

Seventh Day Adventism

By

WILLIAM EDWARD BIEDERWOLF



Published By
THE EVANGELIST OF TRUTH
845 Lovell Road
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37922

SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISM

IF THE followers of William Miller had been as honest as this misguided man himself was, the situation which led to Seventh Day Adventism would not have survived that disappointing day in 1844, when for the second time the hopes of this farmer prophet were dissipated by the failure of Christ to put in His appearance according to the laboriously conceived and widely heralded chronological calculation of this deluded but none the less sincere man.

The First Mistake.

William Miller made his first big mistake when he threw aside all human scholarship and depended alone upon his own untutored ability to master the mysteries of the Word of God. No man has a right to ignore what others have learned before him. You might as well step out into the starry night and expect to write an accurate treatise on astronomy and ignore all the findings and deductions of Galileo and Kepler and Herschel and scores of others who have given decades of tireless study to God's handiwork in the skies. When Phillip found the Ethiopian sitting in his chariot and pondering over the Scriptures, he said to him, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" But the Ethiopian didn't say, "I thank you, sir, but I have the Word." No. But he said, "How can I understand unless some one should guide me?" And God's chosen messenger climbed into the chariot at the Ethiopian's request and put him wise to the meaning of what was puzzling him.

BUT WHAT DID MILLER DO?

He took his Bible in one hand and a Concordance in the other and said, "I'll figure this thing out for myself," and so foolishly sought to establish in this foolish and inexcusable way, "the times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." And so he went to work and he discovered the exact time when the Lord was to come back again to the earth.

AT LEAST, HE SAID HE DID.

But William Miller was not the first nor the last

man to itch after a knowledge of this kind and to think he had found it. But all alike have seen their hopes vanish into thin air.

Presumptuous Prophecies

As soon as Christ had ascended, some of the wise ones got it fixed up that He would come back **BEFORE JOHN DIED.**

Christ had not been gone more than twenty years until a certain party claimed that by divine revelation they were made the heralds of the glad tidings that the time of His second coming was **JUST AT HAND.**

Another hundred years rolled by and some who were wise above what is written got it tipped off to them through ecstatic visions that Christ was **JUST ON THE EVE** of coming. But it was all in their mind's eye.

In the tenth century they got at it again, but it didn't pan out and the movement was followed with the usual disastrous results.

A little later some others got on the job and they said that the fifth kingdom prophesied by Daniel was **JUST ABOUT** to be set up and then of course Christ would come. They were known as "The Fifth Monarchy Men."

A hundred years later Immanuel Swedenborg came along with his revelations. Then came the Irvingites, the followers of Edward Irving. **THEY KNEW WHEN HE WOULD BE HERE.** But He didn't come and the old sun rolled through the sky on the appointed day and said with a laugh, "Guess again."

Another hundred years and Joanna Southcott with her "visions" and her "Book of Wonders" was in the lime-light. She said that she herself was the actual Bride of the Lamb and that Christ would come through her on October 19, 1814. Then came Ann Lee, the founder of the Shakers, and claimed that Christ had come in her. And now, to say nothing of a number of less conspicuous prognosticators, we have today among others one Edward Taze Russell, who says that Christ has already come; that He came in 1874, and who said that He would establish his Millennial reign in October, 1914, but who later changed the date to the same month in 1915.

AS IT HAS BEEN WITH ALL THESE, SO IT WAS WITH MILLER.

THEY THOUGHT THEY KNEW, BUT THEY DIDN'T.

Miller took for the foundation text of his theory the same old verse that so many other self-appointed prophets had bungled over, Daniel 8: 14, "UNTO TWO THOUSAND AND THREE HUNDRED DAYS THEN SHALL THE SANCTUARY BE CLEANSED." He was as ignorant of Hebrew as a Hottentot is of the Klondyke and he got "balled up" over the meaning of the word "day."

With the verse just mentioned as the basis of his calculation, Miller fixed the date of Christ's second coming as October 22, 1843. It is said, although stoutly denied, that on this day the Millerites put on their specially prepared white ascension robes and climbed to the house tops and high places and waited for the moment to come when they would be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air."

At any rate the wildest excitement prevailed. Property was given away and crops were left to rot in the field. They knew the end of the world was upon them. Those who did not believe were to be lost. But remorseless old Time kept marching right on and CHRIST DID NOT COME.

This should have been enough, but Miller, like Pastor (†) Russell, discovered that he had miscalculated by a year and once more he fixed the date on the same day of the month, but in the year 1844. It is said the excitement was even more intense than the year before. "THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF A MISTAKE THIS TIME," said the Advent Message, page 569; "all who reject the light will be lost." But again the day passed without regard to Miller's figures.

The results were pathetic. Many were left destitute, many drifted into the other isms of the times and others went away into infidelity altogether. Everybody tried to explain.

Elder White shoved the date up another year.

BUT THEY MISSED IT AGAIN.

But fanaticism dies hard, if at all, and those determined to find an explanation to relieve them of their ridiculous embarrassment of course found it. They had taught that Christ was coming in 1844, to cleanse the earth, the sanctuary mentioned in Daniel 8: 14, but

since Christ very plainly did not come to the earth in 1844, if they could only find a sanctuary in heaven, the necessary explanation would be at hand, for then they could show that it was the heavenly sanctuary. He came to cleanse instead of the sanctuary which they, "by a slight mistake," had supposed to be the earth.

Well, in the book of Revelation they read of a "temple of God that was opened in heaven," and in the book of Hebrews of a heavenly "sanctuary," a "tabernacle which the Lord pitched," and lo! their explanation was at hand. It was Christ's coming or going into the Holy of holies, the inner sanctuary of this tabernacle in heaven, that Miller ignorantly prophesied, and "God," said Mrs. White, "was in the proclamation of 1843 and His hand hid a mistake in some of the figures" (Early Writings, page 64). This looks a little like God bungled as well as Miller, but anyhow the mistake was satisfactorily explained.

Mrs. White and Her Visions.

The Mrs. White just referred to was, until her recent death, the leader and prophetess of the Seventh Day Advent movement. She was one of the early disciples of William Miller. Her maiden name was Miss Harmon. She was a nervous young girl, and at the age of seventeen she had, as she claimed, her first vision. She was afterwards repeatedly caught up into heaven and "saw things." In one of these translation excursions she claims to have been shown the sanctuary, the temple into which Jesus went.

The purported visions and revelations of this neurotic, hysterical, cataleptic woman were certainly the limit and the credulity that swallowed them was certainly a remarkably easy one. These revelations she called her "Testimonies." She has committed them to writing, and claims inspiration for them even as the writings of the Bible are inspired. These revelations she says are "what God opened to me in vision." **YET SHE HAS ALTERED THEM AGAIN AND AGAIN, A PROCEEDING HARD TO UNDERSTAND IF GOD TOLD HER WHAT TO WRITE IN THE FIRST PLACE.**

But if the credulity that "fell" for them in the first place is astonishing, it is all the more astonishing that any one of even ordinary judgment can put any faith in her inspiration or her divine leadership, since so many, if not every one of her visions and prophecies have proven false.

1. In one of her visions her accompanying angel told her that the time of salvation for all sinners ended in 1844. She now claims the door of mercy is still open.

2. In another vision she discovered that women should wear short dresses with pants and she and her sister followers dressed this way for eight years. But the ridiculous custom has now been abandoned.

3. In another vision she said, "Soon we heard the voice of God like many waters, which gave us **THE DAY AND THE HOUR OF JESUS' COMING.**" This cannot refer to the coming in 1844, because it was in 1849 that she had this vision. Knowing then the exact hour of His coming, what about the prophecy of sixty-seven years ago, when she said, "Now time is almost finished and what we have been years (six years) learning, they (the new converts) will have to learn in **A FEW MONTHS!**"

4. In a vision in 1849 she learned that "The time for Jesus to be in the most Holy Place is nearly finished." He had then been there according to this theory only **SIX YEARS**, and this she said "nearly finished" the time, but He has been there now **SIXTY-ONE YEARS MORE.**

5. In a vision in 1847, she saw that Christ would come before slavery was abolished and that it would be abolished when He came. But slavery has been abolished and Christ has not yet come.

6. In a vision of January 4, 1862, she had it revealed to her that slavery "is left to live and stir up another rebellion." But it did not live and it did not stir up another rebellion.

7. Again it was revealed to her that "When England does declare war, there will be general war." There were others who thought in those days that England was about to declare war, but England did not declare war.

IF THIS IS "READING THE FUTURE WITH MORE THAN HUMAN FORESIGHT," WE FAIL TO SEE IT.

But what saith the Scriptures? "And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which **the LORD HATH NOT SPOKEN**; when a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, **IF THE THING FOLLOW NOT**, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt be afraid of him." Deut. 18: 21, 22.

BUT WILLIAM MILLER SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN HONEST. He said, "We expected the second coming of Christ at that time and now to contend that we were not mistaken is dishonest. I have no confidence in any of the new theories that grew out of the movement" (Advent Message, pages 410-412).

Now, so far as believing in a definite time for the second coming of Christ is concerned, by whatever process of chronological speculation it may have been reached, we may gracefully allow each man his own sweet way about this and pity the victim of his delusion when he is embarrassed by it; but the great objection to Seventh Day Adventism, as to all other fanatical departures from the time honored and generally accepted interpretation of Scripture, is that they do not content themselves with their single, harmless, though unwarranted deduction, but proceed forthwith to gather about it or to deduce from it, as they believe, all sorts of doctrinal vagaries and perversions which make the thing in its ultimate form an undisguised contradiction of all or nearly all the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith.

What Seventh Day Adventism Teaches.

Let us now begin by inquiring what Christ is supposed to have done when He entered the Holy of holies in the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. He is supposed to have cleansed it, or rather to be cleansing it, and when He has finished, his second coming to earth will take place.

BUT HOW IS HE CLEANSING THE SANCTUARY?

He is investigating, they say, the sins of His people with a view to securing for them the pardon of God. When He has finished His investigation, He binds all the sins of His people on the Devil because He discovers the Devil to be the author of them, and these sins the Devil as a scapegoat bears away into oblivion where he will be annihilated, all of which is to take place at the second coming of Christ in the very near future.

The atonement therefore will only be finished when the Devil thus bears away the sins of God's people. Then occurs the resurrection of the righteous dead and the change "in the twinkling of an eye" of the

righteous living, and those thus redeemed enter with Christ into the joys of heaven, while the wicked dead, on the other hand, are left sleeping in the grave and the wicked living are left with Satan on earth, then in a chaotic, desolate condition for one thousand years, at the end of which time the wicked dead are resurrected and with the wicked living are swept away with Satan into the oblivion of utter annihilation. Now until this culmination of God's plan of redemption, the souls of those who die, both of the good and the bad, are asleep in the grave.

The Seventh Day Adventists find most of this as well as other things, they say, in the proceedings of the day of atonement of the Old Testament, on which day, you will recall, the high priest went into the Holy of holies, in which, of course and rightly, they find the great type of Christ's entrance into the Holy of holies in the sanctuary of heaven.

But now in as much as we read in the Scriptures of the high priest that, "on the day of atonement he is the high priest only for those whose names are inscribed on the breast-plate of judgment," therefore, argue the Seventh Day Adventists, when Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary in 1844, the day of pardon was over and no more sinners could be saved. Says Mrs. White: "My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked but could not see it **FOR THE TIME OF THEIR SALVATION IS PASSED**" (Present Truth, page 22, August, 1849).

Again, in as much as no work was to be done on the day of atonement (Leviticus 16), so many of the Seventh Day Adventists held that from the day of Christ's entrance into the Holy of holies in heaven, no more work was to be done and that to do any further work was to be guilty of sin. They expected of course the "cleansing of the sanctuary" to occupy only a brief time.

Once more, in as much as Christ has entered the inner heavenly sanctuary, we are now living in the last days, and finding by a certain species of interpretation that in the last days the Sabbath is to be resumed by Israel, they concluded that the law given on Sinai was never abrogated and that therefore we of today are as much obligated to keep the seventh or Sabbath day as were the Jews in the times of the Old Testament dispensation.

Mrs. White claims to have seen this heavenly sanctuary and its contents, and she says, "Two angels stood one at either end of the ark, with their wings spread over the mercy seat and their faces turned toward it." Jesus raised the cover of the ark and she beheld the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written. She was amazed as she saw "the Fourth Commandment in the very center of the ten precepts with a soft halo of light encircling it."

Now you have the central teaching of Seventh Day Adventism and the strange doctrines gathered about it.

The Teaching Summarized.

1. It teaches that Christ entered into the Holy of holies in the heavenly sanctuary in 1844, to make an investigation of the sins of His people, with the purpose of completing His atonement for them and so securing for them the pardon of God.

2. It taught that the door of mercy was then closed to all who at that time were unsaved.

3. It taught that it was a sin to do any work after that time.

4. It teaches that Satan is to be made the scape-goat to bear away the sins of God's people.

5. It teaches that the souls of the dead sleep in the grave until the day of the resurrection and the judgment.

6. It teaches that the wicked are to be finally annihilated.

7. It teaches that the seventh day of the week is to be observed as the Sabbath and not the first day.

Let us now examine these statements one by one.

THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY

I. CHRIST ENTERED THE HOLY OF HOLIES IN THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY IN 1844. Let us see if He did.

They are wrong, both as to TIME and PLACE, as well as PROGRAM.

1. In the first place, Miller was all wrong in his chronological calculation.

(a) The date from which the time is to be reck-

oned until the sanctuary is to be cleansed clearly begins with the desecration of the sanctuary and the cessation of the daily sacrifice (Daniel 8: 13), **WHICH TIME IS STILL IN THE FUTURE.** But Miller reckoned the starting point to be the same as the "seventy weeks of years," mentioned in the next chapter (Daniel 9) as beginning "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem." And even this starting point he fails to properly date. That "commandment" is without any doubt whatever the decree of Artaxerxes given in the twentieth year of his reign (Nehemiah 2), that is, 445 B. C., by the unanimous testimony of all ancient historians. But Miller took as the starting point the letter of Artaxerxes, mentioned in Ezra 7: 11, which was given in the seventh year of his reign, namely, 457 B. C., to Ezra, and which was no decree at all, but which of course subtracted from 2300 leaves 1843. But having taken the wrong starting point in either case, his concluding date of 1843 would of course have been an altogether wrong one, even if he had been on the right track.

(b) Miller thought the "2300 days" of Daniel 8: 14 meant 2300 years. Sometimes the word "day" does mean "year," but this is one of the places where, if he had known Hebrew, he would have known that it does not mean "year," but an "evening-morning day," as the Hebrew puts it, or a regular day of twenty-four hours, and the 2300 days consequently mean a period of about seven years; and once more, therefore, even if his starting point were right, his date of 1843 would be all wrong.

2. In the second place, shifting the scene to heaven is entirely without warrant. They quote Hebrews 8: 1, in support of their theory. "We have such an High Priest, who is set down **on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens**, a minister of the Sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." But this very passage, as well as many others, utterly contradicts their theory.

(a) Leviticus 16: 2, Numbers 7: 89, 1 Sam. 4: 4, and 2 Kings 19: 5 show that "the throne of the Majesty," the dwelling place of God, is upon "the mercy seat" of the ark between the cherubim, which is "within the veil," in the Holy of holies. And Hebrews 8: 1 states distinctly that Christ "is set down" (R. V. "**sat down**") on "**the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.**" Now this verse was written A. D. 64, and Christ could not, therefore, according

to this verse have entered into the Holy of holies in the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. It makes it plain that the Lord Jesus entered into the heavenly sanctuary, into the Holy of holies at the "right hand of the throne of the Majesty," when He ascended into glory 2000 years ago.

(b) Again, Exodus 26: 33 tells us very plainly that the Holy of holies was "within the veil," and Hebrews 6: 19, 20, says that, "Within the veil the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus made an High Priest forever." Christ, therefore, entered the sanctuary "within the veil" at the time of His ascension and not in 1844. There is absolutely not one grain of evidence that the veil separated the Holy Place from the court, as Mrs. White contends. It separated the Holy Place from the Holy of holies.

(c) Again, Hebrews 9: 24 shows that Christ at His ascension went into and "is NOW in the PRESENCE of God for us," that is, where God dwells, namely in the Holy of holies; and Hebrews 10: 19-22 shows that the Holy of holies has been and is now opened for us, "By a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us THROUGH THE VEIL, that is to say, His flesh."

3. In the third place it is fundamentally wrong to connect the "cleansing of the sanctuary," spoken of in Daniel 8: 14, with the work of the high priest either in the earthly sanctuary or in its antitype, the heavenly sanctuary.

(a) First, because, while the word "sanctuary," in Daniel 8: 14, may be used of the entire tabernacle, the entire sanctuary or of the Holy Place alone, it cannot be used and never is used of the Holy of holies alone.

(b) Second, because the word translated "cleansed," in Daniel 8: 14, strictly speaking means "put right," "set in order," and does not refer to a sanctifying and cleansing based on sacrifice at all, but it refers to an act of taking possession of that which has already been purchased by sacrifice.

THE SHUT DOOR OPENED.

II. THE DOOR OF MERCY WAS CLOSED IN 1844, TO ALL WHO WERE AT THAT TIME UNSAVED.

Was it?

Well then the further spread of their belief was impossible. It then became apparent that if any sort of propaganda was to be carried on with a view to securing converts for Seventh Day Adventism, the door of mercy must be thrown open to all, and it was accordingly done, and any one looking for light regarding the sanctuary might yet enter in.

A FORCED CHANGE OF MIND.

III. IT WAS A SIN TO DO ANY WORK AFTER 1844. They expected the cleansing of the sanctuary to last but a very short time. But time starved them out at this point and they found it convenient to change their mind. It is only fair to say that only a branch of the Seventh Day Adventists had taken this position.

SATAN AS SAVIOUR.

IV. SATAN IS MADE THE SCAPEGOAT TO BEAR AWAY THE SINS OF GOD'S PEOPLE. This is of course a flat denial of the fundamental doctrine of the atonement. It makes the Devil your Saviour instead of Christ, or at least it shares the honor with him.

They get this curious piece of information from the marginal reading in Leviticus 16: 8 (placed in the text in the Revised Version), "ONE LOT FOR JEHOVAH AND THE OTHER LOT FOR AZAZEL." Azazel, they say, means the Devil.

Many of the leading modern scholars agree with them in this interpretation of the word.

But if you will read the Seventh Day Adventist theory of the atonement a few pages farther on you will see that they very plainly make the second goat himself to be the Devil, or rather a type of the Devil.

But with this the many modern scholars do not agree.

Now let us examine this matter for a moment before we set forth their theory of the atonement in detail.

1. In the first place it is hardly probable that two animals of the same kind and of the same qualifications would have been selected to represent two persons of such widely different character as Christ and the Devil. The use of an unclean animal in either case was strictly forbidden. Some one has asked, "Is Satan so virtuous that he must be represented by an animal without blemish?"

2. In the second place the entire teaching of the word of God is against such a theory. Hebrews 9: 28 says, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." This and other verses (Isaiah 53: 6, 11, 12; 1 Peter 3: 18; 1 Peter 2: 24) show very distinctly that it is Christ and not the Devil who is our "sin offering," and that, as John says, it is "the Lamb of God that beareth away the sin of the world" (John 1: 29).

3. In the third place, the similar ritual in Leviticus 14: 1-7 is against any such view of the proceedings. Here the living bird which corresponds to the living goat is allowed to go forth into a life of freedom. The proper explanation is of course that the slain goat and the live goat as well as the slain bird and the live bird both refer to Christ who, "was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification" (Romans 4: 25).

4. In the fourth place it is distinctly stated that both goats were taken for a sin offering (verse 5) and it is just as distinctly stated that the goat to be sent away alive as well as the one to be slain was presented before the Lord (verse 10). Most assuredly therefore neither goat could have represented the Devil.

5. But finally, if we consent that "azazel" is a proper name and that it means the Devil, to identify this individual with the goat is an inexcusable exegetical blunder that completely ignores the grammatical construction in the use of the preposition "for." If "azazel" means the "Devil," then according to the construction one goat was for Jehovah and the other goat was for Azazel, that is, for the Devil.

This is enough to show how absurd and how impossible it is to make the live goat to be Azazel, the Devil, or to make him a type of the Devil as the Seventh Day Adventist people do. Their interpretation is altogether fanciful and wholly without Scriptural warrant.

This settles the thing in question, but it will be of interest to investigate somewhat the real meaning of the word "azazel."

There are four interpretations each one of which has had the support of many leading scholars.

1. It has been taken as the name of the place to which the goat escaped, that is, "a far off place," "a place utterly removed."

2. It has been taken as a designation for the goat itself, that is, "the goat sent away," "the goat al-

lowed to escape." "the escape goat." So the A. V. and many old authorities.

3. It has been taken as a personal being, an evil spirit (some say Satan) to whom the goat was sent. So the R. V. and a number of later scholars.

4. It has been taken as an impersonal word designating a "a complete sending away," "an entire removal."

The correct interpretation is a matter of exegesis about which no impartial scholar will dogmatically declare himself, simply because he cannot be absolutely sure about the derivation of the word and its meaning. Least of all will he inject his interpretation into a system of theology.

1. The first interpretation has little if anything in its favor and has now been practically abandoned by all authorities.

2. The second interpretation is not an impossible one. It at least conveys the sense of the passage. In this way the word is derived from "Az" meaning a "goat" and "azal" meaning "going away." Against this Oehler urges that "Az" means "she goat." But this is not necessarily so. Some nouns have but one form and indicate animals of both sexes, like "ovis" in Latin, meaning a sheep. (See Genesis 27: 9; Deut. 14: 4; Ex. 26: 7). The most serious objection to this rendering is that it makes it somewhat difficult to get a smooth reading out of verse 10 and 26.

3. The third interpretation has met with much favor. But against it the following objections are urged.

(a) Satan is nowhere else mentioned in the entire Pentateuch and he would hardly be mentioned here by a name which he nowhere else has in the whole Bible.

(b) The parallelism formed by the double use of the preposition "for" would force the meaning that just as the first goat was slain as an offering to appease Jehovah, so the second goat was sent away as an offering to appease the Devil or some evil spirit who dwelt in the wilderness, an idea which is revolting and entirely out of harmony with the whole tenor of the word of God. The principal reason for pressing a personal meaning upon the word "azazel" is the double use of the preposition "for," but this must not be carried too far.

Some say the goat with the forgiven sins was sent out to mock the Devil and not to appease him, to gambol in exulting triumph before the Devil. Some say the goat was delivered up to the Devil. But why all this exegetical contortion to explain an improbable meaning.

4. The fourth interpretation is perhaps most in keeping with the nature of the service, most harmonious with the scope of the Scriptures and most in line with the root meaning of the word.

Dr. Eidersheim says, "The word 'azazel' is by universal consent, derived from a root which means, 'wholly to put aside' or 'wholly to go away.'" This root, "azal" probably comes from the Arabic. Whether this be true or whether the word is derived as mentioned above, under the second interpretation, the idea of "complete dismissal" and "removing far away" evidently inheres in the meaning of it. Even Oehler, who interprets the word as "the name of an evil spirit," says it may be taken impersonally and interpreted in the sense of "dismissal." Well, if even he admits such a rendering why not so take it and all difficulty is relieved and the evident sense of the passage retained.

Thus under no circumstances can the goat which is sent away be identified with the Devil or be made a type of the Devil.

THE SECOND GOAT IS THE TYPE OF CHRIST
EVEN AS THE FIRST ONE IS.

How Atonement is Made.

Let us now see how the Seventh Day Adventists work out their theory of the atonement.

You know, the high priest made atonement for the sanctuary itself because of its defilement through the uncleanness of the people. Just so, they say, the sins of believers are laid upon the heavenly sanctuary and atonement must be made for it, and Christ, the Great High Priest, entering the Holy of holies in the heavenly sanctuary made atonement for this sanctuary just as the high priest did for the earthly sanctuary.

But how did the high priest make this atonement for the earthly sanctuary? By taking its sins upon himself. In the same way Christ made atonement for the sanctuary in heaven. The sins of the Israelites

were therefore first laid upon the sanctuary and then upon the high priest and then the high priest came out of the Holiest of Holies with these sins and laid them on the scapegoat, who bore them away to the wilderness. So Christ, the Great High Priest, will one day come forth from the Holiest of Holies in the heavenly sanctuary with the sins of His people which He took from off this sanctuary where they had been laid and He will lay these sins on the Devil, who will in turn bear them away into the wilderness of annihilation.

AND THIS IS THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENT PLAN OF SALVATION!

IT TEACHES THAT OUR SINS ARE NOT AS YET PARDONED OR BLOTTED OUT.

IT TEACHES THAT OUR SINS WILL BE BLOTTED OUT ONLY WHEN CHRIST IS READY TO COME AGAIN TO THE EARTH.

IT TEACHES THAT CHRIST DID NOT MAKE ATONEMENT FOR OUR SINS UPON THE CROSS.

IT TEACHES THAT SATAN AS A FORCED VICTIM IS TO BEAR AWAY OUR SINS.

Thus is the atonement denied and the blessed doctrine of justification by faith set aside by this pernicious doctrine that dares to substitute for Christ's finished work on the cross the vicarious sufferings of the Devil who is made to be a sin bearer in our behalf. The whole thing is a miserable travesty on the gospel of the grace of God.

Indeed they say, "We dissent from the view that the atonement was made upon the cross as is generally held," (Fundamental Principles, page 2), and they say the atonement will be complete only when Christ comes out of the heavenly sanctuary and lays our sins on the Devil and he bears them away.

But my Bible says, "Christ was ONCE offered to BEAR the sins of many" (Hebrews 9: 28), and "When He had by HIMSELF PURGED OUR SINS, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Hebrews 1: 3).

WHERE ARE THE DEAD?

V. THE SOULS OF THE DEAD ARE SLEEPING IN THE GRAVE. So they say. "The state to which we are reduced by death is one of silence, inactivity and entire unconsciousness" (Fundamental Principles, page 12).

1. What then did Paul mean when in Hebrews 12: 22, 23, he enumerated, among other things in heaven, the "spirits of just men made perfect?" Were they unconscious?

2. Did Paul expect to go into a state of "entire unconsciousness" when he said he had a "desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better" (Phil. 1: 23, 24), and when he said, "We are willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5: 1-8)?

3. When Moses met with Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration, was he in a state of "entire unconsciousness"?

4. Was the rich man unconscious when in the lost world he cried out, "I am tormented in this flame," and asked Abraham to send a warning to his brothers on earth?

5. Does not the Bible distinctly state that at death the body "shall return to the earth as it was and the spirit shall return to God who gave it"?

6. When Jesus said to the thief on the cross, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise," and a moment later said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," what happened?

IT IS VERY PLAIN TO SEE WHAT HAPPENED.

HIS SPIRIT WENT INTO PARADISE AND THE SPIRIT OF THE THIEF WENT WITH HIM.

THESE TWO SPIRITS DID NOT GO TO SLEEP IN THE GRAVE.

The soul sleeping texts used by the Seventh Day Adventists refer always to the body and never to the spirit. When it is said Lazarus sleepeth, it does not refer to his spirit, because it says a moment later, "Lord, by this time he stinketh."

In Acts 2: 34, when it says, "David is not ascended into heaven," the whole context shows that the reference is to his body, and as a rule whenever the dead are referred to as sleeping, you will find the subject under discussion is the resurrection of the body. It is the body that sleeps and not the soul. So in Matthew 27: 52 it says, "The graves were opened and many **bodies** of the saints which **slept** arose."

The strongest scriptures used by Seventh Day Adventists are taken from Ecclesiastes and their main

text is Ecc. 9: 5, "the dead know not anything," etc.; also verse 10, "there is no knowledge in the grave whither thou goest." But this is not a divine revelation concerning the state of the dead at all. Everything in the Bible is not true. Every time the Devil opened his mouth he lied. The writer of Ecclesiastes is here reasoning from the standpoint of a man "under the sun." It is the way things look to a man "under the sun," the natural man. They are set down by inspiration, to be sure, just as the words of the Devil are, but this does not mean that they are therefore necessarily utterances of the truth. Take the second verse of this same chapter. We know that is not true and in verse 4 the writer says there is no difference between a dead man and a dead lion, and that a living dog is better than either of them.

THIS DOCTRINE OF SOUL-SLEEPING HASN'T GOT A SINGLE LEG TO STAND ON.

IT IS OPPOSED TO EVERY INTUITION OF MAN'S RATIONAL NATURE.

IT DESTROYS THE IDENTITY OF MAN.

IT CONTRADICTS THE PLAIN AND UNMISTAKABLE TEACHING OF THE WORD OF GOD.

The soul of the believer at death passes immediately into glory and that of the unbeliever into the region of the lost; not necessarily into the fullness of glory nor into the final degree of punishment, but the righteous into a glorious state and the wicked into a condition just the opposite. So the Bible teaches and so the Church has always believed.

THE FATE OF THE WICKED

VI. THE WICKED ARE ULTIMATELY ANNIHILATED. Now this is a harmless sort of a doctrine and we are not going to make any stout denial of the contention of many that if a man were left to his own inclinations he'd rather believe that the wicked cease to exist than to think of them suffering always the everlasting punishment of orthodox theology.

But the trouble with the doctrine is that it is both unscientific and unbiblical.

1. In the first place it contradicts the Bible teaching that there are degrees of reward and punishment. In Romans 2: 6, we are told that God "will render to every man according to his deeds," and in Rev. 20: 13 it says that "they were judged every man according

to their works," but if the finally impenitent are annihilated they are punished every man alike.

2. In the second place the Bible speaks in no disguised manner about the "wrath of God abiding" on the wicked (John 3: 36), and when, in Matthew 25: 46, it says the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into everlasting life, the same Greek word is used in both cases, making plain the fact that the punishment of the finally impenitent is as everlasting as is the reward of the righteous.

So in Revelation 22: 11, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still, and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still," while in Mark 9: 44 we are told of a worm that never dies and of a fire that is never quenched, and in Rev. 20: 10 we are told of a punishment that is to continue "day and night forever and ever." A man who can read annihilation into Scriptures like these can discover a Beethoven symphony in the croaking of a frog pond.

SATURDAY OR SUNDAY

VII. THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WEEK IS TO BE KEPT HOLY AS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD AND NOT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

1. They say that Sunday is the day of pagan sun-worship and is therefore not a fit day for Christians to observe as the holy Sabbath.

BUT THE FACTS ARE AS FOLLOWS.

Sunday was named after the Sun, just as Saturday was named after Saturn, and anybody who knows anything knows that the day of pagan sun-worship was an annual day, that it came only once a year, and that therefore it came on Sunday only once in seven years, and that it came on Saturday just as often as it did on Sunday, exactly as does the Fourth of July or any other annual celebration.

2. They say the Pope is the image of the beast mentioned in Revelation and that he changed the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day, and that therefore the keeping of the first day of the week is the "mark of the beast," and that every one who is not a Seventh Day Adventist and who keeps the first day of the week is eternally lost. WE ANSWER,

(a) What Pope? There ought to be no trouble to locate him. But they have furnished us neither with

his name nor his time. No such person has ever been found.

(b) The "Catholic Dictionary," one of the recognized standard authorities of the Roman Catholic Church says the title "pope" was not exclusively applied to individuals until 1073. **Nothing could therefore be done by a pope before there was a pope.**

(c) **If the Pope changed the Sabbath, why did the Greek Catholic Church, which strongly opposed the Roman Catholic Church and its Pope, observe Sunday as the Sabbath instead of Saturday?**

(d) The Apostolic Church Fathers and early Christians who observed Sunday must have known that the Pope made the change, if he did make it, and therefore when they ascribed the Sunday Sabbath-keeping to another reason, as they all did, every one of them made himself a self-confessed liar.

3. **They say that Constantine, by an imperial edict in 321 A. D. effected the change in compliance with the demands of the Roman Catholic Church, and that thus the pagan Roman Sunday was made the Sabbath instead of the Saturday-Sabbath of the Word of God.**

This same contention is made by the Roman Catholic Church herself: at least by a number of her prominent priests. The Catholic Mirror, the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons and very largely of the Papacy in the United States, says in its issue of September 23, 1893, "The Catholic Church for over 1,000 years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday."

WE ANSWER:

(a) If, however, the Roman Catholic Church wants some testimony fully as authoritative, and even more so than this, they will find it by turning to the article "Sunday" in the **Catholic Encyclopedia**, published by Robert Appleton Co., where they will find these words, "Sunday was the first day of the week according to the Jewish method of reckoning, but for Christians it began to take the place of the Jewish Sabbath in Apostolic Times as the day set apart for the public and solemn worship of God."

(b) Now, that the Apostolic Fathers and early Christians did observe Sunday as the day of rest and worship, exponents and opponents of Sunday-keeping alike acknowledge. See abundant proof of this on pages 42 to 45, and note especially the acknowledgment

of Elder Andrews, the ablest historian the Seventh Day Adventists ever had. This being so, it becomes at once apparent that the edict of Constantine in 321 A. D., which made Sunday the legal Sabbath for Christian people, in reality **CHANGED NOTHING**, but only gave imperial sanction and definite imperial authority to A CUSTOM ALREADY ESTABLISHED AS A FIXED THING IN THE EXPERIENCE OF CHRISTIAN PEOPLE.

(c) Here is exactly what was done. The Romans had their rest day, their Sabbath, every eighth day. It was called "Nundinae." The Christians had their rest day, their Sabbath, every seventh day. It was called "Sunday."

In 321 A. D. Constantine legalized the Christian's Sunday, that is, he made it equal in authority, equal legally to the pagan Roman Nundinae. This, as one can well understand, became to burdensome, and the pagan Nundinae day of rest was suppressed by Theodosius the Great and the Christian Sunday was accepted as the only legal Sabbath of the Roman Empire.

The Sabbath observance of the first day of the week came down to Constantine's day FROM APOSTOLIC TIMES, and neither Constantine nor any other Roman emperor changed the so-called Bible Saturday Sabbath to Sunday, but such a change was made with respect to the pagan Nundinae Sabbath. The truth is that the pagan Nundinae was supplanted by the Christian Sunday.

Now let us investigate the matter somewhat further and get all the facts before us as clearly as possible so that if a decision must be made between the two days it can be made intelligently. If we are told expressly to keep the seventh day, then of course such a command must forever settle any dispute we may have about the matter.

Here now are three positive and undisputed facts:

(1) God rested on the seventh day and hallowed it (Gen. 2).

(2) The next mention of the seventh day Sabbath was 2,500 years later, when God gave it to Israel (Exodus 20: 11). God "made it known" to Israel when they were in the wilderness (Nehemiah 9: 7-14). So we are not certain that the Sabbath was observed prior to this time.

(3) **The Sabbath was given to Israel,**

- (a) **As a remembrance of her deliverance out of Egypt (Deut. 5: 12-13).**
- (b) **As a sign of God's covenant with His people (Exodus 31: 11-18 and Ezekiel 20: 12).**
- (c) **As a shadow of which Christ is the substance (Col. 2: 16-17).**

The Sabbath was nowhere given or enjoined as a memorial of God's creation rest, but as a remembrance and a sign and a shadow as just noted, and of course because of the constitutional demands of man's nature for a day of rest.

NOW LET US NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. The Sabbath day, according to the Old Testament and according to Seventh Day Adventists, began at sunset on Friday evening and ended at sunset on Saturday evening.

But the Sabbath day in the minds of the Disciples evidently did not begin and end with sunset. In fact it seems that no hard and fast time necessarily began or finished the day of rest at the time of the writing of the gospels.

Matthew says (Matt. 28: 1), "In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." It doesn't "begin to dawn" at sunset on Saturday night. For Matthew the Sabbath must have ended at SUNRISE on Sunday morning.

Now if you will look at what the other writers of the Gospels have to say as to the time of the coming to the sepulcher you will see that they apparently make the Sabbath end at MIDNIGHT on Saturday night. It is for this reason that the critics charge the evangelists with error and inconsistency. But they are not uncertain about the time of the resurrection at all, because they all agree that it was about the rising of the sun on the first day of the week, but their statements apparently controvert the Adventists' contention that the Sabbath day in Scripture must begin and end at sunset.

2. It is also quite plain that whether we are under the law or not a universal application of a strict observance of the seventh day, according to the Old Tes-

tament commands, is not only beset with great embarrassment, but is altogether out of the question, because of its utter impossibility. It is this that inclines one to the belief that the seventh day seems to have been given to a special people for a special purpose.

(a) If two men start from the same point and travel, one east and the other west, around the world, when they meet they will be two days apart in time.

(b) If the Sabbath is to be kept from sunset to sunset, as Israel kept it, what about the lands where the sun only sets once in six months? Mrs. White wanted to fix the hour at six o'clock. But the Bible says "sunset." For those who are so insistent on the letter of the law, is it right to substitute expediency for explicit command?

(c) No fire was to be kindled in Israel's day under penalty of death (Exodus 35: 2, 3). Mrs. White says it was not cold there and to kindle a fire would be guilty of needless work. But John 18: 18 says distinctly that it was cold, and that they built a fire and warmed themselves. If no fire is to be built how then could such a Sabbath be kept in lands that are severely cold? If we are to keep the law we must keep it always and not only when it is convenient to do so.

(d) Mrs. White teaches that other planets are inhabited and that God's obedient creatures everywhere, even the redeemed in heaven, "will observe the Sabbath day to all eternity." But in as much as the days vary in length on the various planets how can they all observe any where near the same time?

3. We must further call attention to the fact that while in our minds there is a distinction between what we call the Moral law and the Ceremonial law, there is no such distinction set forth in the Word of God. In the Bible the law is the law.

If now such a distinction between the Moral law and the Ceremonial law be a proper one, and it is, it must be seen in this, that a Ceremonial law is one given as a ceremony to a particular people under peculiar conditions and is therefore local and given for special and peculiar purposes and must necessarily pass away when its purpose is fulfilled and the conditions under which it is given are changed.

The Moral law, however, represents a thing inherently right from all eternity, and is not right because God says so, but is commanded by God because it is

right, and which neither God nor man may violate and which must by reason of its very nature endure forever and be universally binding.

Now it says nowhere in the Bible that the Ten Commandments are the Moral law and the other commandments and injunctions the Ceremonial law. In 1 Corinthians 14: 34, women "are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." Where does the law say this? In Genesis 3: 16. Therefore Genesis is the law.

Read Romans 7: 7 in the same way and find your answer in Exodus 20: 17. Therefore Exodus is the law.

Read Matthew 22: 36 and with it Deut. 6: 5 and Lev. 19: 18. Therefore in the same way Deuteronomy is the law and Leviticus is the law.

Read Matt. 12: 5. Where is this found? In Numbers 28: 9, 10. Therefore Numbers is the law.

The Bible does not say the Ten Commandments alone are the law. It does not say they are the Moral law. Make them the Moral law and then of course the Fourth Commandment is universally binding and binding for all time.

Now if the distinction made, not in the Bible, but in our own minds, is a legitimate one, the Fourth Commandment would be the only ceremonial one in the entire ten. That the distinction is a legitimate and perfectly proper one is clearly proven by the fact that Jesus according to strictest Sabbatarians of His day broke the Fourth Commandment and was criticised by them for doing so. Furthermore Jesus distinctly says, "The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless." Would He have dared to say this if the Fourth Commandment was a Moral law? Could the Seventh Commandment or any other of the ten except the fourth one be broken by the priests and the fact that they were broken in the temple make them blameless? "No, indeed," you rightly cry. To have broken any other commandment in the Temple would have made the foul deed all the fouler.

4. While it proves nothing one way or the other, it does appear a bit strange that Jesus told us to keep His commandments, but He nowhere told us to keep the Sabbath. Seventh Day Adventists ask us where Jesus commands us to keep the first day of the week. With equal propriety the same question may be asked

concerning the seventh day. All the other commandments but the fourth one are enjoined and reinforced in the New Testament:

I. Acts 17: 23-31; Rom. 1: 23-25; 1 Cor. 8: 4-6. II. Acts 14: 11-17; 17: 23-31; 8: 4-6; 10: 7, 14, 19, 20; 2 Cor. 6: 16, 17; Gal. 5: 19-21; Eph. 5: 3-6; Col. 3: 5; 1 John 5: 21; Rev. 21: 8; 22: 15. III. Jas. 5: 12. IV. No references. V. Eph. 6: 1-3; Col. 3: 20. VI. Rom. 13: 9; 1 John 3: 15; Rev. 21: 8; 22: 15. VII. Rom. 13: 9; 1 Cor. 6: 13-18; Gal. 5: 19-21; Eph. 5: 3-6; Col. 3: 5; 1 Thess. 4: 4-7; Heb. 13: 4; Rev. 22: 15. VIII. Rom. 13: 9; 1 Cor. 6: 10, 11; Eph. 4: 28. IX. Rom. 13: 9. X. Rom. 7: 7; 13: 9; 1 Cor. 6: 10; Eph. 5: 5; Col. 3: 5; 1 Tim. 6: 9-11, 17; Heb. 13: 5.

This impels one to the query of why the fourth was omitted. Seventh Day Adventists say Jesus and His disciples kept the seventh day as the Sabbath. That they did before His resurrection is quite certain and quite as natural. The question is, did the disciples keep the first day of the week after His resurrection?

Now regardless of what day the disciples kept after the Resurrection of Christ, we are face to face with the historical fact that both the particular day observed and the manner of its observance have for the greater part of Christendom been changed, and we want now to study and observe very carefully as to whether the grounds for such a change are justifiable or otherwise.

I. In the first place we must admit that there are natural grounds for deeming the change permissible if sufficient reasons for the change are forthcoming. These natural grounds lie as we have already seen:

1. In the more or less ceremonial nature of the Fourth Commandment itself given as it appears to a particular people for a particular purpose.

2. In the impossibility of universally keeping the same time or keeping any time in the same manner.

3. In the advanced civilization which would make altogether unjustifiable the infliction of penalties such as God saw necessary for the Jews in the period of their almost savage tutelage.

II. In the second place certain special Scriptures seem clearly to speak of the passing away of the Sabbath in the old Jewish sense.

1. It seems to be definitely prophesied in Hosea 2: 11. "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths and all her solemn feasts."

2. In 2 Corinthians 3: 7-11 it seems to be clearly indicated that the commandments as such written on tables of stone are "done away" and annulled. "But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious."

III. In the third place Paul, the inspired Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, certainly does not refer to the Sabbath as he ought and as we would expect him to if it was to retain all of its old sanctity and stand out conspicuous among all the other days as a day of rest and worship. This we would expect him all the more to do in as much as his epistles are shot through and through with the passing away of the Old Testament covenant of death and the ushering in of the New Testament covenant of life. If the Fourth Commandment alone was to remain, why didn't he say so? But what are the facts?

1. He never at any time or on any occasion enjoined or enforced the Jewish Sabbath on the Christian church.

2. He seems to be "afraid of" those who observe "days and months and times and years" (Galatians 4: 8-11). What "days and months and times and years"? Why, the ones enjoined in the Old Testament of course.

3. He declares that we are not to be judged "in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbaths" (Col. 2: 16, 17). He says these things "are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ." We are never concerned with the shadow after the man who casts the shadow comes up. As you walk slowly away from the rising sun suddenly the shadow of a man begins to pass you, first his head, then shoulders, arms and body and by this you know some one is overtaking you, and at last some friend in the body comes up alongside of you and what? The shadow is forgotten of course in your sweet communion with your friend who is the substance of the shadow which was cast.

4. He permits every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind (Romans 14: 5, 6). "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

IV. In the fourth place it seems utterly futile to even attempt to set aside the historical fact that the early disciples did observe the first day of the week as their day of rest and worship, and this of course was in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ which occurred on the first day of the week, commonly known as Sunday (John 20: 1).

The two days were kept side by side, the Jews keeping Saturday and the Christians keeping Sunday, the seventh and the first day of the week respectively, the Jewish Christians for a time at least keeping both. When Paul wanted to address his fellow countrymen he went into their synagogues on Saturday, the Sabbath, but when he wanted to address his fellow believers in Christ he went on Sunday, the Lord's day, the Christian's Sabbath, into their meeting place wherever it may have happened to be.

That the early disciples did observe the first day of the week and make it their day of meeting for worship and fellowship is made clear both by Scripture and by early church history.

Let us take first the Scripture testimony.

1. "When therefore it was evening on that day, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you" (John 20: 19).

We must frankly admit that this verse proves nothing in the controversy one way or the other. The Seventh Day Adventists say the disciples were "assembled for fear of the Jews." We think not, but rather that they "shut the door" for fear of the Jews after they were assembled. Read the verse and judge for yourself.

The opponents of Seventh Day Adventism say they were met to celebrate the Resurrection. But this is hardly probable. As yet they did not believe He had risen (John 20: 9, Mark 16: 9-14). It was their abode (Acts 1: 13), and it was the most natural thing in the world that they should be assembled there the second day after the death of Christ. They were doubtless

assembled there as well the day before, on Saturday. I would rather judge they were assembled every day for a few days at least. Put yourself in their place and you will see how natural such a thing would be.

Christ met them there it would seem not so much to celebrate with them His resurrection as to prove to them who were to be his witnesses that He had really risen from the grave (Acts 10: 39-41, Luke 24: 37-43). The fact remains, however, whether it be worth anything in the discussion or not, that it was the first day of the week when the disciples were assembled and that the Lord met with them on that day.

2. "Again after eight days his disciples were within and Thomas with them and Jesus cometh, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst" (John 20: 26). This is plainly the "first day of the week." It is useless to contend that "after eight days" would bring the time to Monday. It is the common expression for, "this day week," counting always the day then present and seven others, or "after eight days."

3. "And upon the first day of the week when we were gathered to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow, and prolonged his speech till midnight" (Acts 20: 7).

(a) The statement that the day began at sunset and that therefore this meeting which lasted till midnight MUST have been on Saturday night and that the next day, Sunday, was spent in travel is too puerile to deserve any serious notice. Even if the day did begin at sunset, which it did not, unless you think of it under what they term the Ceremonial law, this by no means proves that the service did not begin before sunset on Sunday evening. Read the verse for yourself and judge with unbiased mind whether it was on Saturday evening or Sunday evening when the meeting was held.

(b) Again, the expression, "ready to depart on the morrow," means of course on the morrow after the day mentioned in the verse, namely "the first day of the week" when they came together to break bread, and is therefore Monday. It is useless to contend otherwise, and the apparent desire to make Paul travel on Sunday justifies it all the less.

(c) If we reckon the day begins at midnight as is the custom now and as we have already seen it to be with the Gospel writers, then the breaking of bread did not commence until in the beginning of Monday

in as much as Paul preached until midnight, then went down and restored the young man who had fallen from the window and afterwards broke bread with the Disciples. But the mere fact that Paul continued his speech so long and delayed the breaking of the bread until the early hours of Monday morning does not by any means alter the fact that it was on the **FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK** that they came together for the purpose of breaking bread, and the attempt to rob the first day of the week of this fact, as the Seventh Day Adventists do by reason of the above mentioned order of events, only weakens the cause for which they are contending.

It may be of interest to note what the foremost authority on the chronology of the book of Acts, Prof. Ramsey, has to say. In "St. Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen," page 289, he says, "On the Sunday evening just before they start, the whole congregation met at Troas for the Agape; religious services were conducted late into the night, and in the early morning of Monday the party went on board and set sail." Prof. Ramsey is not interested in our discussion at all; he is only trying to make out a good case of chronological accuracy for the book of Acts.

THE VERSE IS A HARD ONE FOR THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST, BUT IT MEANS JUST WHAT IT SAYS, NAMELY, THAT ON SUNDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, THEY CAME TOGETHER TO BREAK BREAD.

4. "Now concerning the collection for the saints . . . Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him" (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2).

While there is therefore no distinct mention of the Disciples keeping the seventh day after the resurrection, the scriptures do make it plain that they did meet on the first day of the week and that the Lord met with them on this day before his ascension and that they met for worship and the breaking of bread.

Let us now look at the testimony of early Church history and see how fully it corroborates the above conclusion.

THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS (100 A. D.) says, "Wherefore also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead."

THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS (107 A. D.), a pupil of the apostles and whose writings were com-

mended by Polycarp, a friend of St. John's says: "And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all days."

"Those who were concerned with old things have come to newness of confidence, no longer keeping Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord's day, on which our life as risen again through Him depends."

In the WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR (145 A. D.) it is said: "But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day of the week and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead."

For some time the Jewish Christians continued to keep both the Sabbath and Sunday, but according to Justin Martyr they were to be borne with as weak brothers. He says in his dialogue with Trypho, chapter 47: "But if some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, along with their hope in Christ, yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised, like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren."

APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS (Second Century): "On the day of the resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord's day, assemble yourselves together without fail, giving thanks to God and praising Him for those mercies God has bestowed upon you through Christ."

DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH (170 A. D.), in an epistle to the Church of Rome, wrote: "Today we kept the Lord's Holy day in which we read your letter."

MELITO OF SARDIS (175 A. D.) wrote a treatise on "The Lord's Day."

IRENÆUS (160-200 A. D.), in arguing that the Sabbaths were to be taken as signs and types and NOT TO BE KEPT WHEN THE SUBSTANCE OF WHICH THEY WERE THE SHADOW WAS AT HAND, says: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day and on this alone should we observe the breaking of the Paschal Feast."

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (174 A. D.) says: "The old seventh day has become nothing more than a working day."

BARDESANES (180 A. D.) says in his book of the "Laws of the Countries," "On one day, the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together."

TERTULLIAN (200 A. D.) says in his Apologeticus: "In the same way if we devote Sunday to rejoicing, from a far different reason than sun-worship, we have some resemblance to some of you 'The Jews,' who devote the day of Saturn (Saturday) to ease and luxury." In another of his works he says: "He who argues for Sabbath keeping and circumcision must show that Adam and Abel and the just of old times observed these things.

"We solemnize the day of Saturday in contradiction to those who call this day their Sabbath."

"We observe the day of the Lord's resurrection laying aside our worldly business."

ORIGEN (185-255 A. D.) says: "John the Baptist was born to make ready of people for the Lord, a people fit for Him at the end of the Covenant now grown old, which is the end of the Sabbath." He further says, "It is one of the marks of a perfect Christian to keep the Lord's day."

CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE (250 A. D.), says: "The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath and the Lord's Day."

CYPRIAN (258 A. D.) says: "Because the eighth day, that is the first day after the Sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give the circumcision of the spirit, the eighth day, that is the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day went before in figure."

VICTORIANUS (300 A. D.) says: "On the Lord's day we go forth to our bread with the giving of thanks. Lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews, which Christ himself the Lord of the Sabbath in his body abolished."—On the Creation of the World, section 4.

PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA (306 A. D.), says: "But the Lord's day we celebrate as the day of joy because on it he rose again."

EUSEBIUS (324 A. D.) of the Ebionites says:

"They also observed the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them, but on the other hand, they also celebrate the Lord's Day very much like us."—Ecclesiastical History, pages 112, 113.

ELDER ANDREWS, the ablest historian the Seventh Day Adventists ever had, says in his "History of the Sabbath," page 308: "The reasons offered by the early fathers for neglecting the observance of the Sabbath show conclusively that they have no special light on the subject which we in this later age do not possess." **What a confession is this! He admits the very thing we have been contending for.**

The question is not now whether they were right or wrong in their view of the Sabbath, but it is this, did they know or did they not know what was the prevailing custom of Christians in the time in which they lived? If there is one extant statement contradicting their testimony, it has yet to be produced.

The Seventh Day Adventists say that you must keep holy the seventh day, Saturday, or be lost; not to do so is to have the mark of the beast. But this is not the spirit which prompts the New Testament Christian to observe the first day of the week; it is not done in the spirit of legality; it is not done in order to be saved, but it is done in joyful recognition and grateful remembrance of Christ's redeeming work which He finished by His triumph in Resurrection.

And so we have seen how untenable the several tenets of Seventh Day Adventism really are. It is a system of legalism and is a travesty of the truth. It says, "Do this and live," but my Bible says (Romans 3: 28). "A man is justified by faith WITHOUT THE DEEDS OF THE LAW."

There was no legitimate reason for Seventh Day Adventism coming into existence, nor is there any for its continuance. If the seventh day Sabbath conviction must find a champion in some religious denomination, the followers of William Miller could have found it in the Seventh Day Baptists, and this is not shot through with the unwarranted chronological speculations and doctrinal vagaries so peculiar to Seventh Day Adventism.

There is a lot of needless speculation that works positive harm. We recall one good woman upon whom some peculiar religious vagary was being pressed and

when asked if she believed it all, out of the confusion of her mind and the distress of her soul she cried, "Oh, God, I don't know what I believe," and as a result of it all her whole faith became unsettled.

"Faith of our Fathers, holy faith,
We will be true to thee till death."

And what is that faith? Christ, the only begotten Son of God, His deity and the value of his Saviorship as based upon it and your justification and mine by faith in Him as witnessed through sincere repentance of sin and baptism for its remission.

THIS IS GLORIOUS AND THIS IS ENOUGH.