similar to the "blank day" of the present proposed calendar. In other words, although the fourth of Sivan was sabbath, the fifth was not "Sunday," but simply a continuation of the sabbath of the fourth—a blank day so far as the reckoning of the days of the week is concerned.

4. Now 365 days equals fifty-two weeks plus one day. But this extra day being eliminated from the count of the weeks, made the year really consist of an exact number of weeks. This caused the sabbaths always to bear a fixed relation to the month, instead of being the seventh day of a free-running week. Thus every year was an exact duplicate of every other year.

#### **Examine First Link in Evidence**

The authors, Cotsworth and Marvin, first endeavor to prove that the Mosaic calendar was solar. This, of course, gave them their foundation for the statement that it consisted of 365 days. Most Jewish authorities hold that their ancient calendar was not solar; but let us grant, for the sake of argument, that it was. What does that prove?—Nothing in particular. Our present calendar is solar, but that gives to it no unusual perpetual qualities. However, the reader of the pamphlet is led to feel that when the solar nature of the Mosaic calendar is established, the other features naturally follow. This feeling is strengthened by the fact that Dr. Julian Morgenstern and Prof. W. A. Heidel (whose views on the solar nature of the ancient Jewish calendar are mentioned in the main text of the pamphlet) are listed along with Samuel Walter Gamble, the father of the whole theory, in a footnote entitled, "Some Authorities We Quote." We therefore wrote to both these Hebrew scholars, informing them of the theory set forth in this pamphlet, and stated in our letter:



"The writers of this pamphlet quote you as one of the authorities in support of the major premise of their thesis, because of your contribution on the calendar of ancient Israel. Your name and the quotations from your work, placed as they are in this pamphlet under the general head, 'Some Authorities We Quote,' lead the general reader to the impression that your researches warrant the ultimate conclusions to which the writers of the pamphlet come. I wish to inquire whether I would be correct in obtaining this impression. In other words, have your researches led you to believe, as do the writers of this pamphlet, that Moses devised a perpetual calendar that placed the Sabbath in a fixed relationship to the month, necessitating the existence each year of an extra Sabbath?"

**Hebrew Scholars Reply**

The essence of Dr. Heidel's brief reply is found in this one sentence from his letter: "Messrs. Marvin and Cotsworth have quite absolutely misrepresented my views."

We quote more in detail from the reply of Dr. Morgenstern:

**"THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE**

**"Cincinnati, Ohio**

*"Office of the President.*

**"January 30, 1929.**

**"MY DEAR MR. NICHOL:**

"Replying to yours of the 24th inst., I am very happy to be able to assure you that Messrs. Marvin and Cotsworth have used my name in their propaganda for the new calendar entirely without my authorization and knowledge, and that the quotations from my article on 'The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel' apparently altogether misrepresent the facts with regard to the history of the calendar of ancient Israel which I have been able to establish. . . .

"Certainly I did not advance the thesis 'that the ancient Jews lived under a fixed or perpetual calendar devised by Moses, which caused the Sabbath always to recur on the same days of the month each year, instead of being an institution related only to the week, as we now have it.' On the contrary, I showed in this article that, at various times in the history of ancient Israel, different calendar systems were employed, that up to approxi-

mately 621 B. C. the old Canaanitish calendar, a purely solar calendar, taking cognizance of the days of the solar equinoxes, was employed in ancient Israel. Then from about 621 to a time somewhat later than 400 B. C., another calendar, apparently a lunisolar calendar, was employed, based apparently largely upon some Babylonian model. It apparently took no cognizance whatever of the Sabbath, which continued a *weekly* institution, falling upon any date in the month, regardless of any considerations other than that the Sabbath came every seventh day. At some time after 400 B. C., the calendar at present employed by the Jewish Church, also based upon Babylonian antecedents, was instituted. This also makes no effort to co-ordinate the Sabbath with any particular days or dates in the month.

"I showed likewise that at some time, probably in the third century B. C., an attempt was made to introduce into ancient Israel a calendar similar to that which Mr. Cotsworth is championing, with the year divided into thirteen months of twenty-eight days, and with particular attention given to the coincidence of the Sabbath with a particular date in each month, probably the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days. This calendar is employed as the basis of reckoning in the books of Jubilees and Enoch, two pseudepigraphical writings which were never regarded as authoritative. This calendar, however, was never recognized as official by Judaism and never came into actual use. Furthermore, Moses himself had no connection whatsoever with any of these calendars. It is clear, therefore, that the above-named gentlemen have either not troubled to read my article carefully, or, if they did, have not understood it or have not wanted to understand it. Certainly, the facts which they state and the conclusions which they drew from them are altogether unwarranted by my article.

"I trust that this gives you the information which you desire.

"Very sincerely yours,

"[Signed] JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

"*President.*"

Comment on this letter is superfluous. Let us therefore examine the next point.

The authors declare that Moses inserted a leap week every twenty-eight years. This was to serve the same purpose as our leap day every fourth year. The only "proof" cited in behalf

of this is that Moses was too wise a statesman not to have done so, and that unless he *had* done so, "his wonderful calendar system" would have collapsed. The only point certain is that the "wonderful calendar system" of the *authors* will collapse without the leap-week feature. There is no proof in the world that *Moses* employed it.

#### Next Link Examined

The next link in the chain is the claim that Moses divided his calendar into twelve thirty-day months, with five supplementary days that could be inserted between the months where needed. Unless he did thus divide the months, the theory could not be made to work. In other words, unless he followed the Egyptian division of months, the theory collapses. But again we are confronted with an assumption, for the authors simply *assume* that he did, and proceed to build a towering structure upon this groundless assumption, which, in turn, rests upon the equally groundless assumption that Moses employed a leap week.

We come now to the examination of a passage in Exodus 19 which is brought forth as evidence for this alleged Mosaic calendar. The first text they quote, including the bracketed phrase, is: "In the third month after the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day [that is, the third day] came they into the wilderness of Sinai; . . . and there Israel encamped before the mount." Ex. 19:1, 2, A. R. V. The bracketed phrase in this verse is inserted by the calendar authors.

They then quote a portion of the 10th and 11th verses, which read as follows:

"Jehovah said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their garments, and be ready against the third day; for the third day Jehovah will come down in the sight of all the people upon Mt. Sinai."

They are endeavoring by these texts to support their contention that Pentecost came on the fifth day of the third month (Sivan), as their reconstructed calendar shows it. Their argument in brief is this:

1. That according to Jewish tradition the law was proclaimed from Mt. Sinai on Pentecost; in other words, that Pentecost is a memorial of that great event.

2. That the Israelites reached Mt. Sinai on the third day of the third month.

3. That the three days mentioned in verses 10 and 11 of Exodus 19 should begin with the third day of the month, thus causing the last of the three days of sanctification—the day when Jehovah came down and delivered the law, in other words, Pentecost—to come on the fifth day of the third month, as their calendar places it.

Let us now examine these three propositions. Even if it be granted that “the same day” means the third day of the month, the conclusions of the authors do not necessarily follow. They must still prove that the words of Jehovah to Moses to sanctify the people “today and tomorrow,” etc., as given in verses 10 and 11, were uttered the very day that the Israelites reached Mt. Sinai. Unless they can do this, their third proposition collapses. But no proof can possibly be given for this claim, and every presumption is against it.

#### **Questionable Methods in Chronology**

If the whole passage from the first verse to the eleventh is read, it will be noted that after the Israelites reached Sinai, Moses went up into the mount (verse 3), and communed for a time with God. How long, we know not. Next, that he descended from the mount (verse 7), and told the people what God had said to him. How much time this consumed, we know not. Next, that Moses reported to Jehovah what the people had said (verse 8), and that following these communications the Lord made the statement concerning the sanctifying of the people “against the third day.” The Scriptures do not divulge how much time elapsed in connection with these conversations, and it is only unwarranted assumption that would declare that the whole passage must bear the date of the first verse, whatever that date may be.

If that sort of assumption is to be employed in determining the dates of events, we can quickly bring the Gamble theory into hopeless straits by turning to the sixteenth chapter of



Exodus. There we read that the Israelites entered the wilderness of Sin on "the fifteenth day of the second month." Verse 1. The next two verses immediately declare that they murmured, craving the fleshpots of Egypt. Then immediately follows the statement of Jehovah (verse 4) that He "will rain bread from heaven," and that "it shall come to pass on the sixth day, that they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Verse 5. Then Moses declares to the people that "in the morning" the people will have "bread to the full." Verses 7, 8. Then follows the story of how "in the morning" (verse 13) the people saw the manna lying on the ground, and gathered it up. Then, that "they gathered it morning by morning" (verse 21) until the "sixth day" arrived, when Moses informed them, "Tomorrow is a solemn rest, a holy Sabbath unto Jehovah." Verse 23.

#### **Chronology Turns Against Them**

Now if we are to date this whole passage in terms of the date given at the head of the narrative,—“the fifteenth of the second month,”—we would conclude that the Israelites murmured the very day they arrived in this wilderness, and that the phrase “in the morning” applied to the very next morning, namely, the sixteenth. But if the sixteenth be the first of six days of gathering manna, then the sixth day, on which they gathered twice as much, would come on the twenty-first and the Sabbath on the twenty-second day of that second month. A glance at the accompanying calendar will illustrate this clearly. But it will also reveal that the authors have listed this twenty-second day in a “work-day column.” Thus according to the very rule that they have followed in trying to establish their point in the nineteenth chapter, we can bring their calendar into confusion by the incidents related in the sixteenth chapter.

Now, let us make it clear that we do not necessarily hold that on the morning immediately after the fifteenth day of the second month, the manna began to fall. We simply contend that it would be as logical to maintain this as for the authors to maintain the position they take on the nineteenth chapter, and that by thus employing this principle in both chapters—for a



principle of chronological interpretation ought to be able to work in more than one chapter—the theory is brought into confusion.

### Phrase Wrongly Interpreted

But we do not grant that “the same day” means the third day of that third month. Jewish scholars explain that in the Hebrew “the same day” is an indefinite phrase, and cannot properly be forced to refer back to the “third month.” Unbroken Jewish tradition has understood “the same day” to mean the first day of that month.\* Thus the Gamble theory advocates are in the peculiar position of *accepting* Jewish tradition in order to establish the *first* of their three propositions, namely, that the law was proclaimed on Pentecost, and *rejecting* Jewish tradition in order to establish the *second* point, namely, that the Israelites reached Sinai on the third day of the month. This is really quite an unusual situation.

Christian commentators are generally in agreement with Jewish scholars in regard to this passage, at least as regards the point that nothing definite can be understood by “the same day.” We give one typical quotation. Lange, in his critical commentary on the Old Testament, thus observes:

“*The same day.*—According to the Jewish tradition this means on the first day of the third month, but grammatically it may be taken more indefinitely—‘at this time.’”—“*A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures,*” by John Peter Lange, translated by Philip Schaff, Vol. II of the Old Testament, p. 69.

We come now to the main part of the Gamble theory, which may be summarized in four propositions:

1. The Sabbath command simply means six days of work followed by a seventh day of rest.
2. The annual sabbaths are decalogue Sabbaths.
3. Counting “seven sabbaths” from the Passover sabbath on the fifteenth of the first month (Abib) brings us to the

---

\* Rabbi Hyamson offers the following comment:

“‘In the third month.’ The Hebrew word *hodesh* means also ‘new moon.’ Hence Exodus 19:1 might be rendered ‘on the third new moon [first day of the third month] . . . on this day they came to the wilderness of Sinai.’ For this rendering of *hodesh* compare 1 Samuel 20:18, ‘And Jonathan said to David, Tomorrow is new moon.’”

fourth day of the third month (Sivan); but the "morrow after the seventh sabbath," Sivan 5, being Pentecost, which was also sabbath, gives us an extra sabbath, and this must be placed in the "Sabbath column" in the calendar.

4. Now the command to work six days is just as mandatory as the command to rest on the seventh, therefore the double sabbath of the fourth and fifth of Sivan must be followed by six days of work before the next sabbath. This results in giving us a blank day so far as the week is concerned. And this, of course, results in eliminating the one day over fifty-two full weeks in a 365-day calendar year.

#### Propositions 1 and 2

Let us examine first propositions 1 and 2. What does the Bible say concerning the nature of Pentecost? We read: "There shall be a holy convocation unto you; ye shall do no servile work." Lev. 23:21. It is because of this statement that the calendar authors place Pentecost in the "Sabbath column" of their calendar, "since it could not, by any rational procedure, be put in any one of the work-day columns."

With this as our guide as to which days should be placed in the "Sabbath column," let us now consider some other scriptures. We read:

"In the first month [Abib], on the fourteenth day of the month at even, is Jehovah's Passover. And on the *fifteenth* day of the same month is the Feast of Unleavened Bread unto Jehovah: seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread. In the *first day* ye shall have a holy convocation: ye shall do *no servile work*." Lev. 23:5-7.

Because of this the fifteenth of Abib is placed in the "Sabbath column." But the next verse declares: "In the *seventh day* is a holy convocation; ye shall do *no servile work*." Identical language is employed to describe the nature of the "first day" and the "seventh day" of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Now if the fifteenth day is the "first day" of the feast, the twenty-first is the "seventh day" of it. And if the fifteenth belongs in the "Sabbath column," then the twenty-first belongs there also. But the Gamble theory does not place it there. Why? No explanation is given.

**Day of Atonement Destroys Theory**

Come now to the seventh month. On the strength of the command that the first, fifteenth, and twenty-second days of the seventh month were to be holy convocations to the Lord, in which "no servile work" was to be done, these three days are placed in the "Sabbath column." But the tenth day of that month, the Day of Atonement,—that day which was a "sabbath of sabbaths," to translate literally the original, on which not only "servile work," but "any manner of work," was forbidden under penalty of death,—is placed in a "work-day column." Now if Pentecost, on which only "servile work" was prohibited, "could not, by any rational procedure, be put in any one of the work-day columns," no possible sophistry can justify placing the Day of Atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, in "any one of the work-day columns." The endeavor to avoid this irresistible conclusion serves only to reveal more clearly the desperate plight in which this Atonement Day sabbath places the Gamble theory. The calendar authors strive to show an analogy between the choosing of the Passover lamb on the tenth of the first month and the Atonement Day on the tenth of the seventh month. Their objective is not quite clear, but their attempted analogy is absurd. When we read it to Rabbi Hyamson, he threw up his hands in a gesture of horror and disgust. For to all devout Jews Atonement Day holds a place far above all other annual sabbaths, and is above analogy to any other activity of the year.

The very same Bible chapter that tells us the first, fifteenth, and twenty-second days of the seventh month are sabbaths, tells us also, and in more emphatic language, that the tenth day of the month is a *sabbath* of sabbaths.

**Must Surrender Another Claim**

Furthermore, with this tenth day of the seventh month allowed to come in a "work-day column," what becomes of the interpretation that "the command to work six days is just as binding as the one to rest on the seventh"? How could a man put in six days of labor between the eighth and the fifteenth of that month, seeing he must *wholly* abstain from work on the

tenth? Simple arithmetic prevents that. Now if the Sabbath commandment does not here demand six days of work following a sabbath, then how can it be made to demand it in connection with Pentecost? But if the demand be surrendered, then the whole argument based on the "extra sabbath" at Pentecost collapses. In other words, if during the seventh month a man need work only four days between the sabbath of the tenth and the sabbath of the fifteenth, why is it necessary that during the third month he must work six days following the sabbath of the fifth (Pentecost) before he can have a sabbath day's rest again?

Therefore this marvelous calendar cannot be made to operate successfully, even when we accept the premises set forth by the authors themselves. This is truly a most remarkable situation. Propositions 1 and 2 cannot be held at the same time.

Into what confusion would those ancient Israelites have been brought had they attempted to employ the premises of this Gamble theory to the understanding of the Sabbath commandment!

Yes, and what confusion is brought to the Sunday advocates who believe these annual sabbaths are decalogue Sabbaths, and that the fourth commandment simply requires rest on a seventh day after six days of work.

### Only One Escape From Confusion

The only escape from this confusion is to reject propositions 1 and 2 as false; and to return to the age-honored interpretation of this whole Sabbath question. This interpretation is built upon certain historical facts:

1. That "from time immemorial," as the Encyclopedia Britannica phrases it,\* there has existed a unit of time measurement called the "week."

---

\* "The week is a period of seven days, having no reference whatever to the celestial motions,—a circumstance to which it owes its unalterable uniformity. . . . It has been employed from time immemorial in almost all Eastern countries; and as it forms neither an aliquot part of the year nor of the lunar month, those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at a loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign it to an origin having much semblance of probability."—Article "Calendar," Vol. IV, p. 988, *eleventh edition*.

2. That this time unit is distinct and altogether separate from the month or the year.

3. That the Jewish nation, throughout its history, employed this time unit, which was finally adopted by the whole civilized world.

4. That "the seventh day" of the Sabbath command has always been understood by the Jewish people to mean the seventh day of the week.

No facts of history are better substantiated than the foregoing. When we understand "the seventh day" in the commandment to mean the seventh day of the week, we have an interpretation that will harmonize with both history and the Bible.

#### **Propositions 3 and 4**

Now what of the claims made in propositions 3 and 4? First, let us dispose briefly of the assertion that in the Sabbath commandment, work on the six days is as definitely commanded as rest on the seventh. If the authors conscientiously believe this to be the true interpretation, they ought to raise their voices against the present trend toward a five-day week.

We have already discovered the impossibility, during the first and seventh months, of obeying a command to work six consecutive days. But worse still, a man who thus interpreted the commandment could never take a day's vacation during the six-day period. Happily for all concerned, the word "shalt," in the phrase "six days shalt thou labor," does not necessarily indicate a command. It may simply indicate permission. The Hebrew word allows of either. Context and usage determine the meaning. A comparison of various scriptures, coupled with the united and uninterrupted sense in which not only Jewish but Christian scholars have understood the term, leaves no doubt that the word "shalt" is simply permissive. We are *permitted* six days in which to work.

#### **"Sabbath" Has Various Meanings**

Applying this rule of context and usage—the proper rule to employ in examining words—to the term "sabbath," brings



us to grips with the underlying premise of this whole theory, the proper meaning of the word "sabbath." The assumption of the Gamble theory is that the word has only one meaning, and in harmony with this belief the word "Sabbath" in the decalogue is applied to the annual sabbaths.

But if mere similarity of words is sufficient proof of similarity of thought, then confusion would arise on every side. Take the word "day," for example. We employ it sometimes to mean twenty-four hours, and sometimes to mean simply the light part of the twenty-four-hour period. Again, we may use it wholly in a figurative sense, as, This is the *day* of opportunity. But there rarely need be any doubt as to the meaning intended. The context, the setting, makes it clear.

As a Biblical illustration, take the word "law." It may mean the moral, civil, and ceremonial commands contained in the books of Moses. By extension it may mean the whole of Moses' writings, as in the phrase, "the *law* and the prophets."

Such illustrations from either the Bible or everyday life might be multiplied indefinitely. Only confusion can result from a failure to remember that a word may have more than one rigid and restricted definition.

### Summary of Meanings

When we examine the term "sabbath" in this fashion, we discover, as might naturally be expected, that it has more than one meaning. The Hebrew lexicons reveal that:

1. The word "sabbath" has as its root meaning, "rest from labor."
2. The term is used primarily to denote the day of rest from labor at the close of the weekly cycle—the sense in which the word is used in the Sabbath commandment.
3. By extension, the term is used for the annual feasts, such as the Passover sabbath, etc.
4. The term is used also to mean a week, as in the phrase, "seven sabbaths shall there be complete." Lev. 23:15. The use of the word in this sense naturally grew out of the fact that the Sabbath coming at the end of each week marked off these seven-day units.

There are more senses in which the term may be used, but these are sufficient for the problem before us. (See page 207 for further comments on the value of the word "sabbath.")

Just when one definition should be employed, and when another, is no more difficult to determine than with numerous other words.

With these various definitions of the word "sabbath" before us, let us examine the pivotal text of this whole theory, the text on which proposition 3 is built:

"Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the [Passover] sabbath [the fifteenth of the first month, Abib], from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths shall there be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days." "Ye shall make proclamation on the selfsame day [that is, on the fiftieth day, Pentecost]; there shall be a holy convocation unto you; ye shall do no servile work." Lev. 23:15, 16, 21.

#### **View Held by Sadducees**

Viewing this scripture historically, we find that two interpretations have been held. About two thousand years ago there existed for a limited period a Jewish sect called the Sadducees. They held that the word "sabbath" in these texts should be understood to mean the Sabbath of the decalogue. This was one point of controversy between them and the Pharisees, who represented the accepted interpretation that has come down to our day. Because of this, the Sadducees contended that the count of the fifty days should not be begun on the sixteenth of Abib, which was "the morrow after the [Passover] sabbath" of the fifteenth; but that the count should begin on the day that followed the first decalogue Sabbath in Passover week. For example, if Passover sabbath came on Thursday, they held that "the morrow after the sabbath" was the following Sunday, because it was "the morrow after" the decalogue Sabbath. According to their interpretation,—which was held by a very limited number and for an equally limited period,—Pentecost would always come on Sunday.

But the Sadducees did not therefore believe in breaking the weekly cycle; their very interpretation forbade allowing

even the name "sabbath" to be coupled with the Passover or any other annual sabbath. To them, the very word itself as found in the fourth commandment was wholly apart from, and above, contact with annual feasts. When they came to the week-end at the close of the seven-week period after the Passover, the Sadducees simply rested from all labor on that seventh-day Sabbath and from "servile work" the first day of the next week, Pentecost. And when the seventh day of *that* week arrived, they kept Sabbath again. This was no more difficult for them to do than it is for a present-day devout Sabbath keeper to rest from labor on Saturday of one week, take a holiday on Sunday of the next week, and then rest again from labor the next Saturday.

#### **How Jewish Scholars Translate the Passage**

But when we turn to the now universally accepted understanding of these texts by all Jewish scholars, we find the Gamble theory demolished with equal completeness. This interpretation renders the phrases "seven sabbaths" and "the morrow after the seventh sabbath," as "seven weeks," and "the morrow after the seventh week." For Jewish authorities have never confused the decalogue Sabbath with annual sabbaths, and accordingly have understood that the term "sabbath" can have different meanings. For example, if Passover sabbath came on Wednesday, the fifty-day count would begin on Thursday of that week, and Pentecost would come on Thursday of the seventh week. Thus there would not even be a doubling up of sabbaths at Pentecost time. Therefore the passage utterly fails to give even a shadow of support for the spectacular theory that has been built upon it.

Furthermore, let us repeat, the translation of "sabbath" as "week" in this passage is not based upon the view of some *few* Hebrew scholars who have a particular theory to maintain, but represents the translation that has been employed through all the centuries by *all* Jewish scholars,—with the exception of the limited period when the small sect of Sadducees held a differing view,—and is today the translation employed by both Orthodox and Reformed rabbis.

In the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament completed in the second century B. C., the word "sabbath" in Leviticus 23:15, 16, is translated by the Greek word *hebdomas*, meaning "week."

Indeed, no other meaning than "week" could consistently be understood for the word "sabbath" in the phrases "seven sabbaths" and "the morrow after the seventh sabbath," in Leviticus 23:15, 16, for the parallel passage in Deuteronomy 16:9, 10, reads thus: "Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee: from the time thou beginnest to put the sickle to the standing grain shalt thou begin to number seven weeks. And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto Jehovah." The Hebrew word translated "week" in Deuteronomy 16 *cannot* be translated "sabbath." Therefore, the only way to make Leviticus and Deuteronomy harmonize is to give the meaning of "week" to "sabbath" in the passage in Leviticus 23. This, as we have already learned, may properly be done.

Furthermore, it is an interesting fact that the Jewish people use not only the word "Pentecost" to describe the feast day that comes fifty days after Passover, but they call it also the Feast of Weeks.

Directly bearing on this point is a letter received from Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of Dropsie College, Philadelphia, and an outstanding Hebrew scholar. It was written in response to our request for his views on this question:

"THE DROPSIE COLLEGE

"For Hebrew and Cognate Learning,

"Philadelphia,

"January 31, 1929.

"DEAR MR. NICHOL:

"I am in receipt of your letter of January 25. I have not the pamphlet of Dr. Marvin and Moses Cotsworth before me, although I think I saw it some time ago. There is no warrant for their theory that there was an extra Sabbath in connection with Pentecost. If you desire to see the Jewish normal interpretation of these verses, I would refer you to the translation

of the Bible issued by the Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia in 1917. I give these verses herewith: 'And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the day [Hebrew, sabbath] of rest, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the waving; seven weeks shall there be complete; even unto the morrow after the seventh week shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall present a new meal offering unto the Lord.'

"This represents a very old controversy. According to the Jewish tradition, the Biblical commandment to offer the omer 'on the morrow after the sabbath' was interpreted by the rabbis to refer to Passover, so that it means that the seven weeks should begin to be counted from the first day after the beginning of Passover. There was an early interpretation that it should begin on the first day after the first Sabbath during the Passover, which would make Pentecost always fall on Sunday. This sectarian view has completely disappeared.

"But what I would point out to you is that *even this sectarian view in no way favors the idea of a wandering Sabbath, it rather emphasizes the word 'Sabbath' so that it could not be used even for another holiday.* I can say to you most emphatically that whatever perturbations there have been concerning the Jewish calendar from the earliest period down, the one central feature was always to maintain the week of seven days without any interruption whatsoever.

"Very sincerely yours,

"[Signed] CYRUS ADLER."

Essentially the same analysis of this passage in Leviticus is given in a long letter from Dr. H. S. Linfield, of the American Jewish Committee, New York. After examining all the Bible texts employed by the calendar authors, he concludes his letter thus: "An examination of each passage has convinced the writer that there is not a shred of evidence in support of any of the claims made by the joint authors."

#### **Significance of Double Feast Days Today**

One small piece of corroborative evidence on this double-sabbath argument remains to be demolished. After declaring that in ancient times the Jews kept such a double sabbath, the authors add this persuasive item of news: "The significant fact remains, that through traditional usage the Jews generally con-



tinue to observe two days at the feast of Pentecost." In reply we inquire: If at the present time a devout Jew can observe two days at Pentecost without breaking the cycle of the week, why could he not have done so anciently?

The fact is that when the Jews were dispersed from Palestine, they began the custom of keeping two days in connection with *each* annual sabbath—excepting Atonement Day—for fear that in their calculating of the new moons they might have made an error in determining the beginning of a month. (The explanation for the failure to observe the two days in connection with Atonement Day is that it would have necessitated forty-eight hours of complete fast.) By the time a calendar had been agreed upon by the "Dispersed" throughout the world,—which was somewhere about the fourth century A. D.,—the custom of celebrating two days for each annual sabbath had become so firmly established that it was retained by most Jews. This second day that is kept in connection with each of the annual sabbaths is described in Hebrew by a phrase which, translated literally, means: "The second day feast of the exile." This is a familiar phrase in Talmudic lore.

#### An Argument for Us

Therefore, for the purposes the *authors* intended, "the significant fact" of the double sabbaths now kept by Jews in various lands, has *no* significance. Instead it has a significance on *our* side of the argument. The very fact that the reckoning of months presented such difficulties when the Jews moved from Palestine, reveals the absolute confusion into which the Sabbath institution would have been thrown if it had been related to the months, as this unwarranted Gamble theory contends. Only by being connected with a time cycle, the week, that runs independently of calendars, could the Sabbath of the moral code, whose precepts have world-wide application, be successfully kept in various lands. Only by connecting it with the cycle of the week could the identity of the Sabbath be retained, for the week is unique in that it has come down through the centuries independent of calendars. No matter where the "Dispersed" of Israel have been located, and no mat-

ter what their difficulties have been in keeping the reckoning of the annual feasts that are dependent on months, they have never had any uncertainty as to which day is "the seventh day" of the commandment, for the sun sets regularly each night in each land. The Jews of the Dispersion have never had any controversy with the Palestinian Jews as to which is the seventh day of the week. They have never differed in their observance of the decalogue Sabbath. And why need they, for could not the Jews in Spain, for example, count the cycles of seven sunsets as easily as the Jews in Palestine?

We discover, therefore, from an examination of Jewish history and from a study of the different senses in which the word "sabbath" may properly be understood, that the arguments built upon Leviticus 23:15, 16, have no foundation.

But let us take the matter a little further. The very fact that there are different senses in which the word may be employed, and that basically it means simply "rest from labor," demands that the phrase, "the seventh day," in the Sabbath command, possess an unmistakable definiteness.

#### **Different Sabbaths Distinguished**

The authors of the revived Gamble theory endeavor to give definiteness to this phrase by attempting to place the decalogue Sabbath in a fixed relationship to the months. We have already offered an abundance of proof that this cannot be done. We wish to offer still further proof by summarizing the command for the decalogue Sabbath alongside the commands for the annual sabbaths. When Jehovah proclaimed the Sabbath commandment, the Israelites listened to these identifying facts:

1. Six days shall work be done.
2. The seventh day is the rest day of Jehovah—no work shall be done.
3. In six days Jehovah created the earth, and rested the seventh day.
4. Jehovah hallowed this day, that is, set it apart for a holy use.

Later, when Moses instructed the children of Israel as to the annual feast days (see Leviticus 23), they received these facts:

1. On the fifteenth and twenty-first days of the first month—first and last days, respectively, of the Feast of Unleavened Bread—"no servile work" shall be done.

2. On the fiftieth day from "the morrow after the" fifteenth of the first month—known later as Pentecost—there shall be a special ceremony of offering "two wave loaves"—"no servile work" shall be done.

3. On the first day of the seventh month there shall be a memorial of blowing of trumpets—"no servile work" shall be done.

4. On the tenth day of the seventh month there shall be the Day of Atonement—"ye shall do no manner of work."

5. On the fifteenth and twenty-second days of the seventh month—the beginning and end of the Feast of Tabernacles—"no servile work" shall be done.

#### **Strong Contrasts in Sabbaths**

Other distinguishing characteristics might be enumerated, but these will suffice to provide more than enough material for a series of strong reasons why the decalogue Sabbath and the annual sabbaths, such as the Passover, etc., are not the same:

1. If the two kinds of sabbaths are the same, and the Feast of Trumpets, for example, on the first day of the seventh month, was a decalogue Sabbath, why was it necessary for Moses solemnly to inform the hosts of Israel that the opening day of the Feast of Tabernacles, on the fifteenth of the month, was also a Sabbath? Could not even the simplest have comprehended that if the first of the month is a Sabbath, two cycles of seven would cause the fifteenth to be a Sabbath also? Or more incredible still, if the opening day of the Feast of Tabernacles on the fifteenth was a decalogue Sabbath, how utterly pointless for Moses to inform them that the closing day of that feast on the twenty-second was a Sabbath also. Any one capable of counting up to seven would have known that already, for is not fifteen plus seven twenty-two?

Indeed, if the Israelites were so hopelessly dull witted as to necessitate such specific instruction as to what date in the month was seven days later than the fifteenth, would they not also need to be instructed as to what date came seven days later than the twenty-second, and so on throughout the year?

Why single out one month, the seventh month, at that? Why wait until the year is half over before giving them detailed information? The very fact that Moses so solemnly announced the fifteenth and twenty-second days of the seventh month as sabbaths, reveals clearly that these dates were not automatically sabbaths by virtue of the fourth commandment.

2. The fact has already been noted—but is so conclusive as to justify repeating it in this summary—that the annual sabbaths are not generally separated by seven-day periods, and no possible arrangement of dates can make them all come in that sequence.

3. The reasons given for observing these various sabbaths are different. The decalogue Sabbath was to be a holy rest day because “in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day.” But the first day of the seventh month, for example, was to be a day of rest because it was the Feast of Trumpets; and the tenth day of that month, because it was Atonement Day; and the fifteenth and twenty-second, because they were the opening and closing dates of the Feast of Tabernacles. In the case of the decalogue Sabbath, the reason for its observance remained the same continually. But with the annual sabbaths the reason is different in each case.

Now, when the Israelites learned that they were to do no servile work on the fifteenth and twenty-second of the seventh month, *because* these dates marked the beginning and end of the Feast of Tabernacles, what possible reason was there for them to conclude that they should rest also on the eighth or the twenty-ninth of that month, for example, seeing that these dates marked neither the beginning nor the end of any feast? Rather would they reach the very opposite conclusion.

4. The very fact that it was necessary to command the people to refrain from work on each of these annual feasts, reveals that they were not decalogue Sabbaths; for the fourth commandment already forbade “any work” on the “seventh-day” decalogue Sabbaths.

5. The decalogue Sabbath is specifically connected with a time unit of seven days, which, according to the Bible and the best secular authorities, has been employed by the Jews and various



other Eastern peoples "from time immemorial." But the annual sabbaths were specifically connected with a time reckoning that began at the exodus, for that was "the beginning of months" for the Israelites. It was then that their months received distinguishing titles, "first month" and "seventh month," for example. (See Ex. 12:1, 2.) Each feast was to be on a certain day of a certain *month*.

When we consider "the seventh day" Sabbath in terms of the week, then are we able to harmonize theology, philology (the science which deals with the meanings of words), and the understanding of the commandment by the Jewish race through all their history.

### **The Word "Week" Analyzed**

Take the word "week." This word, when found in the Old Testament, comes from a root meaning "seven." To reveal the close relationship between these two terms, it should be explained that in ancient Hebrew only the consonants were written. The context, the setting of the word in the sentence, enabled the reader to know which of the possible variant meanings should be understood in each case. Written in this fashion without vowels, the words translated "seven" and "week" are identical. Thus the ancient scribe had to decide by the context whether to give it one pronunciation and read it as "seven," or give it a little different pronunciation and read it as "week," for in the spoken language there was a slight difference in pronunciation.

To be more exact, when the hearer listened to the word as pronounced for "week," there was really conveyed to his mind the thought of "sevenfold," "a combination of seven," or "sevened," which would be a very literal way of translating the Hebrew word for "week." Thus embedded in the very roots of that ancient language is found one of the strongest proofs, not only of the existence, but of the great antiquity of a time cycle of seven days.

### **A Contradiction of Terms**

To have spoken to an ancient Hebrew of a week of eight days, for example, would have sounded in his ears like a con-



tradition of terms, for how could eight be "sevenfold"? It would have been as inaccurate as for one unacquainted with the English language to speak of a fortnight of sixteen days, for the word fortnight is a contraction of "*fourteen* nights."

This important fact as to the meaning of the Hebrew word makes altogether irrelevant the extended comments and tables in the Gamble book regarding the eight-day weeks of certain pagan peoples and the nine-day weeks of others. We are no more concerned with the many time cycles of these peoples than we are with their many gods.

The Scriptures themselves speak of the week long before the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai. Laban said to his son-in-law Jacob with regard to Leah: "Fulfill her week" Gen. 29:27. The history of Jewish customs reveals that this phrase refers to the week of wedding festivities which were considered a part of the ceremony, and which lasted seven days. A comparison with verse 22 shows that the feast had been called, and a comparison with various other scriptures reveals the custom of holding feasts seven days. Thus does the Bible itself corroborate strongly the undisputed understanding of this passage as given by the historians of Jewish customs. And thus does the Bible corroborate the united statements of learned authorities, that the week has been known "from time immemorial."

#### **What Other Conclusion?**

The hosts who gathered at Sinai were a people whose ancestor Jacob was well acquainted with the time cycle called the week, and whose very language employed a term meaning "a combination of seven" to describe that cycle. What, then, would be their most natural conclusion when they listened to Jehovah speak twice in the Sabbath commandment of a cycle of seven days—six days shalt thou labor, but the seventh day is the Sabbath—in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh? In the absence of any declaration to the contrary, would they not most obviously conclude that "the seventh day" meant the seventh day of the week, that long-established combination of seven days? To that most natural conclusion Jews everywhere through all the centuries have come.

And to what other conclusion could they rationally have been expected to come, seeing they knew nothing of the Gamble calendar! We are therefore prepared to take our leave of this revived Gamble theory. But wait, there is one more piece of evidence that is triumphantly presented as a sort of capstone to the argument.

#### **The Case Summed Up**

This capstone consists of an alleged proof—independent of the main line of argument—that the second year of the Mosaic calendar began on a Sabbath. In order properly to introduce this last point, we should summarize briefly the whole series of propositions that the calendar authors have reared up:

1. If the Mosaic calendar was a 365-day solar calendar (but virtually all authorities declare it was not); and,

2. If Moses divided this 365-day calendar on the basic plan of the Egyptian calendar (but for this there is not the slightest proof); and,

3. If Moses placed three supplementary days at the end of the sixth month and two at the end of the twelfth (but for this there is no proof whatever); and,

4. If the Sabbath commandment means simply one day of rest following six days of labor (but evidence shows it does not mean this); and,

5. If the command to work six days is as compulsory as the command to rest the seventh (but it is not); and,

6. If the Passover sabbath came on the fifteenth of the first month, then the first day of the first month of the first year came on a sabbath, because it was exactly two weeks earlier (but the Passover sabbath was not a decalogue Sabbath, and therefore counting back from it by sevens proves nothing); and,

7. If the Israelites reached Sinai on the third day of the third month (but this is an assumption incapable of proof); and,

8. If the three-day period in preparation for the giving of the law began on the third day of the third month (but this also is sheer assumption); and,

9. If there was a double sabbath at Pentecost, with the extra sabbath not counted in the cycle of the week (but there was no such extra sabbath outside the week);

10. Thus and thus only could the first day of the second year begin on the same week day as the first year.

11. Now with the point already proved that the first day of the first year began on Sabbath (but the point has been fully disproved); therefore,

12. If we can prove from independent evidence that the second year began on a Sabbath, we will have provided a convincing demonstration that our argument concerning a blank day in the Mosaic calendar is correct!!

### The Capstone Examined

And what is this clinching demonstration that is to give the final proof to a theory that has been refuted at every step—this evidence that the second year began on a Sabbath? Here it is: The command to set the showbread in order every Sabbath, is cited (Lev. 4:8), and then the following passage is quoted:

*"It came to pass in the first month in the second year, on the first day of the month, that the tabernacle was reared up. . . . And He [Aaron] put the table in the tent of meeting, upon the side of the tabernacle northward, without the veil. And he set the bread in order upon it before Jehovah; as Jehovah commanded Moses."* Ex. 40:17-23. (Italics theirs.)

But the authors have quoted only part of the scripture. Let us give the whole passage:

*"It came to pass in the first month in the second year, on the first day of the month, that the tabernacle was reared up. And Moses reared up the tabernacle, and laid its sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bars thereof, and reared up its pillars. And he spread the tent over the tabernacle, and put the covering of the tent above upon it; as Jehovah commanded Moses. And he took and put the testimony into the ark, and set the staves on the ark, and put the mercy seat above upon the ark: and he brought the ark into the tabernacle, and set up the veil of the screen, and screened the ark of the testimony; as Jehovah commanded Moses. And he put the table in the tent of meeting, upon the side of the tabernacle northward, without the veil. And he set the bread in order upon it before Jehovah; as Jehovah commanded Moses."* Ex. 40:17-23.

### The Capstone Collapses

When the whole scripture is quoted, the matter assumes a very different aspect. Moses and his helpers were certainly

tremendously busy that first day of the first month of the second year. The scene around the tabernacle must have been one of great physical activity, of diligent work, as the sockets were laid, the boards set up, the bars put in, the pillars reared up, the tent spread over, and the covering put above it,—to recount only a part of the work that was done.

If that were proper to do on the Sabbath day, we would have an excellent precedent for building churches on the Sabbath. But then what would become of the command not to do "any work" on that holy day? And how would the Israelites be able to harmonize such labor with the warning that prefaced the whole episode of tabernacle building? For when Moses descended from the mount with the plans for the sanctuary, as recorded in the end of the thirty-fourth chapter, he assembled all the people together to invite their participation in the making of the tabernacle; and from the opening of the thirty-fifth chapter to the close of the fortieth, the record deals exclusively with the construction of this center of worship. And thus is the whole narrative introduced:

"Moses assembled all the congregation of the children of Israel, and said unto them, These are the words which Jehovah hath commanded, that ye should do them. Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a Sabbath of solemn rest to Jehovah: whosoever doeth any work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." Ex. 35:1-3.

Then follows immediately the description of plans for the tabernacle, which, as we have already noted, must have called for an immense amount of physical labor. Jehovah left no uncertainty in the minds of the people as to the specific relationship of the Sabbath command to the task of building the house of the Lord, for He warned them immediately before they began this great task, that the seventh day should be a "Sabbath of solemn rest." Therefore the passage quoted by the authors as a climax to their whole argument, and as an irrefutable proof that the first day of the second year was a Sabbath, fails utterly to aid them. In fact, it proves the very



opposite from what they intended—it proves that the first day of the second year was *not* a Sabbath.

### No Conflict in Commands

And now, lest some one should feel that the fact that this first day of the second year was not a Sabbath presents a difficulty because of the command to set the showbread in order on the Sabbath, let us make a few observations. A command as to any feature of routine ritual cannot become operative until *after* the ritual is established. For example, the Lord declared to Abraham: "He that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised." Gen. 17:12. Then follows this statement: "Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him." Verse 23. Should we therefore conclude that there was no "male among the men of Abraham's house" who was more than an infant of eight days? The very next verses specifically declare that Abraham himself was ninety-nine years old and Ishmael thirteen at this time. Did Abraham therefore go contrary to the command of God? No. The law as to the age at circumcision applied, *not* to the *instituting* of the rite, but to the operation of it once it had been instituted.

Thus with the showbread. The solemn rite of *changing* the bread each Sabbath could not apply until there was bread on the table to change. And in fact the whole series of instructions regarding the ritual of the tabernacle, as given in Leviticus 24, most obviously could not apply until *after* the tabernacle was completed and set in operation.

But an even more simple answer can be given by declaring that there is no proof that the showbread was set in order on that first day. The whole passage from the seventeenth to the thirty-third verse deals with the final work of rearing up the tabernacle from the material that had been furnished. That series of verses relates a great number of acts that might conceivably have taken several days. To declare that they must all have taken place on the one date mentioned at the beginning of the passage, is to make an assumption that is impossible of



proof. It is similar to the argument the authors attempted to draw out of the nineteenth chapter of Exodus. But assumption is of the essence of this Gamble theory, and it remains assumption to the end.

Cotsworth and Marvin assure us calmly that this marvelous calendar they have been describing was lost by the Jews when they went into Babylonian captivity. Just why seventy years in Babylon should cause them to abandon so vital, so remarkable, a method of time reckoning is not made clear! Indeed, the authors do not even divulge to us how the Jews lost this calendar during the exile. We shall therefore not attempt to pry into the matter.

But Mr. Gamble, who brought forth the original form of the theory, has a very detailed theory as to the change from the alleged fixed sabbaths to free-running weekly Sabbaths. He claims that Christ kept the fixed sabbaths like other Jews until the time of His death, but that when He arose that Sunday morning, it was the beginning of a new order of Sabbaths. Mr. Gamble reaches this conclusion by translating the phrase "the first day of the week" (in Matthew 28:1 and parallel passages in the Gospels), as "the first of the Sabbaths," or "the chiefest of the Sabbaths."

In the next chapter, entitled, "Should 'First Day of the Week' Read 'First of the Sabbaths' in Matthew 28:1?" we shall deal with this point.

## SHOULD "FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK" READ "FIRST OF THE SABBATHS" IN MATTHEW 28:1?

WE concluded the preceding chapter on the theory of Mr. Gamble with the statement that he endeavored to prove the transition from the fixed sabbaths of his alleged Mosaic calendar to the Sunday of the free-running week, by giving a different translation to Matthew 28:1 and parallel passages. We deal with this point in a separate chapter because, in a sense, it is a separate argument for Sunday observance. Many opponents of the Sabbath, who do not attempt to build any case on the Gamble claims of ancient fixed sabbaths, bring forth impressively the argument that "the first day of the week" (Matt. 28:1) should be translated "the first of the Sabbaths," or "one of the Sabbaths," and that this indicates that the apostles spoke of the resurrection Sunday as the first of a new order of Sabbaths.

The basis of the contention by Mr. Gamble and those who have followed him, is that the Greek word *sabbaton* translated "week" in Matthew 28:1 and parallel passages, should never thus be 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: Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 18:12; 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 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 Gamble claim. But that two different time periods should be described by the same term is not peculiar to the Greek. As noted in the last chapter, we describe the twelve-hour period, the twenty-four 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 "Sabbaton"**

"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. XII, p. 481, 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*, Vol. IV, p. 2484, art. "Week" (ed. 1891).

"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*, p. 936, art. "Time" (ed. 1924).

"The Hebrew *shabhua*, 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 (*sabbaton*, -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*, Vol. V, p. 2982, art. "Time" (ed. 1915).

"The plural *sabbata* . . . means a week as well as a Sabbath or Sabbaths (comp. Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; and Matt. 28:1). . . . *Sabbata* in the second clause [of Matt. 28:1] certainly means 'week' and not the Sabbath day."—"A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures," by John Peter Lange, 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.

Mr. Gamble 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 Gamble contention is based on the fact that in the Greek the word "day" is not found in the phrase "first day of the week." This phrase in Matthew 28:1 is in the original, *mian sabbatōn*. Concerning its proper translation eminent theologians and Greek scholars of Sunday-keeping denominations have written. As far back as the year 1899, when Gamble first brought out his theory, the claim for Sunday built upon this revised translation of *mian sabbatōn* was exploded by a writer in the *Methodist Review*. We quote briefly from his article:

#### "Fool's Gold"

"This widely heralded Klondike discovery as to *mian sabbatōn* 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 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 *mian* is in the feminine gender, and an immutable law requires adjective modifiers to agree with their nouns in gender. *Sabbatōn* 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 *hēmera*, 'day,' as analogously it is found in Mark 14:12, *prōtē hēmera tōn azumōn*, '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 Sabbatarians rejoice,  
Lest the daughters of the Saturdarians triumph."

—Dr. Wilbur Fletcher Steele, in an article, "Must Syntax Die That the Sabbath May Live?" in the *Methodist Review*, New York, May-June, 1899.

#### Greek Scholar Examines Whole Group of "First Day" Texts

As recently as 1931 this question of *mian sabbatōn* was raised by an inquirer in *The Expositor*, a widely circulated preachers' journal. *The Expositor* has a question-and-answer feature entitled "Expositions," conducted by Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D., who is widely regarded as one of the most eminent of modern Greek scholars, and who is the author of a number of works on Biblical Greek, including an exhaustive grammar. Professor Robertson holds 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*



*sabbatōn*' (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, Tex."

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

"Now about the case of *sabbatōn* 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 *tēn hebdomēn Sabbata caloumen*. We call the seventh day Sabbath.) Precisely this usage occurs in the New Testament, as in Luke 4:16, 'on the Sabbath day,' *en tē hēmera tōn Sabbatōn*. 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\* with the Sabbath. So in Mark 16:9 we have *prōi prōtē sabbatou*, early on the first day of the week. Here *prōi* is an adverb, but *prōtē* is a feminine adjective, locative, singular, agreeing with *hēmera* (day) understood, while *sabbatou* is neuter gender, genitive, singular, so that it is impossible to render this 'early on the first Sabbath.' 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, *tē de mia tōn sabbatōn*, 'on the first day of the week.' There we have *mia* used as an ordinal like *prōtē*, as is common in the *Koinē*. The same use of both *mia* for 'first' and the plural *sabbatōn* 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 by Dr. Robertson in *The Expositor*, October, 1931.

**A Suggestion on Meeting Quibbles**

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 than they are, we believe 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 rendering of the scripture should be given.

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 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 hears 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.

## **EVIDENCE OF THE ANTIQUITY AND THE UNBROKEN SEQUENCE OF THE WEEKLY CYCLE**

THE recent agitation for calendar revision served the very useful purpose of placing eminent astronomers on record concerning the antiquity and the unbroken sequence of the weekly cycle. Never before in the Christian era has a proposition turned so directly on the question of the validity of the week as an ancient, unbroken time cycle. Much money was spent to promote the proposed new calendar, and arguments ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous were employed in an attempt to break down the opposition.

The most significant fact that stands out of the whole discussion is that the proponents of calendar revision did not include in their varied arguments any claim that the weekly cycle had been broken or that time had been lost. If they could have made and supported such a claim, it would have demolished with one stroke all the appeals of Jews or Seventh-day Adventists for the preservation of the unbroken week; for why be zealous to preserve the week of today if it has been broken in the past? This silence of the calendar advocates on the question of the weekly cycle must ever stand as one of the most eloquent proofs that the weekly cycle has not been broken. This fact may very properly be stressed in discussing "lost time" with any one.

But more than that, various astronomers, when asked to express their scientific opinion as to the wisdom of a new calendar which included a feature that broke the weekly cycle, opposed the change on the ground that this cycle should not be tampered with. Their comments are found in the official League of Nations document entitled: "Report on the Reform of the Calendar, Submitted to the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations by the Special Committee of Enquiry Into the Reform of the Cal-

endar." This document was published at Geneva, August 17, 1926. Following are quotations from their statements, with the page number of this Calendar Report noted at the end of each quotation:

#### Testimony of Astronomers

"The reform would break the division of the week which has been followed for thousands of years, and therefore has been hallowed by immemorial use."—*M. Anders Donner, formerly Professor of Astronomy at the University of Helsingfors, page 51.*

"One essential point is that of the continuity of the week. The majority of the members of the Office of Longitudes considered that the reform of the calendar should not be based on the breaking of this continuity. They considered that it would be highly undesirable to interrupt a continuity which has existed for so many centuries."—*M. Émile Picard, Permanent Secretary of the Academy of Sciences [France], President of the Office of Longitudes, p. 51.*

"I have always hesitated to suggest breaking the continuity of the week, which is without a doubt the most ancient scientific institution bequeathed to us by antiquity."—*M. Edouard Bailaud, Director of the Paris Observatory, p. 52.*

"It is very inadvisable to interrupt by means of blank days the absolute continuity of the weeks—the only guaranty in the past, present, and future of an efficient control of chronological facts."—*Frederico Oom, Director of the Astronomical Observatory of Lisbon, Portugal, p. 74.*

*Nature*, the leading scientific journal of Great Britain, in an editorial department entitled, "Our Astronomical Column," carried an item, "Calendar Reform," in which the proposed blank-day calendar was discussed. We quote in part as follows:

"The interruption of the regular sequence of weeks, which have now been running without a break for some three thousand years, excites the antagonism of a number of people. Some of these (the Jews, and also many Christians) accept the week as of divine institution, with which it is unlawful to tamper;

others, without these scruples, still feel that it is useful to maintain a time unit that, unlike all others, has proceeded in an absolutely invariable manner since what may be called the dawn of history. This view found strong support at the meeting of the International Astronomical Union at Rome in 1922."—*June 6, 1931.*

### Different Calendars Agree on Week

A very strong proof that the count of the week has not been lost during the Christian era, is the fact that while Jews, Christians, and Moslems keep different calendars, they all agree on the order of the days of the week. On this point, Samuel M. Zwemer, D. D., widely known authority on Mohammedanism, and a professor at Princeton University, writing under the title, "An Egyptian Government Almanac," says in part:

"Some years ago I wrote an article on 'The Clock, the Calendar, and the Koran,' showing that the religion which Mohammed founded bears everywhere the imprint of his life and character. The connection between the clock, the calendar, and the Koran may not appear obvious to the Western reader, but to those living in Egypt and the Orient the connection is perfectly evident. Both the clock and the calendar are regulated by the book of the Prophet. The Moslem calendar . . . is fixed according to the laws of the Koran and orthodox tradition, based upon the practice of Mohammed himself.

"This connection and confusion of the clock, the calendar, and the Koran brings about the result that the *only* time reckoning on which Christians, Moslems, and Jews *agree* in the Orient is that of the *days of the week*. These are numbered and called by their numbers, save Friday and Saturday, which are known as the 'day of the assembling,' and the 'day of the Sabbath.'"—*The United Presbyterian, September 26, 1929.*

### Julian and Gregorian Calendars

The relation of the calendar change—Julian to Gregorian—to the weekly cycle is stated briefly in the Catholic Encyclopedia. It is most appropriate to quote from this Catholic work, for the calendar change was made by a pope. This is the only calendar change in the Christian era. The quotation follows:



"It is to be noted that in the Christian period the order of days of the week has never been interrupted. Thus, when Gregory XIII reformed the calendar, in 1582, Thursday, 4 October, was followed by Friday, 15 October. So in England, in 1752, Wednesday, 2 September, was followed by Thursday, 14 September."—*Vol. III, p. 740, art. "Chronology."*

#### **Correspondence With an American Astronomer**

Still further evidence that time has not been lost, and that the weekly cycle has in no way been affected by any calendar change, is contained in letters received from two eminent astronomers. Under date of February 25, 1932, we wrote to Dr. A. James Robertson, Director, American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, at the Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.

The astronomer who is the director of the Nautical Almanac, or the American Ephemeris, as it is generally known, to distinguish it from the British Nautical Almanac, must always be a man in the very first rank of his profession, for it is the computations found in this weighty volume, published annually, that govern navigation for all American ships.

Following is the major part of our letter to him:

"DEAR DR. ROBERTSON:

"I have just been reading statements by various astronomers of Europe to the effect that the weekly cycle has come down to us unbroken from very ancient times; in other words, that the seventh day of our present week, for example, is identical with the seventh day of the week of Bible times. I write therefore to inquire:

---

On the opposite page is a reproduction of the calendar year 1582 A. D., in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, the countries that complied immediately with the calendar-revision decree of Pope Gregory XIII. The light-face type indicates the Julian calendar, and the bold-face, the Gregorian. The calendar change called for the dropping of ten days. This was effected by causing October 4, Julian reckoning, to be followed immediately by October 15, Gregorian reckoning. But there was no break in the weekly cycle. The people retired Thursday night, October 4, Julian reckoning, and awakened next morning to find it Friday, October 15, Gregorian reckoning.

JANUARY							JULY						
Su.	Mo.	Tu.	We.	Th.	Fr.	Sa.	Su.	Mo.	Tu.	We.	Th.	Fr.	Sa.
....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
28	29	30	31	....	....	....	29	30	31	....	....	....	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
FEBRUARY							AUGUST						
....	....	....	....	1	2	3	....	....	1	2	3	4	....
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
25	26	27	28	....	....	....	26	27	28	29	30	31	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
MARCH							SEPTEMBER						
....	....	....	....	1	2	3	....	....	....	....	....	1	....
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	30	....	....	....	....	....	....
APRIL							OCTOBER						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	....	1	2	3	4	15	16
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	31	....	....	....	....	....	....
29	30	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
MAY							NOVEMBER						
....	....	1	2	3	4	5	....	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
27	28	29	30	31	....	....	28	29	30	....	....	....	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
JUNE							DECEMBER						
....	....	....	....	1	2	....	....	....	1	2	3	4	....
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	26	27	28	29	30	31	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....

THE YEAR 1582 A. D. IN SPAIN, PORTUGAL, AND ITALY

JANUARY							JULY						
Su.	Mo.	Tu.	We.	Th.	Fr.	Sa.	Su.	Mo.	Tu.	We.	Th.	Fr.	Sa.
....	....	....	1	2	3	4	....	....	....	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	....	26	27	28	29	30	31	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
FEBRUARY							AUGUST						
....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	30	31	....	....	....	....	....
MARCH							SEPTEMBER						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	....	....	1	2	14	15	16
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
29	30	31	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
APRIL							OCTOBER						
....	....	....	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
26	27	28	29	30	....	....	29	30	31	....	....	....	....
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
MAY							NOVEMBER						
....	....	....	....	....	1	2	....	....	....	1	2	3	4
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	26	27	28	29	30	....	....
31	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
JUNE							DECEMBER						
....	1	2	3	4	5	6	....	....	....	....	1	2	....
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
28	29	30	....	....	....	....	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
....	....	....	....	....	....	....	31	....	....	....	....	....	....

THE YEAR 1752 A. D. IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES.

"1. Do you concur in these statements regarding the antiquity and unbroken sequence of the week? Or, to state the matter negatively, Have any of your investigations of past time given you any reason to doubt these statements?

"2. Have the changes in our calendar in past centuries affected in any way the cycle of the week?

"3. To make my inquiry very concrete: According to the Bible record and the universal belief of Christians, Christ was crucified on a Friday and lay in the tomb on Saturday, which was 'the Sabbath day according to the commandment' (Luke 23:56). My question is this: Is the Saturday of our present time the lineal descendant in unbroken cycles of seven from that Saturday mentioned in the record of the crucifixion?"

Dr. Robertson replied under date of March 12, 1932. The portion of his reply that relates to inquiries concerning the weekly cycle is as follows:

"Your letter of 25 February, 1932, containing questions on the continuity of the weekly cycle, is at hand.

"As to question 1, I can only state that in connection with the proposed simplification of the calendar, we have had occasion to investigate the results of the works of specialists in chronology, and we have never found one of them that has ever had the slightest doubt about the continuity of the weekly cycle since long before the Christian era.

"As to question 2, there has been no change in our calendar in past centuries that has affected in any way the cycle of the week.

"As to question 3, the answer is implied in the answer given to question 1."

(See next page for a photographic reproduction of his whole letter.)

---

On the opposite page is a reproduction of the calendar year 1752 A. D., in English countries. England and certain other countries did not obey the pope's decree in 1582, but continued to operate under the Julian calendar until 1752. By this date it was necessary to drop out eleven days in order to adjust the reckoning. The light-face type is Julian reckoning, and the boldface Gregorian. Again it will be noted that there was no break in the weekly cycle. The people retired Wednesday night, September 2 of the Julian calendar, and awakened Thursday morning, September 14 of the Gregorian calendar.

N. N. Ob. 35

IN REPLY ADDRESS NOT THE SIGNER  
OF THIS LETTER, BUT  
SUPERINTENDENT, NAVAL OBSERVATORY  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

REFER TO No.

NAVY DEPARTMENT  
U. S. NAVAL OBSERVATORY  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
12 March 1932

EN23/H5(14)(1)

Inclosures. 2.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of 25 February, 1932, containing questions on the continuity of the weekly cycle is at hand.

As to Question (1) - I can only state that in connection with the proposed simplification of the calendar, we have had occasion to investigate the results of the works of specialists in chronology and we have never found one of them that has ever had the slightest doubt about the continuity of the weekly cycle since long before the Christian era.

As to Question (2) - There has been no change in our calendar in past centuries that has affected in any way the cycle of the week.

As to Question (3) - The answer is implied in the answer given to question (1).

Through the courtesy of the Superintendent, Captain Hellweg, I am inclosing an article on Calendar Reform, published by Admiral Upham, that might be of interest to you.

I am also returning your very interesting debate with Mr. Eastman. It was very considerate of you, for which, I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

*James Robertson*  
James Robertson,

Director American Ephemeris.

Mr. F.D. Nichol,  
The Advent Review & Sabbath Herald,  
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.



**Correspondence With a British Astronomer**

On February 25, 1932, a letter of inquiry concerning the weekly cycle and its relation to calendar change, etc., was addressed also to Sir Frank W. Dyson, Astronomer Royal of Great Britain, under whose direction is the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, London. We quote from his reply, bearing date of March 4, 1932:

"As far as I know, in the various changes of the calendar there has been no change in the seven-day rota of the week, which has come down from very early times. There have been attempts in the French Revolution and in Russia to alter this cycle.

"In the 'Nautical Almanac' for 1931, p. 740, in the last paragraph, a very learned chronologist, Dr. Fotheringham, states, 'When we come upon clear evidence, the period of seven days was reckoned independently of the month, and in fact of all astronomical periods. From the Jewish Church it passed into the Christian church.'"

(See next page for a photographic reproduction of this letter.)

**Simplify "Lost Time" Problem**

It will be noted that astronomers and others speak with certainty concerning the continuity of the weekly cycle "since long before the Christian era," to borrow the words of Dr. Robertson of the U. S. Naval Observatory. There is no need that we carry the question of "lost time" back before the beginning of our era, for the following reasons: All agree that the weekly cycle was employed in Palestine at that time, and all Sunday-keeping peoples base their belief on the fact that Christ arose on the first day of the week. Now the Bible plainly states that the day preceding that first day was "the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. Thus the seventh day of the weekly cycle in the first century of the Christian era was the "seventh day" of the Sabbath command. Accordingly, it is quite unnecessary to present evidence against "lost time" for the centuries preceding Christ.

Communications  
should be  
addressed to the  
ASTRONOMER ROYAL.



Royal Observatory, Greenwich,

London, S.E.10.

4th. March, 1932.

F.D. Nichol Esq.,  
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald,  
Takoma Park,  
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Dear Sir,

As far as I know, in the various changes of the Calendar there has been no change in the seven day rota of the week, which has come down from very early times. There have been attempts in the French revolution and in Russia to alter this cycle.

"  
In the 'Nautical Almanac' for 1931, p.740, in the last paragraph, a very learned chronologist, Dr. Fotheringham, states - "When we come upon clear evidence, the period of seven days was reckoned independently of the month and in fact of all astronomical periods. From the Jewish Church it passed into the Christian Church".

You will see from this statement that no astronomical evidence connected with seven day period can be given.

Yours faithfully,

*F.W. Dixon*

Astronomer Royal.

## AN EXPLANATION OF THE ORIGINAL WORDS FROM WHICH "SOUL" AND "SPIRIT" ARE TRANSLATED\*

### "Soul" in the Old Testament

IN the Old Testament the word "soul" is used 473 times. There are three words in the Hebrew from which "soul" is translated:

- 1 time from *nedibah*.
- 1 time from *neshamah*.
- 471 times from *nephesh*.

These three terms are translated by the following words in our English Bible:

#### *Nedibah*

- 1 time, "soul." Job 30:15. (The only use of *nedibah* in the Bible.)

#### *Neshamah*

- 17 times, "breath" (breathe, breatheth, breathed). For example: Gen. 2:7; 7:22; Deut. 20:16; Joshua 10:40; 11:11.
- 3 times, "blast." 2 Sam. 22:16; Job 4:9; Ps. 18:15.
- 2 times, "spirit." Job 26:4; Prov. 20:27.
- 1 time, "souls." Isa. 57:16.
- 1 time, "inspiration." Job 32:8.

---

\* In one or two instances the figures given to indicate the specific number of times that a Hebrew or Greek term is translated by a certain English word, will vary, depending on which concordance is used as authority. The figures in this chapter have been obtained from a comparative study of The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, The Englishman's Greek Concordance, Young's Analytical Concordance, and Strong's Exhaustive Concordance. However, the fact of interest is not the particular number of times that a certain term is translated by a particular English word, but the great *variety* of words by which the Hebrew or Greek term is rendered.

*Nephesh*

- 471 times, "soul." (Every text in Old Testament where "soul" is used, except Job 30:15 and Isaiah 57:16.)
- 118 times, "life" (life's, lives). For example: Gen. 1:20, 30; 9:4; 1 Kings 19:14; Job 6:11; Ps. 38:12.
- 29 times, "person." For example: Num. 31:19; 35:11, 15, 30; Deut. 27:25; Joshua 20:3, 9; 1 Sam. 22:22.
- 15 times, "mind." For example: Deut. 18:6; Jer. 15:1.
- 15 times, "heart." For example: Ex. 23:9; Prov. 23:7.
- 9 times, "creature." Gen. 1:21, 24; 2:19; 9:10, 12, 15, 16; Lev. 11:46.
- 7 times, "body" (or, dead body). Lev. 21:11; Num. 6:6; 9:6, 7, 10; 19:13; Haggai 2:13.
- 5 times, "dead." Lev. 19:28; 21:1; 22:4; Num. 5:2; 6:11.
- 4 times, "man" (men). Ex. 12:16; 2 Kings 12:4; 1 Chron. 5:21; Isa. 49:7.
- 3 times, "me." Num. 23:10; Judges 16:30; 1 Kings 20:32.
- 3 times, "beast." Lev. 24:18.
- 2 times, "ghost." Job 11:20; Jer. 15:9.
- 1 time, "fish." Isa. 19:10.

*Nephesh* is also translated one or more times as *we, he, thee, they, her, herself, him* (and other forms of the personal pronoun), and as *will, appetite, lust, thing, breath*, etc., etc.

Two striking facts stand out in this study of the word *nephesh*:

1. The wide variety of uses to which the word is put.
2. The word is used to describe something that can be killed, and also to designate dead persons.

Note also the repeated statements as to a "living creature [*nephesh*]." The adjective, "living," would be superfluous if *nephesh* itself meant an immortal, never-dying entity.

**"Soul" in the New Testament**

In the New Testament the word "soul" is used 58 times and is uniformly the translation of the Greek word *psuchē*. *Psuchē* is rendered by the following words in our English Bible:

58 times, "soul."

40 times, "life." For example: Mark 3:4; 10:45; Luke 6:9; 9:56; John 13:37; Rom. 11:3; Rev. 8:9; 12:11.

3 times, "mind." Acts 14:2; Phil. 1:27; Heb. 12:3.

1 time, "heart." Eph. 6:6.

1 time, "heartily" (literally, *from the soul*). Col. 3:23.

*Psuchē* is also used, once in John 10:24 and in 2 Corinthians 12:15, in idiomatic phrases that cannot be literally translated.

Note that the words "kill" and "destroy" are used several times in regard to *psuchē*.

### "Spirit" in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament the word "spirit" is used 234 times. It is a translation of the following Hebrew words:

2 times from *neshamah*.

232 times from *ruach*.

These two terms are translated by the following words in our English Bible:

*Neshamah*

(See analysis earlier in chapter.)

*Ruach*

232 times, "spirit." (With the exception of Job 26:4 and Prov. 20:27, which are from *neshamah*, "spirit" in the Old Testament is always from *ruach*.)

97 times, "wind." ("Wind" in the Old Testament is always a translation of *ruach*.)

28 times, "breath." For example: Gen. 6:17; 7:15, 22; Job 12:10; Ps. 104:29; 146:4; Eccl. 3:19.

8 times, "mind." Gen. 26:35; Prov. 29:11; Eze. 11:5; 20:32; Dan. 5:20; Hab. 1:11.

4 times, "blast." Ex. 15:8; 2 Kings 19:7; Isa. 25:4; 37:7.

*Ruach* is also translated one or more times by the following words: *anger*, *air*, *tempest*, *vain*, etc.

### "Spirit" in the New Testament

In the New Testament the word "spirit" is used 290 times. It is a translation of the following Greek words:



2 times from *phantasma*.  
288 times from *pneuma*.

These two Greek words are translated by the following words in our English Bible:

*Phantasma*

2 times, "spirit." Matt. 14:26; Mark 6:49. (These are the only uses of the word *phantasma* in the Bible.)

*Pneuma*

288 times, "spirit." (With the exception of Matt. 14:26 and Mark 6:49, "spirit" in the New Testament is always a translation of *pneuma*.)

92 times, "ghost." Matt. 27:50; John 19:30. (Also every instance where the word is used in the phrase "Holy Ghost.")

1 time, "life." Rev. 13:15.

1 time, "wind." John 3:8.

1 time, "spiritual." 1 Cor. 14:12.

**Definitions of Hebrew Terms**

The following definitions are from Gesenius, probably the greatest of Hebrew lexicographers. The edition of the Lexicon here used is one published in 1875 by John Wiley & Son, New York, the English translation being by Samuel P. Tregelles:

"NEDIBAH: *Nobility, a noble and happy condition.*"

"NESHAMAH: (1) *Breath, spirit.* (a) The Spirit of God imparting life and wisdom. (b) The spirit of man, *soul*. A *living creature*. . . .

"(2) *The panting of those who are angry, used of the anger of God.*"

"NEPESH: (1) *Breath.* . . .

"(2) *The soul, anima, psuchē*, by which the body lives, the token of which life is drawing breath, . . . hence *life*, vital principle. Gen. 35:18; 1 Kings 17:21; Ex. 21:23. *The soul* is also said both to live (Gen. 12:13; Ps. 119: 175); and to die (Judges 16:30); to be killed (Num. 31:19). . . . It is often used in phrases which relate either to the loss or to the preservation of life. . . .

"(3) *The mind*, as the seat of the senses, affections, and various emotions. . . .

"(4) Concretely, *animal*, that in which there is a soul or mind. . . .

"(5) It is sometimes *I, myself, thou, thyself*."

"RUACH: (1) *Spirit, breath*. (a) Breath of the mouth. . . . Hence used of anything quickly perishing. . . . Often used of the *vital spirit*. . . . (b) *Breath* of the nostrils, snuffing, snorting. . . . Hence *anger*. . . . (c) *Breath of air, air in motion*, i. e., *breeze*. . . .

"(2) *Psuchē, anima, breath, life, the vital principle*, which shows itself in the breathing of the mouth and nostrils (see No. 1, a, b), whether of men or of beasts, Eccl. 3:21; 8:8; 12:7. . . .

"(3) *The rational mind or spirit*. (a) As the seat of the senses, affections, and emotions of various kinds. . . . (b) As to the mode of *thinking and acting*. . . . (c) *Of will and counsel*. . . . More rarely (d) it is applied to the *intellect*. . . .

"(4) *The Spirit of God*."

#### Definitions of Greek Terms

The following definitions are from Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, than which there is none more authoritative:

"PSUCHE: I. *Breath*, Latin, *anima*, especially as the sign of life, *life, spirit*. . . . II. *The soul or immortal part of man, as opposed to his body or perishable part*, in Homer only in the significance of a *departed soul, spirit, ghost*: he represents it as bodiless and not to be seized by mortal hands. . . . III. As the organ of *nous*, i. e., of thought and judgment, the *soul, mind, reason, understanding*. . . . IV. The *anima mundi*, or *living spirit*, which was supposed in the ancient philosophy to permeate all lands and the whole extent of the sea and high heaven."

"PHANTASMA: *An appearance, image, phantom, specter*. . . . *A vision, dream*. 2. Especially an *image presented to the mind by an object*. . . . 3. *A mere image, unreality*."

"PNEUMA: *Wind, air*. . . . 2. Especially like Latin *anima*, the *air we breathe, breath*, . . . also *breathing, respiration*. . . . 3. *Life*, . . . also the *spirit, a living being*. . . . 4. *A spirit, spiritual being*, [in] New Testament. 5. Metaphorically, *spirit*, i. e., *feeling*."

In these definitions of both Hebrew and Greek words used for "soul" and "spirit," agree the other lexicographers.

There is nothing in the *primary* definitions of these terms that demands or even warrants the thought of an immortal, undying entity, independent of the body. True, the second definition given for *psuchē* is the "immortal part of man," etc., but the lexicographers are simply noting down one of the uses of *psuchē* by the classical Greeks, such as Homer, who were *pagans*. To attempt to settle a question of Christian theology by appealing to a definition based on the usage of a word by pagan writers, would indeed be a strange procedure. By such a method we could find support for the pagan doctrine of pantheism in the fourth definition of *psuchē*, which, again, is simply an illustration of the usage of the word by *pagan* writers.

We grant that the pagans believed in disembodied souls, or spirits, and therefore, at times, used *psuchē* and other terms to express that belief. The question is simply this: Does the primary meaning of *psuchē*, or any other term translated "soul" or "spirit," necessitate belief in the immortal-entity idea? The answer is, No. Then follows the companion question: Does the use of these terms by *Bible* writers—not pagan writers—necessitate, or even warrant, such belief? The answer is, No.

## THE SCAPEGOAT AND THE ATONEMENT

THE charge that Seventh-day Adventists make Satan their vicarious substitute and savior, is based on the fact that we believe the scapegoat represents Satan. The Scripture passage that bears directly on this point is Leviticus 16, which gives the Atonement Day ritual.

Those who bring against us the charge of making Satan our savior hold that the scapegoat represents Christ as truly as does the slain goat. Following are the main reasons they set forth for this belief:

### Claims of Opponents

1. That the Hebrew word "Azazel," which is translated "scapegoat" in our King James Version, should be translated "goat of departure," deriving Azazel from two Hebrew words meaning "goat" and "to depart."

2. That the Azazel goat is a sin offering, even as is the Lord's goat that was slain.

3. That the bearing away of the sins by the Azazel goat is a type of Christ's bearing away our sins.

4. That the slain goat represents Christ's death on Calvary, and the live goat directs attention to the risen and living Saviour (emphasis being placed on the fact that the resurrection as well as the death is needed in the plan of salvation), and that the live goat's being accompanied by some one to a desert place, symbolizes the impossibility of the return of the sins.

Incidentally, those who bring against us the charge concerning the scapegoat, and who hold that this scapegoat represents a phase of Christ's work, quite generally in their attacks seem willing to allow the impression to be created that the view they hold is the practically universal orthodox belief of Christendom. Thus in the most pronounced and heinous sense of the word, Seventh-day Adventists are made to stand forth as preachers of strange, heretical doctrines.

**Claims Examined**

Let us examine the claims set forth in these four points:

1. The basic claim as to the meaning of the word "Azazel" cannot be proved, as we shall discover from an examination of the etymology of the word later in this chapter.

2. We do not believe the Bible teaches that Azazel is a sin offering. If we were confined to the fifth verse of Leviticus 16, we might conclude that both goats were a sin offering. But we are immediately informed that a very unique procedure took place. When the two goats were brought to the door of the tabernacle, lots were cast upon them. Nowhere else in the sacrificial service is there a parallel to this. The obvious idea to be obtained from the use of the lot throughout the whole Bible is that of deciding between two or more. For example, there were two candidates selected for the office of apostleship, to fill the place of Judas. The casting of the lot determined which of the two should function in that capacity. That this is the correct understanding in the problem before us seems clearly to be borne out by the fact that after the lot was cast, the reference to the sin offering is the word "goat"—singular number. "Aaron shall bring the *goat* [not goats] upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer *him* for a sin offering." Verse 9. Note also verses 15 and 27.

Those who hold that the scapegoat as well as the slain goat represents Christ, endeavor to find a parallel to this unusual Atonement Day procedure by reference to Leviticus 5:7-10. Here provision is made that a man who is too poor to bring a lamb may bring "two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, unto the Lord; one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering." Verse 7. We make three brief comments:

a. The priest did not cast lots. Thus the most important point of comparison is lacking.

b. Both of the birds were for the Lord, but only one goat.

c. The lives of *both* birds are taken by the priest.

Reference is sometimes also made to the two birds brought for the purification of a leprous man (Lev. 14:4-7), but this reference may be disposed of by comments "a" and "b" above, and by the simple statement that we have here no reference to



a sin offering or to the purging of sin. Lange's Commentary discusses the dual offering of the poor, and then comments on the two birds for the leprous man's purification, remarking: "These last, however, were not a sacrifice."—*Comments on Leviticus 16*.

Being brought before the Lord in the way that these two goats were, is without a parallel in the Levitical service. This fact in itself should at least suggest that some essentially new and added truth was to be conveyed by the service. With this general statement doubtless our opponents would agree, contending that it was necessary to have these two animals in order to represent rightly the work of Christ as a sin offering. But to make such a claim as this is equivalent to saying that all the rest of the Levitical ritual of the various sin offerings, including the Passover lamb, which the Scripture tells us is the exact type of Christ's sacrifice for us (1 Cor. 5:7), are hopelessly deficient in their symbolism.

Furthermore, how could a live animal properly be considered a sin offering? In every other passage dealing with the sacrificial system, the sin offering was slain. Is this to be a lone case where a sin offering lives? If so, we ask the question: What becomes of the scripture that underlies the whole sacrificial system, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" of sin? Heb. 9:22. Seeing that the priest does not take the life of the second goat, how can its relation to the sins of the people have any "remission" value? And if it has no "remission" value, how can it be properly described as a sin offering?

Indeed, what necessity is there for twice remitting the sins of the people? for the blood of the slain goat is taken into the sanctuary, to which the sins of the people have been transferred in type during the year, to "make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins." Lev. 16:16. And then when the priest "hath made an *end* of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar," he turns to the live goat. The idea of having the second goat atone again for the sins seems strange even to those who hold that theory.

### Why Need a Double Atonement?

In an article entitled, "The Meaning of 'Azazel,'" in the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, Grant Stroh inquires: "Since the sins of 'all the congregation of Israel' had already been atoned for by the death of the first goat, what is the significance of confessing and placing them upon the head of the live goat that was to carry them away with him?"—*March, 1932*. But he endeavors to prevent this fact from giving any aid to our view, by adding immediately: "If these sins already had been atoned for, it certainly is incongruous to explain this ceremony as an act of judgment. This much ought to be clear."

As to whether the judgment idea is incongruous we shall discuss later. But surely this much ought to be clear, that if the sins of the Israelites had already been atoned for by the death of the first goat, it is incongruous to view the second goat as a sin offering.

Mr. Stroh goes on to support his belief that the "live goat directs our attention to the risen and living Saviour," by remarking that "in the New Testament the death and resurrection of our Lord are indissolubly joined together." Paul's statement is then quoted: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." 1 Cor. 15:17. But if "the sins of 'all the congregation of Israel' had already been atoned for by the death of the first goat," and this represented Christ's death on the cross, why must the freeing of believers from sin, in the antitype, await a further act, namely, the resurrection?

In order to have the live goat also represent Christ, those who hold this view of Azazel must blur over, if not contradict altogether, the proposition they elsewhere set forth so dogmatically; namely, that complete atonement for sin was made on the cross.

### An Unwarranted Play on Words

3. To attempt to find a parallel between the act of the second goat in bearing away the sins, and that of Christ in bearing our sins, is to go contrary to the explicit statements of Scripture. We read of Christ, "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body *on the tree*." 1 Peter 2:24. The margin reads, "*to the*

tree." The American Revised Version reads: "Who His own self bare our sins in His body *upon the tree*," and the margin reads, "*carried up . . . to the tree*." It is said that the live goat was needed to supply a feature that the slain goat could not, that is, the bearing away of the sins. But John the Baptist (John 1:29) used the symbol of the Lamb (which to the Jews would convey the thought of the sacrificial lamb, whose blood was poured out) to convey the truth of Christ's bearing our sins. Evidently, John the Baptist viewed Christ's bearing of sins in the way Peter did (1 Peter 2:24), and not in the way these theologians do, who view the scapegoat as Christ.

Surely the Scriptures are so clear that the bearing, or carrying, or taking away, of sins is from us to the "tree," that they quite demolish the most plausible-sounding parallel between Christ and the second goat, the parallel built on the word "bear." Evidently the live goat's bearing of sins must have a different significance from that of Christ's bearing them.

4. Those who teach that the live goat "directs our attention to the risen and living Saviour," must, to be consistent in their symbolism, believe that Christ rose from the dead loaded with the sins that He had borne up to the tree. The ritual shows very plainly that the second goat was to be regarded as a thing so unclean that the man who led it away into the wilderness must "wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water" (Lev. 16:26) before coming again into the camp. Do the advocates of this doctrine we are examining really believe they find in this picture of the second goat a parallel to the glorified Christ rising from the tomb and commanding Mary, "Touch Me not"?

#### **Biblical Authorities Cited**

So much for an examination of the main reasons brought forth in behalf of the interpretation that views the live goat as well as the slain goat as representing Christ. We wish now to quote from a representative group of Biblical authorities, Jews and Christians, liberal and conservative, regarding Azazel. These quotations will reveal, we believe, further evidence against the interpretation we have been examining, and will afford the reader an opportunity to judge for himself whether Seventh-

day Adventists are preachers of strange and anti-Christian doctrines in holding that Azazel represents Satan.\*

### M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia

"Scapegoat (Hebrew, *Azazel*) is the name given in the A. V. to one of the two goats used in the sin offering for the entire community of Israel on the great Day of Atonement, the goat which was to be sent away into the wilderness. . . . There can be no doubt that this has the appearance of being some sort of personage, or interest personified, standing over against Jehovah, or somehow contradistinguished from Him. But opinions have from early times been divided on the subject.

"1. The one followed by our translators, which regards it as a name for the goat itself, is of great antiquity, and has numbers on its side. . . .

"2. By others it has been taken as the name of a place. . . .

"3. Others, again, have taken the word as a *pealpal* form of the Arabic verb *to remove*, . . . so that the meaning comes to be for a *complete removing* or *dismissal* (Tholuck, Steudel, Winer, Bähr). Grammatically, no objection can be urged against this view; and it undoubtedly accords well with the general import of this part of the rite. 'The true expiation,' to use the words of Bähr, 'was effected by the blood of the first goat, which was set apart for Jehovah; on the other hand, the ceremony with the other goat appears as a mere addition made for special reasons, a kind of complement to the wiping away of the sins which had already been effected by means of the sacrifice.' . . .

"4. But there is still another class of writers who are disposed to claim for the word a more distinctly personal existence, and who would refer it directly to Satan. This view is certainly of high antiquity. . . .

"It was very common with the rabbins, as in later times it has the support of many authorities—Spencer, Ammon, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, etc., who hold it to be equivalent to the Roman *averruncus*, or evil demon, which was supposed to inhabit desert

---

\* Brevity demands that we eliminate much of the repetitive matter in these quotations. We cannot attempt to give the full argument for any of the views held regarding Azazel. We believe, however, that we are quoting sufficient to reveal the main reasons for the principal views. We have eliminated the argument based on the alleged parallel between the two goats and the dual offering for a leprous person, etc., because we have already noted this argument.



places, and who needed to be propitiated; but adopted also, though purged of this idolatrous connection, by Witsius, Meyer, Alting, Hengstenberg; also quite recently by Vaihinger and Kurtz. These writers hold that the view in question best preserves the contrast between the two goats—one for Jehovah, and one for the great adversary Azazel—the latter a being as well as the former, and a being who (as demons generally) was supposed to have his peculiar dwelling in the desert. The goat, however, that was sent to this evil spirit—emphatically the removed or separate one—was no sacrifice, but rather a witness that the accepted sacrifice had been made. It proclaimed, as it were, ‘that the horrible wilderness, the abode of impure spirits, is alone the place to which the sins of the people, as originally foreign to human nature and society, properly belong; that Azazel, the abominable, the sinner from the beginning (John 8:44), is the one from whom they have proceeded, and to whom they must again with abhorrence be sent back, after the solemn atonement and absolution of the congregation have been accomplished’ (Vaihinger). No doubt, as thus explained, the leading import of the transaction with this goat is in proper accordance with the service of the day; but it cannot appear otherwise than strange that, in the most sacred rite of the old covenant, Satan should be so formally recognized as, according to this view, he must have been.”—*M’Clintock and Strong’s Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedia*, Vol. IX, pp. 397, 398, art. “Scapegoat.”

#### Encyclopedic Dictionary

“*Azazel*.—1. In Scripture: A word occurring in Leviticus 16:8, 10, and 26, where it is translated ‘scapegoat;’ but the antithesis which makes the one goat be for Jehovah and the other for Azazel, is best preserved by supposing Azazel to be such a being as Satan or some other evil spirit.”—*The Encyclopedic Dictionary*, Vol. I, p. 397.

#### Hastings’ Bible Dictionary

“Etymology, origin, and significance [of Azazel] are still matters of conjecture. The A. V. designation *scapegoat* . . . obscures the fact that the word *Azazel* is a proper name in the original, and in particular the name of a powerful spirit or demon supposed to inhabit the wilderness or ‘solitary land’ ([Lev.] 16:22, R. V.).”—*Hastings’ Bible Dictionary*, p. 77, art. “*Azazel*.”



**Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia**

"The meaning of the word [Azazel] has occasioned much discussion. Starting from the fact that 'for Yahweh' and 'for Azazel' stand in opposition (verse 8), many think that it is the name of a being opposed to Yahweh,—a desert monster, a demon, or directly Satan. Such as attempt an etymological interpretation then explain it as characterizing the demon or Satan as removed or apostatized from God, or a being repelled by men (*averruncus*), or one which does things apart and in secret (from *azal*, 'to go away'). Others conceive of Azazel, not as a proper name, but as an appellative noun and modified reduplicated form of a root '*azal*, 'to remove, retire.' . . . The contrast between 'for Yahweh' and 'for Azazel,' however, in verse 8 favors the interpretation of Azazel as a proper noun, and a reference to Satan suggests itself. . . . A definite explanation, satisfactory to all, can hardly be looked for."—*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. I, p. 389, art. "Azazel."

**Smith's Bible Dictionary**

"In regard to the Hebrew word *Azazel* ('scapegoat,' A. V.), the opinions most worthy of notice are: 1. A designation of the goat itself. The old interpreters in general, the Vulgate, Symmachus, Aquila, Luther, the A. V., etc., supposed it to equal *the goat sent away*, or *let loose*. But the application of *Azazel* to the goat itself involves the Hebrew text in difficulty. . . . 2. The name of the place to which the goat was sent. But the place is specified in Leviticus 16:10, 21, 22 (Gesenius). 3. A personal being to whom the goat was sent. (a) Gesenius makes *Azazel* equal *avertter*, *expiator*, and supposes it to be some false deity who was to be appeased by a sacrifice of the goat. (b) Others have regarded him as an evil spirit, or the devil himself. . . . 4. An explanation of the word which seems less objectionable, if not wholly satisfactory, would render the designation of the lot (Lev. 16:8, etc., 'for the scapegoat,' A. V.) 'for complete sending away.'"—*Smith's Bible Dictionary*, p. 83, art. "Atonement, the Day of."

**Jewish Encyclopedia**

"Azazel (scapegoat, Leviticus 16, A. V.): The name of a supernatural being mentioned in connection with the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16). After Satan, for whom he

was in some degree a preparation, Azazel enjoys the distinction of being the most mysterious extrahuman character in sacred literature. Unlike other Hebrew proper names, the name itself is obscure. . . . Most modern scholars . . . have accepted the opinion mysteriously hinted at by Ibn Ezra and expressly stated by Nahmanides to Leviticus 16:8, that Azazel belongs to the class of 'se'irim,' goatlike demons. . . .

"Far from involving the recognition of Azazel as a deity, the sending of the goat was, as stated by Nahmanides, a symbolic expression of the idea that the people's sins and their evil consequences were to be sent back to the spirit of desolation and ruin, the source of all impurity. The very fact that the two goats were presented before YHWH [Jehovah] before the one was sacrificed and the other sent into the wilderness, was proof that Azazel was not ranked with YHWH, but regarded simply as the personification of wickedness in contrast with the righteous government of YHWH. . . .

"Azazel would therefore appear to be the head of the supernatural beings of the desert. . . . The fact that such a ceremony as that in which he figured was instituted, is not a contravention of Leviticus 17:7, by which demon worship was suppressed. For Azazel, in this instance, played a merely passive part. Moreover, as shown, the symbolical act was really a renunciation of his authority. Such is the signification of the utter separation of the scapegoat from the people of Israel."—*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, pp. 365-367, art. "Azazel."

#### International Standard Bible Encyclopedia

"By the use of the same preposition *le* in connection with Jehovah and Azazel, it seems natural to regard the expressions as entirely parallel and to think of some personal being. Some interpret this word as referring to a demon of the wilderness, . . . and explain the term as 'one who has separated himself from God,' or 'he who has separated himself,' or 'he who misleads others.' But a demon of this kind could not possibly be placed in contrast to Jehovah in this way. . . . In later times the word *Azazel* was by many Jews and also by Christian theologians, such as Origen, regarded as that Satan himself who had fallen away from God. In this interpretation the contrast found in verse 8, in case it is to be regarded as a full parallelism, would be perfectly correct. But it must be acknowledged that in Holy Scripture, Satan is nowhere called by the name of Azazel.

. . . It is accordingly advisable to interpret Azazel adjectively, i. e., to forgo finding a complete parallelism in verse 8, and to regard the preposition in connection with Jehovah as used differently from its use with Azazel. . . . With this interpretation a certain hardness yet remains for our linguistic sense, because we cannot find a good translation for the adjective. . . .

"Both goats, according to verse 5, are to be regarded as a single sin sacrifice, even should we interpret Azazel as demon or Satan, and we are accordingly not at all to understand that a sacrifice was brought to these beings. . . . In the personal interpretation, we could have, in addition to the idea of the removal of the guilt, also a second idea, namely, that Azazel can do no harm to Israel, but must be content with his claim to a goat which takes Israel's place."—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, pp. 343, 344, art. "Azazel."

#### Kitto's Cyclopedia

"The only difficulty here, and that is a great one, is with respect to the meaning of the word *Azazel*, which our translators, in common with a large class of modern commentators, regard as applied to the goat itself, and render it by 'scapegoat.' Others produce reasons, not easily answered, for showing that the word must be taken as a proper name. Then arises the question, What is the name? Several of the rabbinical writers regard it as the name of the *place* to which the scapegoat was conducted. . . . A step further, however, brings it more within the range of our recognition—this is, that Azazel is but a name for Satan, as was the opinion of most of the Jewish writers and of the early Christian church; and that the meaning of the ceremony is, that while the remission of sin is effected by the sacrificed goat (for without shedding of blood there was no remission, Heb. 9:22), the other was laden with the sins already, through the other goat, pardoned, by way of symbolically notifying the fact to Satan, and of triumphing in his discomfiture. . . . There is another more common explanation, which, if correct, forms a very beautiful interpretation of the typical rite. This view recognizes the substantial typical identity of the two goats, and in the victim goat sees Christ dying for our sins, and in the liberated goat views Him as rising again for our justification. But it must be admitted that the whole subject forms one of the greatest difficulties of Scripture."—*Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature*, by John Kitto, p. 363, art. "Goat, Scape."

**Lange's Commentary**

"In regard to the meaning of Azazel: in the great variety of etymologies given for the word by scholars of the highest standing, it may be assumed as certain that nothing can be positively determined by the etymology. . . . Not only the roots themselves are varied, but their signification also, and still further the signification of the compound. Little light can be had from the ancient versions. The Sam., and the Targs. of Onk., Jon., and Jerus., retain the word unchanged: so also does the Syriac. . . . The Jewish authorities differ, . . . many of them explaining the word of the devil. . . . The great majority of modern commentators agree with Spencer and Rosenmüller in interpreting the word itself of the devil, although Bähr, Winer, and Tholuck contend for the sense *complete removal*."—*Lange's Commentary, Notes on Leviticus 16*.

**New Standard Bible Dictionary**

"Azazel must . . . be the name either of the act of sending the goat away into the wilderness or, preferably, of the person to whom it was sent, possibly a demon in the wilderness. . . .

"In Israel it [the Atonement Day ritual] . . . was used to express the thought that sin belongs to a power or principle hostile to Jehovah, and its complete purgation must include its being sent back to its source."—*New Standard Bible Dictionary*, p. 85 (*Funk and Wagnalls*).

**Teachers' and Students' Bible Encyclopedia**

"To determine which of the two goats was to be slain, and which sent alive into the wilderness, it was ordered that the priest should 'cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord (Jehovah), and the other lot for the scapegoat,' Lev. 16: 8, but literally *for Azazel*, a word nowhere else used. There can be no doubt that this has the appearance of being some sort of personage, or interest personified, standing over against Jehovah, or somehow contradistinguished from him. But opinions have from early times been divided on the subject."—*Teachers' and Students' Bible Encyclopedia*, by Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Vol. VI, p. 109, art. "*Scapegoat*."

**Encyclopedia Biblica**

"The meaning of Azazel is much disputed; it is, of course, a subject closely connected with the inquiry into the origin of



the custom. It is at least certain that, as Azazel receives one goat while Yahwe [Jehovah] receives the other, both must be personal beings."—*Encyclopedia Biblica*, by T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., and J. Sutherland Black, M. A., LL. D., Vol. I, p. 395, art. "Azazel."

#### Eadie's Biblical Cyclopedia

"A common opinion is, that the one goat which was slain represented Christ dying and dead for the sins of man, and that the other goat, which lived and was dismissed, symbolized Christ risen and pleading our cause. But it might be objected to such a view that the sins of the Hebrew nation were laid on the live goat after its fellow had been sacrificed—an arrangement which does not harmonize with the actual atonement of the Son of God, for our sins were laid, not upon the *risen* Saviour, but upon Him *before* He died, and *in* His death. We incline to the oldest view of this subject—a view common in the church till the period of Julian the apostate, by whom it was abused and caricatured.

"The language in the original is precise and peculiar. It reads, 'And Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats—ONE FOR JEHOVAH, ONE FOR AZAZEL.' What we are to understand by Azazel has been much disputed. The language appears to us to imply the personality of Azazel—'one for Jehovah, one for Azazel.' By Azazel we venture to understand Satan, as do almost all the ancient versions, which leave the word, as they do the names of other persons, untranslated. Satan is not here, as some allege against this opinion, put on an equality with God; for the two goats were both brought 'to Jehovah,' and were His; while the very casting of lots, which was in itself a solemn appeal to God, shows that Jehovah claimed the power of disposal. Neither can it be objected that this was in any sense a sacrifice to Satan, for the animal was not slain to him; it was only sent to him in disgrace. Bearing upon it sins which God had already forgiven, it was sent to Azazel in the wilderness.

"The phrase 'scapegoat,' by which the strange term Azazel is rendered in our version, came from the '*hircus emissarius*' of the Vulgate. The term *Azazel* may mean the 'apostate one'—a name which Satan merits, and which he seems to have borne among the Jews. It was Satan that brought sin into the world; and this seduction of man adds to his guilt, and consequently



to his punishment. Sin is now pardoned in God's mercy. The one goat was sacrificed as a sin offering; its blood was carried into the holy place, and the mercy seat was sprinkled with it. Guilt was therefore canceled; by this shedding of blood there was remission. But sin, though pardoned, is yet hateful to God, and it cannot dwell in His sight: it is removed away to a 'land not inhabited'—severed from God's people, and sent away to man's first seducer. The sins of a believing world are taken off them, and rolled back on Satan, their prime author and instigator. Though the penalty is remitted to believers, it is not remitted to him who brought them into apostasy and ruin. The tempted are restored, but the whole punishment is seen to fall on the archtempter."—*Eadie's Biblical Cyclopaedia, from the Original Text of John Eadie, D. D., LL. D., late professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to the United Presbyterian Church, art. "Scapegoat," p. 577. (Preface to the new edition written by A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, and bears date of 1901.)*

#### "Sunday School Times"

"Of the two goats, one was for Jehovah, signifying God's acceptance of the sin offering; the other was for Azazel. This is probably to be understood as a person, being parallel with Jehovah in the preceding clause. So Azazel is probably a synonym for Satan. The goat for Azazel, the scapegoat, as it is somewhat misleadingly translated, typifies God's challenge to Satan (cf. Job 1:8; Eph. 3:10)."—*J. Russell Howden, Notes on the Sunday School Lessons, in Sunday School Times, Jan. 15, 1927.*

#### Bible Translations

Following is a partial list of the translations of the Bible that retain the original word "Azazel" in the text:

English Revised Version  
American Revised Version  
American Baptist Improved  
Rotherham's  
Moulton's  
Moffatt's  
Darby's  
Smith's (J. Powis)

Leeser's (Jewish translation of the Old Testament)  
Jewish Publication Society translation, 1917. (The Old Testament by a committee of Jewish scholars. Probably the most authoritative translation among English-speaking Jews.)

### Conclusions From Quotations

From the foregoing quotations we may draw the following important conclusions:

1. The meaning of the word "Azazel" is so obscure that no doctrine may properly be built upon an attempted translation of the term. Special significance attaches to the fact that so many translations of the Bible, including the Jewish, leave Azazel untranslated. In fact, with but two or three exceptions, all our Bible translations either follow the King James Version and use the word "scapegoat," or else leave "Azazel" untranslated. The retaining of the original term "Azazel" indicates either that the translators felt that the meaning of the word was too obscure, or else they considered Azazel a proper name, which would therefore not call for translation. But of course if Azazel is a proper name, then it must stand for some being in contrast to Jehovah.

2. A wide divergence of interpretation of the meaning of the Atonement Day ritual has existed from earliest times.

3. The view which regards Azazel as symbolizing Satan has been held through the centuries by many theologians, both Jewish and Christian. Lange's Commentary, which is perhaps the most exhaustive and reliable of such works, affirms that "the great majority of modern commentators" view Azazel as Satan. (Comments on Leviticus 16.)

4. This view, which makes Azazel a personal being in antithesis to Jehovah, finds strong support in the very construction of the Hebrew itself. One goat is "for Jehovah," the other "for Azazel." To prevent the natural conclusion of opposing personalities, implied by the similar preposition ("for"), requires the doubtful expedient of understanding the preposition "in connection with Jehovah as used differently from its use with Azazel."—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*.

But even then, as this Bible Encyclopedia admits, there remains a "linguistic" difficulty. This procedure, while technically violating no law of grammar, may properly be viewed as questionable. Certainly a heavy burden of proof rests upon those who maintain that a preposition ("for") used in two apparently parallel and immediately joined phrases, should be given a different value in one phrase than in the other. Evidently the proof produced has not been sufficient to convince a large part of the theologians through the years, as is witnessed by the great number who have held that Azazel represents a personality in antithesis to Jehovah.

5. Even among theologians who do not allow Satan in the picture and who thus restrict the symbolism of both goats to Christ, the position is set forth (and by one of the most able exponents of that view, Bähr) that "the true expiation was effected by the blood of the first goat" and that the "ceremony with the other goat appears as a mere addition made for special reasons, a kind of complement to the wiping away of the sins which had already been effected by means of the sacrifice." (See quotation from M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia.) Certainly under this view of the matter, the functions of the "risen and living Saviour," if He is the Azazel goat, are reduced to a rather purposeless "mere addition."

6. The many theologians, from the ancient rabbins down to a recent contributor to the *Sunday School Times*, who have held that Azazel represents Satan, have not found it necessary to view him as a substitutionary sacrifice, a savior. On the contrary, they repudiate the thought.

7. Among the theologians who view Azazel as representing Satan, there is prominent the idea of judgment, the returning to their satanic source of the *pardoned* sins of God's children. (See quotations from M'Clintock and Strong, Jewish Encyclopedia, Kitto, New Standard Bible Dictionary, and Eadie's Biblical Cyclopaedia.) Evidently the introducing of the thought of judgment into the Atonement Day ritual does not seem "incongruous" to a wide group of both Jewish and Christian theologians. On the contrary, the idea of judgment seems vital to many expositors.

### A Brief Survey of the Adventist Position

We would not for a moment attempt to prove that our belief as to Azazel is correct simply because many Christian leaders through the centuries have held that belief. But when our opponents endeavor to give strength to their attack on us by creating the impression that we teach strange, unchristian doctrine in this matter, we may rightly introduce as most relevant the evidence of the extent to which this doctrine as to Azazel has been held from earliest times.

It is hardly within the scope of this chapter to go into an extended discussion of our teachings as to the sanctuary, which provide the proper background for our belief regarding Azazel. Extended discussions of the sanctuary doctrine are easily obtainable in various of our works. But the following brief outline may appropriately be given:

In the slaying of the Passover lamb we see Christ, our Passover, slain. (See 1 Cor. 5:7.) We see in the round of the Levitical service, with its priests ministering the spilled blood of the various sin offerings, our great High Priest in heaven, ministering His blood for those who accept His sacrifice. In the Atonement Day service, which was the culminating event in the Levitical cycle, and was the day when the sins that had been confessed throughout the year were finally disposed of, we see the type of the last work which Christ performs in His priestly ministry for repentant sinners.

We believe that when Christ completes this final work of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary, the fate of all is determined for eternity, and that then will go forth the edict: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. 22:11.

In the typical high priest's coming out to the Azazel goat after having "made an atonement . . . for all the congregation of Israel," having indeed "made an *end* of reconciling," we see Christ's leaving the sanctuary after finally completing His work of atonement, and rolling back upon the head of Satan, the instigator of all sin, the primary guilt, which is his alone, for the sins of the now-pardoned and eternally saved believers.

Finally, we see in the scapegoat being led off into the wilderness, a type of Satan, the scapegrace of the universe, being taken by a strong angel and cast into the "bottomless pit."\* Rev. 20:1-3.

We believe that this view of the sanctuary service provides an interpretation of the function of Azazel that is both rational and Scriptural.

Far from the idea of a judgment's being "incongruous" as a conclusion to the work of atonement, the very opposite is true. There is no fact more striking in the Scriptures than that Christ, when He has finished His work of pleading for men, will put on the garments of vengeance to execute judgment.

### Final Objection Examined

Only one objection remains to be considered. It is based on Leviticus 16:10. "The goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him." Our opponents quote this verse and declare to us: "If you believe the scapegoat typifies Satan, then you believe that Satan is your savior." We answer emphatically, "No," and add: "If you believe that the scapegoat typifies Christ, then you believe in a savior we cannot find anywhere in the Bible." Note the following facts:

1. We stand squarely on the solemn declaration that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. As already stated, the scapegoat's blood was not shed. Therefore this goat could not typify the work of a Being who could give us remission of sins. Others may believe that they see the work of atonement *for our sins* typified by an animal that is not slain, whose blood is not poured out. But we cannot.

2. Earlier in this chapter we established that only one goat, "the Lord's goat," is offered up for a sin offering. Therefore we must base our hope of salvation on the Being typified by the

---

\* The term "bottomless pit" is from the Greek word *abussos*. This is the word used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint) in the sentence which describes the chaotic state of the earth at the beginning of creation week: "Darkness was upon the face of the deep [*abussos*]." Gen. 1:2. The *abussos* into which the devil is cast—this earth which has again returned to a lifeless, barren state as a result of the cataclysm of the second advent—may very properly be typified by the wilderness destination of the goat.



goat that was offered up for sin. That is the only kind of Saviour that the Bible describes. Those who would make a savior of one who was not offered up, teach an unscriptural view of salvation. Therefore we do not, we cannot, view the live goat as typifying Christ, who saves us from our sins.

3. The blood of the slain goat made atonement "for all the congregation of Israel" for "all their sins." Verses 17, 16. And when the priest had finished ministering its blood, he had "made an *end* of reconciling." Verse 20. These statements are so plain that, as we noted at the beginning of this chapter, our opponents frankly admit that "the sins of 'all the congregation of Israel' had already been atoned for by the death of the first goat" when the high priest came out to the live goat. Thus the people had already been freed from their guilt, and accordingly were no longer in need of a Saviour from their sins, when the high priest came out of the sanctuary. The Saviour described in the Bible came to our rescue "while we were yet sinners." Rom. 5:8. Poor sinners do not stand in need of a Saviour who makes no contact with their sins until *after* those sins have been atoned for. Where is the text that gives even the semblance of support for the belief that sins which have been atoned for are then laid upon Christ? Yet that is the kind of savior we would have if we viewed the scapegoat as a type of Christ. We find no such Christ in the Scriptures. Therefore, believing that Azazel represents a personal being, we are logically compelled to view the scapegoat as typifying Satan.

#### **Explain a Hard Passage by Simpler Ones**

We willingly admit, as theologians have admitted through all the years, that Leviticus 16:10 is a perplexing passage. In dealing with it we have endeavored to follow the approved principle of Bible interpretation, that is, of understanding a difficult passage by other and clearer passages. The various other texts in Leviticus 16 regarding the function of the two goats, and the texts elsewhere that deal with the work of Christ for sinners, surely prohibit us from viewing the scapegoat as Christ. And by a parity of reasoning they prohibit us from understanding the word "atonement" in verse 16 as signifying

the performance of a work similar to that performed by the slain goat.

In one of the opening chapters of this book (page 133) we gave an illustration of the relation of Satan, the archfiend, to the plan of salvation. We restate in part:

A group of men have been arrested, tried, and convicted of certain crimes. A heavy fine is imposed upon them. They are in a hopeless state, for they are penniless. But their hopelessness is changed to joy; a rich philanthropist offers to pay their fine. They accept, and are freed. The case is apparently settled. But no; the court, continuing its investigations, discovers that a person of fiendish cunning has really dominated these poor men, and has seduced them into their course of wrong doing. He is captured, and judgment is meted out to him. He is made to pay a heavy fine—much heavier even than that from which the poor men have been freed by the gracious act of the philanthropist; for the court reasons that the fiend is doubly guilty.

Now it may truly be said that the philanthropist atones, or makes satisfaction, for the crimes of these poor men. Yet in another sense we could speak of the archfiend's atoning for those very crimes. There is no confusion of meaning, even though each gives satisfaction to justice in a basically different way. Nor by declaring that the archfiend gives satisfaction for those crimes do we minimize in the slightest degree the gracious act of the philanthropist toward the penniless men.

This, we believe, is the explanation of the statement in Leviticus 16:10. The people's sins are atoned for by a Substitute, typified by the slain goat. Then these *atoned for* sins are thrown back on the head of the archfiend, Satan, typified by the Azazel goat, who must bear the guilt of primary responsibility for their sins. In the words of Dr. John Eadie: "The sins . . . are . . . rolled back on Satan, their prime author and instigator. Though the penalty is remitted to believers, it is not remitted to him who brought them into apostasy and ruin. The tempted are restored, but the whole punishment is seen to fall on the arch-tempter."—*Eadie's Bible Cyclopedia*, p. 577.

There is another objection, which is scarcely worthy of even passing notice. It is said that even if Azazel represents Satan, the goat itself did not represent Satan, that instead it was simply "for Azazel." But those who raise this quibble believe that the slain goat, chosen "for the Lord," represents the Lord Jesus Himself. Therefore it is but consistent to affirm that the goat "for Azazel" represents Satan himself.

### Why Are We Singled Out for Attack?

In view of all the evidence in this chapter, especially the evidence as to the widespread belief among stalwart Protestant theologians that Azazel represents Satan, what is to be thought of the unspeakable charge brought against us by a certain class, that we make Satan our savior, because we, along with this great company of theologians, believe that Azazel represents Satan? But those who bring these charges against us because of our views concerning Azazel, have never brought any like charges against any others who believe similarly. This is indeed the most singular fact in connection with the whole matter. We therefore decline to give further serious consideration to these indictments against us until those who bring them are willing to level the same charges against the long and impressive list of Christian leaders who have held that Azazel represents Satan.

### One Writer Retracts Charge

In fairness, it should be stated that one writer who had charged us with teaching that Satan is our savior, afterward withdrew it. In the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* of November, 1930, Grant Stroh, editor of the "Practical and Perplexing Questions" department, made this charge. After our correspondence with the *Moody Monthly*, Dr. Stroh published this statement in the February, 1931, issue of that journal:

"The chief exception taken to our statement concerned their doctrine of the atonement. We said: 'Seventh-day Adventism denies the atoning sacrifice of Christ as the only means of man's salvation, and declares instead that Satan is our savior, sin bearer, and vicarious substitute.'

"This seems to be an extreme statement, and having read some of the writings of the Seventh-day Adventists since it was

made, we find it could be proved from them that such is not their belief. I am sure that most of these people are saved, in spite of their unscriptural teachings, and that most of them probably do not hold any such view of the atonement. It is only fair to truth, however, that we read not only a popular statement on their beliefs, such as in the booklet, 'Belief and Work of Seventh-day Adventists,' but also examine the way of salvation as set forth by their acknowledged prophet, Mrs. E. G. White, in 'The Great Controversy,' upon which the statements in 'Heresies Exposed' were based. Even then we apologize for the baldness of the statement in our November issue, and beg forgiveness of these good people for any misstatement of their doctrines."

#### **Mrs. E. G. White Describes the Function of the Scapegoat**

This retraction is given unique weight by the candid admission that it is the result of "having read some of the writings of the Seventh-day Adventists *since*" the charge was made. Might we not be permitted to suggest to others that they likewise read carefully some of our standard works before hastening forth to broadcast the hideous charge that we make Satan our savior? It is true that Dr. Stroh further in his article expresses distress at the statements made in "The Great Controversy," because they permit Satan to be introduced at all into the picture. But he sets forth nothing from Mrs. E. G. White that warrants his withdrawing his retraction. How could he, when Mrs. White states unequivocally on page 658 of that work:

"Now the event takes place, foreshadowed in the last solemn service of the Day of Atonement. When the ministration in the holy of holies had been completed, and the sins of Israel had been removed from the sanctuary by virtue of the blood of the sin offering, then the scapegoat was presented alive before the Lord; and in presence of the congregation the high priest confessed over him 'all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat.' Lev. 16:21. In like manner, when the work of atonement in the heavenly sanctuary *has been completed*, then in the presence of God and heavenly angels and *the host of the redeemed*, the sins of God's people will be placed upon Satan; he will be declared guilty of all the evil which he has caused

them to commit. And as the scapegoat was sent away into a land not inhabited, so Satan will be banished to the desolate earth, an uninhabited and dreary wilderness." (*Italics ours.*)

Our opponents, who have examined so critically Mrs. White's writings in an attempt to find some stray phrase on which to base a charge, must surely have read this statement in "The Great Controversy," for it is the climax to her description of the sanctuary service. If they had been willing to publish this quotation, the appalling indictment that we make Satan our savior would have been exposed as false. Why have they failed to do so? We must leave that question for them to answer.



# SCRIPTURAL INDEX

## GENESIS

1: 2	245
1: 5, 8, 13, 19, 23,	49
1: 31	224
1: 20, 30	56
1: 21, 22	224
1: 21, 24	152
1: 26 sq.	157
1: 26, 27	56
1: 27, 28	141, 143
1: 29	97
1: 30	143, 174
2: 2, 3	34, 175
2: 3	223
2: 7	152
2: 16 sq.	157
2: 17	224
2: 19	152
3: 3	96
3: 19	108
6: 3	225
6: 17	225
7: 15, 22	225
7: 21, 22	94
7: 22	223
9: 4	224
9: 10, 12, 15, 16	224
12: 13	226
13: 13	15
14: 20	143
17: 12	205
17: 19	119
17: 23	205
20: 7	143
26: 5	15
26: 35	225
29: 22	201
29: 27	201
35: 18	95, 226
39: 9	15
49: 10	158

## EXODUS

12: 1, 2	200
12: 16	224
12: 24	118
12: 43	17
15: 8	225
15: 20	143, 145
16: 1	185
16: 4	185
16: 5	185
16: 7, 8	185
16: 13	185
16: 21	185
16: 23	185
19	206
19: 1	186
19: 1, 2	183
19: 3	184
19: 6	19

19: 7	184
19: 8	19, 184
19: 10, 11	183, 184
20	37, 57
20: 1-17	151, 154
20: 2-17	143
20: 3-17	43, 57, 164
20: 3-18	157
20: 8	211
20: 8, 10, 11	174
20: 8-11	139
20: 10	36, 53
20: 11	38, 55
21	158
21: 1-6	119
21: 23	226
22: 1-29	158
23: 9	224
24: 7	19
24: 8	20
31: 14	39
31: 18	17
33 and 34	88
34	204
34: 1	157
35: 1-3	204
35: 3	211
40: 15	118
40: 17-23	203

## LEVITICUS

4: 8	203
5: 7-10	230
10: 2	68
10: 10	68
11: 44-47	141
11: 45	39
11: 46	224
14: 4-47	230
16	132, 229
16: 5	230, 238
16: 8	236, 239
16: 8, 10, 26	235
16: 9	230
16: 10	245-247
16: 10, 21, 22	236
16: 15, 27	230
16: 16	231
16: 17, 16	246
16: 20	246
16: 21	249
16: 22	235
16: 26	233
17: 7	237
19: 18	27
19: 28	224
19: 35-37	38
20	40
20: 27	113
21: 1	224
21: 11	224

22: 4	224
23	43, 197
23: 5-7	187
23: 15	191, 208
23: 15, 16	194, 197
23: 15, 16, 21	192
23: 21	187
23: 32	49
23: 37, 38	44
24	205
24: 17-33	205
24: 18	224
25: 8	208
26: 1, 10, 14	158

## NUMBERS

4: 15, 20	68
5: 2	224
6: 6	224
6: 11	224
9: 6, 7, 10	224
16: 22	109
19: 13	224
23: 10	224
27: 16	109
31: 19	224, 226
35: 11, 15, 30	224

## DEUTERONOMY

5: 12	37
5: 14	38
5: 15	37, 38
5: 22	154
5: 32	157
6: 5	27
10: 4	157
10: 5	18
13: 6, 10	40
15: 15	38
16: 9, 10	194
18: 6	224
18: 10, 11	113
20: 16	223
21: 18, 21	40
22: 21-28	40
27: 25	224
31: 9, 24	17
31: 26	17

## JOSHUA

10: 40	223
11: 11	223
20: 3, 9	224
24: 19	161

## JUDGES

4: 4	145
9: 7-15	116
16: 30	224, 226

1 SAMUEL	37: 25	79	DANIEL		
20: 18	38: 12	224	2	84	
22: 22	45: 6	119	5: 20	225	
28: 7-19	68: 2	121	9: 11	17	
	89: 30-34	158	9: 27	157	
2 SAMUEL	89: 48	122	12: 2	129	
6: 6	104: 29	225			
6: 7	110: 4	119	HOSEA		
22: 16	115: 17	115	13: 14	124	
31: 4	119	161			
1 KINGS	119: 1 sqq.	152	AMOS		
17: 17	119: 4-6	158	3: 7	83	
17: 21	119: 97	29	JONAH		
17: 21, 22	119: 101, 104, 128	158	1: 17	119	
19: 14	119: 175	226	2: 1, 2	122	
20: 32	145: 13	119	2: 6	119	
	146: 4	225			
2 KINGS	PROVERBS		HABAKKUK		
5: 27	20: 27	223, 225	1: 11	225	
12: 4	23: 7	224	HAGGAI		
14: 9	29: 11	225	2: 13	224	
19: 7	29: 18	145	ZECHARIAH		
22: 14			9: 12	111	
1 CHRONICLES	ECCLESIASTES		MALACHI		
5: 21	3: 19	94, 225	4: 1	121	
23: 13	3: 21	227	4: 1-3	115, 121	
2 CHRONICLES	7: 29	157	4: 3	128	
9: 29	8: 8	227			
36: 17-21	9: 3-6, 10	115	MATTHEW		
36: 19-21	12: 7	93-95, 227	1: 21	22, 137	
EZRA	ISAIAH		3: 12	121	
9: 13, 14	8: 20	73	5	163	
NEHEMIAH	19: 10	224	5: 5	158	
13: 17, 18	25: 4	225	5: 10-12	211	
JOB	37: 7	225	5: 17	155, 161	
1: 8	40: 8	119	5: 17, 18	26, 174	
4: 9	42: 7	109	5: 17-19	158	
6: 11	49: 7	224	5: 17, 38, 39	158	
11: 20	56: 1-8	36	5: 22, 29, 30	122	
12: 10	56: 2, 4, 6, 7	174	5: 29, 30	125, 126	
14: 12-15, 20, 21	57: 16	223, 224	6: 19-21	89	
17: 13	58: 13	53	6: 30-33	79	
19: 25-27	61	103	7: 21	13	
26: 4	61: 1	109	10: 28	122-126	
27: 3	61: 1, 2	103	11: 23	122	
28: 28	61: 2	104	12: 1	211	
30: 15	66	126	13: 39	117	
32: 8	66: 22, 23	36	14: 26	226	
33: 4	66: 24	126	16: 17, 18	161	
34: 14, 15	JEREMIAH		16: 18	122	
41: 21	13: 23	161	18: 9	122	
PSALMS	15: 1	224	19: 16, 17	13	
1: 2	15: 9	69	19: 17	163	
9: 17	17: 21-27	127	22: 35-40	27	
16: 10	17: 27	127	22: 37-40	157, 174	
18: 15	31: 33	159	23: 15, 33	122	
19: 11	EZEKIEL				
34: 12-16	11: 5	225	24	83	
37: 11	18: 4	128	24: 3-36	84	
37: 20	18: 32	88	24: 13	132	
	20: 32	225	24: 15	83	
	22: 26	69	24: 20	60	
	36: 26, 27	20	24: 24	145	
	36: 27	159	24: 27	86	

24:33	84
24:36	84
25	116
25:31-41	115
25:31, 41	125
25:31-46	94
25:41	117
25:46	117
27:50	226
28:1	45, 206
28:6	111
28:19	139

# MARK

1:21	211
1:27	75
2:27	36
2:28	53
3:4	225
6:49	226
8:38	78
9	126, 128
9:43-48	126
9:43, 45, 47	122
10:45	225
14:12	210
16:1, 2	65
16:2	208, 211
16:2, 9	45, 207
16:9	211

# LUKE

2:36	145
4:16	211
4:17-19	103
4:18-21	109
4:21	103
4:31	211
6:9	225
9:35	35
9:56	225
10:15	122
12:5	122
12:51-53	77
16:14	116
16:17	161
16:19-31	114
16:23	122, 124
16:29, 31	115
17:10	158
18:12	207, 209, 211
20:35	132
21	83
21:9	52
23:43	110-112, 123
23:43, 46	123
23:56	59, 65, 219, 221
24:1	45, 207, 208, 211
24:39	86

# JOHN

1:9	36
1:17	24
1:29	131, 233
3:5-8	137
3:8	226
4:22	35
5:9	211

5:26	93
5:28, 29	86, 129
5:44	161
6:44	161
7:48	76
8:34	29
8:44	15, 235
10:24	225
13:34	26
13:37	225
14:1-3	85
14:15	73
14:26	85
15:5	14
15:12	27
15:22	138
16:7	85
16:7-9	108
16:8	74
16:13	74
19:30	226
20:1, 19	211
45, 53, 207, 208,	211
20:17	110
20:19	47
20:26	46
21:1-5	46
21:6	46

# ACTS

1:3, 9	46
1:11	86
1:13	47
2:27	122, 124
2:27, 31	122
2:46	48
4:32-37	90
5:29	70
13:14	211
13:39	158
14:2	225
15:5	42, 43
15:10	42
15:10, 11	159
16:13	211
16:31	136
17:5, 6	144
17:19	75
20	49, 50
20:7	48, 49, 174, 207, 211
20:8	49
20:11	49
20:15	49
20:28-30	82
21:8, 9	145
24:14	144
26:22	76

# ROMANS

1:23	92
2:7	91
2:14, 15	157
2:15	154, 162
3:19	157
3:20	15, 25, 158, 161
3:21, 22	21
3:31	26, 158, 161, 174

4:15	15, 161
4:25	132
5:8	246
5:12, 19	157
5:13	16
6:3-5	55
6:12, 14	158
6:14	154, 158
6:14, 15	22
6:15	158
6:16, 18	22
6:23	41, 92
7:7	15, 158
7:7, 22	17
7:9, 14, 24	158
7:12	154
7:12, 7, 14, 22	161
7:12, 22, 25	158
7:24, 25	158
8:1	158
8:1-4	137
8:2, 4	161
8:3, 4	21, 23, 158
8:7, 8	161
8:11	105
8:22, 23	105
10:4	19, 21, 161, 174
10:5	157
11:3	225
13:8, 9	157
13:8-10	158
14:17	142

# 1 CORINTHIANS

1:23, 24	26
1:26	77
2:7	117
3:17	141
5:7	44, 157, 231, 244
6:19, 20	140
7:19	158
9:8-10	158
9:27	142
10:31	142
12:28	161
14:12	226
15:17	132, 232
15:51-54	102, 106
15:51-55	121
15:53	92
15:54	92
15:55	124
15:56	23
16:1, 2	174
16:1-3	50
16:2	207, 211

# 2 CORINTHIANS

3:7	19
3:7, 8	21
3:14	155
3:17	31
5:1-8	105
5:4	106
5:5	105
5:8	104
6:16	158
6:17	157
12:15	225

## GALATIANS

2:4	42
2:16	158
2:20	13, 21, 26
3:9, 14	159
3:10, 12	157
3:13	158, 159
3:19	163
3:21	159, 161
3:24	158
3:24, 25	23
4:1-3	157
4:1-3, 6, 7	159
4:4, 5	158
5:1	159
5:1-3	43
5:6	149
5:14, 16, 18-23	158

## EPHESIANS

1:21	117
2:14, 15, 16, 17	41
2:15, 16	157
3:10	241
3:20	26
4:22-24	107
6:2	158
6:2, 3	158
6:6	225

## PHILIPPIANS

1:6	85, 137
1:21-23	100, 107
1:23	104
1:27	225
2:12	13
3:20, 21	106
4:13	14

## COLOSSIANS

1:16	55
1:17	55
1:26	117
2:14	16, 17
2:14, 16, 17	157
2:14-17	41
2:16	44
2:17	157
3:4	102
3:23	225

## 1 THESSALONIANS

1:9, 10	85, 139
1:10	159
4:13	101
4:15	81, 82
4:15-18	86
4:16	86
4:16, 17	106
4:16-18	101
5:2-4	84
5:20	145

## 2 THESSALONIANS

2:2	82
2:3	82
2:7	52

## 1 TIMOTHY

1:5	21, 161
1:9, 10	28
1:17	91, 92
6:16	92

## 2 TIMOTHY

1:8	78
1:10	92
1:12	78
2:2	82
3:16	58
4:7, 8	78, 82
4:8	102
4:10	117

## TITUS

2:11-14	159
---------	-----

## PHILEMON

15	120
15, 16	118

## HEBREWS

1:8	119
2:16	35
2:17	117
5:1	117
5:6	117, 119
6:20	119
7:11-14	118
7:17, 21	119
7:25	132
8:6	20
8:6-9	19
8:10	20, 159, 161
9	157
9:10	17
9:22	231, 238
9:24-26	118
10:1	18, 157
10:8	18
10:12	18
10:26-29	40
11:16	78
12:3	225
12:9	109
12:14	161
12:23	109
12:28, 29	158
13:20	101, 119

## JAMES

1:23-25	158
1:25	157
2:8	158
2:8, 10-12	157
2:10, 11	158
2:10-12	30
2:11	158
3:6	122
5:11	21

## 1 PETER

1:9-12	82
1:15, 16	141

1:25	119
2:11	142
2:13, 14	158
2:24	131, 232, 233
3:8-12	158
3:17-22	109
3:18-20	107, 110
3:19	109

## 2 PETER

1:11	119
1:19	82
1:21	58
2:4	122
2:5	108
2:6	118
3	103
3:3-13	103
3:7-13	128
3:10	104
3:18	137

## 1 JOHN

2:3, 4, 7, 8	158
2:4	28
3:3	90
3:4	15, 22, 29, 41, 74
4:1	73, 145
5:2, 3	28

## JUDE

3	144
7	118, 121
14, 15	143
20, 21	161
23	157

## REVELATION

1:1	54
1:3	83
1:7	82, 87
1:10	51, 174
1:18	122
2:7	110
6:8	122
6:9, 10	98
6:9-11	114
6:14-17	86
8:9	225
12:7-10	122
12:11	225
12:17	145
13:15	226
14:6, 7	139
14:12, 13, 54, 73	74
19:10	145
20	103, 126
20 and 21	128
20:1-3	245
20:10	117
20:11-15	125
20:13	124
20:13, 14	122
22:1, 2	110
22:11	244
22:12	94
22:18, 19	74

